

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 33 Maple Grove Road

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: 8

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between January 4 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and January 14, 2021 (committee meeting date): 10

(Note: A petition in opposition to the application containing 277 signatures was submitted in September 2020, prior to the report publication. A submission was also provided to the Coordinator by Jill & Glen Jones, dated August 25, 2020, prior to report publication)

Primary concerns, by individual

Jake Cole (oral submission)

- neighbours on this application have concerns and don't think it's compatible with the rest of neighbourhood; they have offered a good compromised solution to allow the developer to make a return on investment and provide a dwelling people can live with and feel good about, which should be considered
- where there is conflicting opinions at these meetings, the developers seem to have the upper hand and the final decision goes in their favour; developers and people who work with them or own development companies can contribute to Councillors' campaigns, as has been the case here, which can lead to a perceived conflict of interest
- residents' concerns should outweigh developers' requests

Brad Hall (oral submission)

- the application is disingenuous and falsely presents a proposal for two 3-storey buildings when in reality they would be two 4-storey buildings when viewed from the rear and side, due to the slope of the lot in question north from McCurdy to Young Pond Court; the impact on neighbours in the area is thus significantly more than portrayed or stated in the staff report
- staff are biased to the City's policy, which favours the developer and ignores

context, and lack of neighbourhood knowledge

- approvals of similar, apparently minor, development will create dissension if proposed in other wards
- neither the developer nor staff have provided full or correct context of the application or the development in the surrounding area, including the provision of additional illustrations that would make the height disparity clear
- claims about access to public transport are inaccurate and do not reflect the actual walking or biking distance, or the slope to the Terry Fox transit corridor that inhibits anyone with wheelchair or walker, or of any age, in winter negotiating that slope easily to Terry Fox; this location encourages car use, rather than use of public transport

the neighborhood would be happy to see increased density through suitable development infill here with less objectionable and intrusive options that respects the zoning change but without permitting further exemptions

David & Susan Wice (oral submission and written submission with Susan Wice)

- the proposal is not good for the community; it is overdevelopment of the site, being too dense and tall
- the City has defined 'low rise' as four units per apartment, so this exemption is a change in the definition of "low rise" that should be addressed by the Planning Committee in that regard, and the proposal should be viewed as true zoning rather than a bunch of exemptions; these are more exceptions and accommodations than the existing neighbourhood should be reasonably expected to embrace or accept given the rules and regulations in place
- the Site Plan attached to the report doesn't show storm water ponds on the property but it is in the text of the report; the report doesn't address the lack of sewers or the safety concerns associated with open water during storms, or the private lot that would impact on seepage, and it's the same area where there'd be snow piling, salt and sand, which would cause problems to surrounding vegetation; the City should require the applicant to install storm water sewers on Maple Grove Road, as there are none in this section, as they have done with other developers
- the exceptions for number of units and lack of proper drainage both sound like corporate greed at the expense of bedrock residents of the community and future residents of the proposed development
- the report provides recommendations on how the developer can build without installing proper support infrastructure; allowing infill construction of this type in this

community would send an alarming signal to residents that the City is willing to undo years of conscientious planning and design for one applicant at the cost of the established individuals and home and other investors of the surrounding existing neighbourhood

- page 3 of the executive summary incorrectly identifies that the property is “opposite a park and an institutional use, both with large amounts of open space”, but it should be noted that these open spaces are across McCurdy and across the intersection of McCurdy and Maple Grove; the immediate neighbours that share property lines are existing private homes
- there is no evidence to support the report’s claim that development applications and new construction adversely impact property values
- if this plan is to continue to be considered, the applicant should be expected to reduce the plan to 4 unit buildings - two storeys from the front and three storeys from the sides and back of the buildings with room for appropriate parking, which would allow for the initial plan to preserve mature vegetation; with appropriate storm sewers, the initial plan of a rear yard could also be maintained, instead of the site becoming a building, abutting a parking lot, abutting large storm ponds, that do not allow for the “substantial rear yard space” originally presented

Matt Brearey, Vice-president, Katimavik-Hazeldean Community Association (oral submission)

- the community understands the need for an upgrade and it’s a large lot with an opportunity to meet some of the intensification goals with infill that’s a priority for this committee, but by approving this development it’s more cramming a square peg into a round hole, and many residents are opposed
- the proposal is an R4 zoning with a severance and a laundry list of exceptions and the two extra units per building may call into question whether it’s still an R4 zoning
- turning a single-family home into 12 apartments is more than 8 times the intensification, it’s over 1000%, which seems excessive
- the committee should consider what the true best use of this property would be with respect to its surroundings of single-family homes

Don Bell (oral and written submission)

- expressed disappointment with the way the application review has been conducted and how completely City planners accepted every assertion from the applicant and how casually they dismissed every community resident’s concern
- there is community perception that developers have significant influence at City Hall

- the general public, constituents, voters and taxpayers will only embrace tough new processes like intensification if they are seen to be honest, respectful and fair and it is not clear this has been the case here; if citizens feel their concerns are being ignored, that staff are predisposed to serve some applicants well and ignore others completely, it will be impossible to gain trust or support of citizens; Ottawa needs smart, effective intensification but first it needs the support of its citizens
- the concept was simple – convert the lot to R4 and build to those specs, with building height capped at 11 m, but the proposals have not been even close; the first design stood 14 m, roof peak to ground in the front, 15.3 m to the parking lot at the back- almost twice the height and four times the volume of surrounding single family homes; when residents expressed concern, a revised plan came back even taller, but by poking projections and soffits through the roof they managed to claim a reduction in building height; this final proposal arrived with several major exceptions requested – an extra half metre of building height, two extra apartments per building, parking in the side yard, and others, all of which were quickly recommended by obliging City planners, even though 250+ residents raised multiple concerns
- submitted a written explanation of key events leading up to this proposal and a list of suggested questions the committee might want to ask staff about their rationale for accepting this proposal before making a decision on the matter

Dawn Nicholson-O'Brien & Greg O'Brien (oral submission and written submission with Greg O'Brien)

- the proposal in no way compliments the existing character of the neighbourhood, contrary to staff assertions
- a number of years ago the Ruddy Shenkman Hospice, across the street from the proposed development, was granted a number of exemptions but neighbours had no objections because the setback was exceptionally large, the building was low density and complimentary of existing single family homes; this development is not - it is more than 2 times the average adjacent family homes in all directions surrounding it
- the sheer number of variances and exemptions being sought in this proposal flies in the face of the City's published residential fourth density R4 Zoning Review document, tabled on Oct. 14, 2020 and amended in November, in which staff indicated the study would set zoning that will allow as-of-right the kind of desirable development that shouldn't have to seek a variance, but it will also make clear that further variances from those standards to be generally discouraged, when in fact there are a sizable number of variances and exceptions being sought here

- the community is not opposed to appropriate development; if the developer was putting forward a proposal for garden homes, semi-detached or single family homes, they would have no issue, but two towering buildings do not constitute complementarity
- if Planning Committee and Council continues to approve these kinds of developments in uniquely family-home areas, people will start bankrolling candidates who take a very different view; since this does not conform with policy, legal and other requirements, including those of the province, the City will meet considered resistance
- all Members of Council should visit the site to understand how anomalous the proposal is relative to the existing residential homes surrounding the area and how the significant exceptions, variances and exemptions will adversely impact people's lives
- this application, if approved, will set a precedent for further multi-unit development in the community
- the two proposed buildings are monstrosities in scale, devoid of aesthetic appeal, will cast shade over adjacent homes and will adversely affect property values; studies show that home buyers seek homes that are largely homogenous in size, and in nature, congruent with those already in place in neighbourhoods, whereas these large, boxy, multi-unit buildings in residential areas detracts from the quality of the neighborhood that drew people into the area in the first place
- there is comparably little negative reaction, by contrast, being witnessed for infill development that involves well-conceived garden homes, town homes, and, semi-detached homes
- Ottawa residents have not in any way given their consent to infill development and the City has no mandate to proceed
- this specific proposal is not consistent with the City of Ottawa Official Plan, nor, does it meet critical policy tests
- it is a conflict of interest that Council members can legally currently accept campaign donations from individuals directly involved in the developer/builder industry and still be permitted to sit on the Planning Committee, where members routinely receive and approve submissions from property developers and investors; it is not enough that an individual Council Member can voluntarily recuse themselves from a particular agenda discussion of the Planning Committee, where they declare a perceived or real conflict of interest; . they will seek policy and legislative changes in this regard

- the City uses development charges and various fees to generate revenues to meet forecasted future budget shortfalls, but infill development is not the answer to budget shortfalls
- apartments have their place as new developments are being considered but not in pre-existing uniquely single-family home areas
- the staff summary of residents' comments who oppose the application does not begin to cover many of their key concerns and many comments are not reflected at all. It betrays a blindness to the concerns of residents; more than 265 signatories, neighbourhood residents, vehemently oppose the two apartment buildings; over 300 neighbours participated in a Zoom call involving residents who were universally, not 150 people, as stated in the staff report; and, more than 1000 residents signaled their opposition through their signatures on online petitions that were not given standing
- a review of Planning Committee meetings Minutes for 2020, to ascertain how often or how infrequently requests emanating from developers were actually returned to be altered, or were rejected by the Committee, does not inspire confidence that this proposal will be altered or denied, as it should be, in its entirety; many residents allege this is simply a pro forma process with approval already given to the developer
- there is currently no demand for apartment dwellings in this neighbourhood; there is plenty of rental stock in Kanata and some are currently being constructed, and these buildings don't fill a pressing citizen need, other than, possibly, to generate profit for the investors; people in this neighbourhood are seeking to buy garden homes, semi-detached homes, or single-family homes where they retain their investments, and, see their equity grow in value; tens of thousands of long-term and short-term rentals have also increased recently and, for the same price, or less than you would pay to rent an apartment, you can rent a single family home or a townhouse, on a long-term rental; there is now more demand for multi-room semi-detached homes, and, single-family homes, with fewer requirements for City transit, as people work from home on an ongoing basis, post-pandemic
- the proponent has made very few changes to the original proposal, in spite of the massive opposition expressed by residents to the proposal, and the changes made to date are so minor in nature as to be inconsequential
- they would never have built their house in this neighbourhood four decades ago if they had known that infill development would be considered in the neighbourhood

- rezoning the property from R1M to R4F could have a substantial adverse neighbourhood effect; this proposal is not congruent, nor compatible with, the existing character of single-family homes that dominate this area, and is completely disproportionate to what the City's own infill requirements are
 - a shade/shadow review should be conducted to materially assess the impact of the shadow that the proposed buildings would have, casting shadow over and obliterating the light coming into adjacent homes, as this is a quality of life and health issue, in addition to having financial and privacy impact on adjacent homes
 - the permitted height of 11 metres has never been used in the area; the average two-storey house in the area is 18 – 20 feet high at most, while the developer is proposing a height of 38 feet, more than twice the height of adjacent family homes
 - neither the front nor side yard setbacks are adequate or comparable to those of adjacent properties, making the buildings so visually dominant and without transition, it would ruin the street views in all directions, and it seems that inconsistent standards are being applied, as the Ruddy Shenkman Hospice, right across the street, was required to have (correctly) huge setbacks
 - the developer cannot preserve trees on the property in order to build the parking area, which further demonstrates the site would be overbuilt
 - the notion that the proposed buildings have design characteristics, colours and materials, that are 'characteristic of the area' is balderdash, and the fallacy that this proposal represents "good planning" and will result in "site improvements" is so specious as to be deemed without credibility

Steve Morvai (oral and written submission)

- the developer was disingenuous about his intentions for the property when he bought it, saying he had plans to rent the property for retirement income and to recover investment and plans to eventually replace the house on another adjacent lot; he did not disclose his actual intention to tear down the home and put up large rental buildings
- it is understandable that older run down homes can be replaced and larger lots subdivided for additional family homes but a welcoming mat was not put out for the owner to bulldoze the area and set up shop as rental landlord in this community; the community will not stand for massive overshadowing boxes to cage residents
- concessions shouldn't have to be made by the community

- noted that he has posted alternative proposal options on Twitter and that staff have ignored his written submissions and requests to provide Committee with alternative recommendations
- questioned how community interests and their investments will be protected from applications that jeopardize stable and well established neighbourhoods that careful homeowners spent their life savings on; this residential area currently has no R4 sub-zones, multiple density tenant dwellings, or commercially operated apartment complexes
- questioned who is responsible to ensure applications are rejected for mature neighbourhoods with attractive properties or enforce that established sub-zones are not breached so that homeowners and investors continue to follow existing and well established blueprints in residential areas by strictly building within the lines
- questioned why the city pitched a charitable objective - R4 zoning, emphasizing urban intensification, to provide affordable accommodations for people - when the applicants are seeking enrichment opportunities, having emphasized that the target audience is upscale and premium clientele; the City's R4 vision not been predominantly exercised in affluent areas where derelict mansions, such as Rockcliffe, Sussex, Island Park, and on vast sprawling properties that can afford massive R4 expansion opportunities, but appears to only target average income and less affordable neighbourhoods of isolated pockets with limited growths to meet objectives
- the applicant and his multiple companies publicly advertise their professional nature to secure depressed properties in communities as their investment strategy and solicit investors to engage in the practice with them not on a philanthropic level but capitalistic in nature, which does not enrich communities but tears into them; this does not ensure that homeowners' stake in the community is preserved without leaving residents with lifelong resentment
- questioned how the City can justify that property values for existing homes are not devalued when the existing owners, the majority of who disapprove of the proposal, and any new owners that come into the area would also share the same conclusion, that the City is pulling the wool over their eyes
- questioned the applicant's intent with an extreme proposal that breached several zoning criteria and why adhering to R1/R2/R4 criteria was not sufficient in redevelopment to embolden his investment

Phil Boyd (written submission)

- the proposed development does not fit the character of the neighbourhood; instead

of conforming to the character of the neighbourhood, the developer is looking to maximize their profits by fitting as many units as they perceive the City will bend the rules for them to construct

- the community put forth detailed arguments against the zoning amendment which clearly outline why this particular building design does not meet the criteria set out in the zoning by-law; the fact that this application had to create a new zoning designation and still couldn't conform with it, asking for another exemption to increase the height of the property is a clear indication that this design does not fit the community
- the community is happy to see the property redeveloped just adhering to the spirit of the character of the community

Blair Moxon (written submission)

- at last count there are 269 individuals in 137 homes that strongly oppose this misguided and disastrous proposal, which will destroy the neighborhood and line the pockets of greedy developers; City planners have disregarded all of the complaints and protestations leveled at them
- this proposal will lead to future misguided policies, urban planning disasters and developer greed
- two 3-storey apartment buildings in an area filled with one and two story buildings, in a quiet residential area, is unacceptable; it will block sunlight across the neighbourhood (being at the top of a hill), block the view for all residents, violate neighbours' privacy, lower property values for surrounding homes, introduce a high volume of traffic and potential for accidents (walking and transit are not practical options here); all car accident and legal costs should be directed to the City of Ottawa and the Planning Department
- this is a case of greedy developers destroying the community's architectural environment; there is plenty of land in the surrounding areas to build more appropriate apartments and houses
- this will not provide accommodations for low income housing but will line the pockets of developers as a commercial operation; residents bought into this neighbourhood to get away from commercial development, and this is an underhanded attempt to rezone and commercialize the neighbourhood
- any councilors that want to retain their seats should think carefully about the legacy they intend to leave the city; the next steps will be appeals, lawsuits against the city, the developers, lost jobs and campaigns to prevent any city councillor from ever holding office again

Mike Derstroff (written submission)

- is against rezoning, the City should listen to the people of this community and vote against the proposal

Suzanne Moxon (written submission)

- most people in the immediate area are perfectly fine with a multi-family residence being built in the property (two story townhomes) but the size and number of residences in this proposed apartment complex is just too much; infrastructure will be strained, available parking is inadequate; the building is too high and will negatively impact adjacent homes, and is not in keeping with the neighbourhood
- the major concerns of residents have not been addressed
- street parking along McCurdy is already a big problem because of the Hospice and traffic congestion will likely increase with this apartment complex (and maybe others); the number of parking spaces allotted isn't adequate to support the occupants, leaving aside any visitors, which will exacerbate parking issues on neighbouring streets, interfering with snow removal, visibility, noise, safety, etc.
- public transit serving the area has deteriorated and is not a viable option, particularly for those with mobility issues, to reduce traffic congestion
- approval of this could set a development precedent for similar properties in the area, including the one directly behind her own house, further blocking out the sun and destroying the value of her property

community response to the October 23, 2020 submission by Novatech, transmitted by Councillor Allan Hubley (written submission)

- the resubmission fails to address the fundamental concerns of the community, although there have been welcome minor changes (two additional parking spaces, widening of the drive aisle, moving the garbage / recycling storage from the rear yard to an internal location, doubling the number of bicycle parking spaces and adding eight new trees)
- the applicant continues to attempt to minimize the impact by comparing the proposed development at 33 Maple Grove to an "imaginary neighbourhood" as if it were built to full R1 maximum height and volume with allowed secondary buildings
- the Official Plan explicitly states that, when considering a proposal for residential intensification through infill or redevelopment in the General Urban Area, the City will "assess the compatibility of new development as it relates to existing community character so that it enhances and builds upon desirable established patterns of built form and open spaces "; single-family homes, namely bungalows and two-storey

homes, dominate this neighborhood; the proposed buildings are nearly twice the height and four times the mass of the existing homes

- despite the claims made by the applicant, public transportation options from this location are limited; the bus stop on McCurdy provides service to and from Tunney's Pasture during morning and evening commute hours only; there is no local or weekend route, and the nearest crosstown route is down a steep hill; this development is more than two kilometres by foot or bicycle of the Terry Fox Bus Rapid Transit station, not within about one kilometer, as the applicant has asserted
- the community has six major objections to the proposed development, relating to the application's compliance with zoning regulations and its compatibility with the neighbourhood as required by the Official Plan
 - Zoning: the maximum number of permitted dwelling units within a low-rise apartment dwelling in the R4F zone is four (not six as requested in this application); Novatech is being disingenuous in stating that the proposal meets or exceeds the required setbacks for the zoning, as the R4F subzone only allows a maximum of four units per building, not six; there is no R4 subzone that would permit both the unit count and the tight spacing of buildings over 11.5 metres; given the narrow interior setback, the maximum number of units in each of these buildings should be four as stipulated by the City
 - appropriateness of the site for the proposed level of intensification: increasing density to make development more efficient doesn't mean it applies equally to every infill site across the city; intensified development still has to be appropriate for, and compatible with, the neighbourhood; Planning Authorities have not identified this site or area as appropriate for intensification due to transit - a bus stop in front of the site (with a route that operates only during rush hours) or on Terry Fox doesn't justify this level of intensity; the existing neighbourhood is a uniformly single-family home community with mature, landscaped yards, tied together with a system of wooded open spaces and trails; the proposal does not complement, add to or improve on these existing neighbourhood qualities in any way; this project appears to be aimed at a target market of younger tenants. Without three-bedroom apartments and barrier-free access, it will not provide adequate housing for families, or for seniors and the disabled
 - height and mass; the height and mass of these buildings is out of scale with the existing adjacent homes; these buildings appear to dwarf the existing adjacent home with almost 4 times the wall and roof area; the adjacent

homes were not built to the maximum height allowed by their zoning - their actual height is approximately 8 metres; there are errors in Figures 10, 11 and 12 with respect to height and roofline that require clarification; the buildings have been artificially raised, and the rear part of the lot lowered, to allow for parking under the buildings, rather than following the natural slope of the site; grading changes across the site, combined with the proposed under-building parking, mean that the east elevation is actually four storeys in height (not three); the upper dormers arguably add another storey to the visual height of the buildings; the buildings are raised above McCurdy by approximately half a floor; the apartment buildings will be significantly taller than the surrounding single-family homes, blocking sunlight, casting shadows and negatively affecting privacy; this is a corner lot, giving significant exposure to the side and rear of the buildings as well as the front; the proposed southerly building will significantly crowd and overshadow the existing house on McCurdy and create a four-storey wall 3 metres from the property line; the rear elevations (seen from Maple Grove Road and from the properties on Young's Pond Court) will appear as 4 to 5 storeys in height, rather than the 3 storeys described in the report, and, given the overall size of the buildings, this is an unacceptable erosion of privacy

- setback: the fact that the minimum lot frontage is proposed to increase from 12 metres to 15 metres is irrelevant when it means that the use on the lot is changing from a single-family house to six-unit apartment buildings, and the same goes for the setback revisions, as they have little application when the resulting built form has a volume of 3 or 4 times that of other neighbourhood dwellings; the two proposed buildings' front walls are situated approximately 4 to 6 metres from the street line; most of the existing homes are set back 9 to 12 metres, with just their one-storey garages set back approximately 6 metres, which means the proposed buildings will appear even more imposing from the street, and out of place for the neighbourhood
- parking and transit: the applicant has added two parking spaces, and, as a result, the northmost and southmost parking spaces intrude into the required setbacks; the zoning by-law requires 3.0 metres of landscaped setback between an apartment dwelling in an R4F subzone and an R1 zone (109 McCurdy Drive); one of the parking spaces intrudes into this setback, and this is not acknowledged as a required exception; while parking is now provided in accordance with the R4F zoning by-law (7 resident spaces and 1 visitor space per building), this amount of parking remains wholly inadequate for 12 two-bedroom apartments in a suburban location, and public

transportation options are limited outside of normal commuting hours and don't provide for much public transportation, to grocery stores, for example; on average, there will be demand for more than one parking space per unit; the submission makes a number of statements with respect to transit access and routes that are inaccurate; even with the 2 additional parking spaces, there will be street parking, interfering with pedestrian, bike and road traffic and adding to an unresolved neighbourhood problem with street parking generated by the Ruddy-Shenkman Hospice located directly across the street; handicapped parking spaces are being provided at the rear of the buildings, but someone using a wheelchair or walker would need to climb a 3-metre staircase, or travel about 90 metres around the front of the buildings and up the ramps, to reach the entrance

- design: the proposal states that the ground floor units of each building will have direct access from McCurdy Drive but this is not evident in the illustrations provided; the north elevation for the buildings shows that the increased slope of the roof cuts to about five feet above floor level on the third floor, which seems to compromise the usability of the interior spaces between the projecting dormers, and with no interior schematics, it's hard to judge the proposal's assertions about floor space and utilization; the proposal doesn't complement the neighbourhood in terms of architectural design; all claims about "high quality residential buildings" and about materials complementing neighbouring buildings are made without substantiation and are not enforceable; the relative height and bulk of the buildings and the surface parking make them incompatible with the surrounding dwellings; the cramped entranceway between the buildings has potential to become a public-safety nuisance; the buildings will likely not command the rents that the applicant imagines their high-end property to be worth, nor will the location likely be viewed as transit-friendly by DND employees (purported by Novatech at the community meeting to be targeted tenants); flush eaves (not projecting) are a poor design choice for this climate and don't complement the neighbourhood; the low grading of the rear parking lot will produce an impractical 10% upward grade on the drive between the parking aisle's nearest catch-basin and the sidewalk adjacent to Maple Grove
- other concerns about the development relate to safety, noise, precedent, garbage/recycling, and impact on operations of the Ruddy-Shenkman Hospice
- there are alternatives that would achieve the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and Official Plan intensification goals while being compatible with the neighbourhood and addressing most (if not all) of the concerns raised by residents, which Novatech

does not appear to have considered; the preferred option is townhouses within R3 zoning, fronting Maple Grove, with a stepped building design that follows the natural sitegrading, which would be a much more complementary design solution with less neighbourhood impact and would achieve the City's objective to intensify development, while addressing the community's concerns and satisfying the financial interests of the applicant; alternatively, these buildings must be redesigned as two-storey, four-unit apartment buildings compliant with an existing "junior" R4 subzone without need of an exception for the building height and the number of units

- the addition of garage doors to the covered parking spaces appears to be a ploy to avoid the need for site plan approval, as the addition of the outdoor parking spaces in the revised submission would otherwise have made site plan approval necessary; the very fact that the applicant is pushing every limit, asking for exceptions and making unsubstantiated statements, and that the document contains numerous questionable design decisions and errors, argues for the Councillor and/or Planning Committee to force a Site Plan Approval Review

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Murray Chown, Novatech (oral submission)

- this proposal conforms with the City's goals for intensification in existing neighbourhoods
- provided site context and an overview of the application, noting proximity to amenities and transit (existing and planned), proposed landscaping/greenspace, setbacks in relation to the neighbouring home, the proposed servicing solution, which includes extension of storm sewer to serve this development
- the two proposed apartment buildings match the building envelope permitted on the street, but they need an exemption for the number of units inside the buildings

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent one hour and 46 minutes in consideration of the item.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented, with Councillor Hubley dissenting.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between January 14 (Planning Committee consideration date) and January 27, 2021 (Council consideration date): 1

Primary concerns, by individual

Don Bell

- over 250 local residents have joined in a detailed, respectful program of replies to this proposal emphasizing the dominating height, tight interior side yard (ISY) setbacks and large number of apartments
- the applicant initially proposed a rezoning to R4F because it alone offered an exceptionally narrow minimum side yard, allowing two buildings to be squeezed onto the McCurdy Road frontage; numerous exceptions were permitted - notably higher building height and more apartments than contemplated in an R4F - all justified by the pressing need for intensification
- during review, City planners elected to recommend instead an R4J rezoning, again with numerous exceptions; somehow, the fact that the required minimum side yard clearance of an R4J is 1.5 metres, and that both R4F and R4J zonings in the process of being revised, increasing interior side yard clearances to 2.5 metres for buildings as tall as these ones will be; it is unclear why planners would recommend such narrow clearances, and increasing the number of dwelling units permitted, when they know that this ISY Increase is underway
- to local residents, the whole process seemed more like an elaborate bait-and-switch than an objective, rules based process; residents fully expected that some compromise proposal would eventually be found that would fairly balance applicant expectations and resident concerns but what they did not anticipate was how completely City planners would accept every assertion from the applicant, and how casually they would dismiss every community resident concern
- there will be a large number of review processes like this to complete as the Intensification Program moves forward; Council needs all stakeholders to feel confident that proposals are being evaluated objectively, consistently and fairly for all participants; approval of this proposal in its current form and with its current history will send a strong message to residents that their expectation of fair treatment is being ignored and Councillors should consider if that is the legacy they want to leave

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

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