

**FCA INFILL 2 WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES 5 FEB 2015**

**Location:** CHAMPLAIN PARK FIELD HOUSE (7 to 10 PM)

**Attendees:** Planning and Zoning Representatives from Community Associations in the inner and outer urban wards.

**Purpose of the Group:** To encourage CA's to read and comment on Infill II zoning documents and to communicate within their communities, between communities, and with City of Ottawa Planning Dept, Planning Committee and their Ward Councillors

**Background:** Community associations from the inner and outer wards affected by the Infill 2 zoning by-law proposal (inside the greenbelt) were invited to participate in this discussion group. Member associations had already discussed and responded to a pre-circulation of the by-law proposal to a deadline of Jan. 21. Several representatives also had met with Planning on or prior to that date.

**Purpose of the Meeting:** To provide an opportunity to discuss the revised Infill 2 By-law documents first distributed Jan. 29, 2015 (some changes appeared on the website after that date).

**Introduction:** These Notes are a high level summary of the issues discussed at the meeting. They are not a transcript of the discussion. It is evident that different communities are in different stages of the intensification and urban renewal process. Some communities, especially some in the outer urban areas, have been barely touched by it, whereas most, if not all of the inner urban areas have been experiencing it for several years now. Some shared views and concerns were identified. It was also clear that the individual character and development history of each community are reflected in their responses to the Infill 2 By-law proposal.

Group members unanimously supported FCA Principle #4, *Protect Community Character. Plan for Ottawa as a City of Communities and Neighbourhoods: "Future development in established communities ... to be compatible with established Community Character"* as outlined in the FCA's **Summary of Recommendations on City of Ottawa Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan and Infrastructure Master Plan.**

**General Comments:**

1. Representatives commended City Staff for their sincere desire to "Do infill differently".
2. The "Required Rear Yard Setback" provisions are strongly favoured by communities. Some minor changes to tighten up the wording were suggested.
3. The provisions regarding required side yard and front yard setbacks are reasonable.
4. Representatives expressed appreciation that rooftop accesses have been downsized. There still are significant concerns with the potential siting of these accesses, which, along with parapets, visually contribute to massing. The narrower the dwelling, the more problematic this siting becomes. Questions also arose regarding the appropriateness of rooftop decks where there is ground level amenity space required. The issues with rooftop accesses arise

## FCA Infill 2 Working Group Meeting Notes 5 Feb 2015

because a “one size fits all” solution is being proposed for all residential zones. (*Attachment 2* details a few of the ideas discussed regarding “Permitted Projections”).

5. Height / Massing: Community Character and / or environmental considerations have not been addressed. While the height reductions are uniformly welcomed, massing has not been well considered. In particular, the promotion of a particular building form, that is, flat-roofed over peaked roof dwellings, will continue under the Infill 2 provisions, because of the significant amount of top-floor living space that characterises flat roofed dwellings when built to the same height provisions as sloped roofed buildings. Parapets and roof top accesses above the maximum height add to the massing. Within a residential zone, “one height fits both” for flat and peak roofed dwellings does not address community character. (*Attachment 1* outlines height and equitable massing issues and related FCA resolutions).
6. Other jurisdictions zone for the number of storeys and amount of living space on the third level (e.g.: Oakville), prohibit rooftop decks (e.g.: Toronto), etc. The public consultation, analysis and documentation done in these jurisdictions is impressive. A detailed rationale is provided for the provisions adopted.
7. Why was the proposed revision to R1 heights down to 8.5 metres not also applied to the R2? Although it was mentioned that this difference may have been proposed due to intensification pressures in the R2, a couple of representatives conveyed that in their community a 9 metre height is too tall for flat roof buildings. The currently proposed 9 m. height allows for a 2- storey sloped roof but a 3- storey flat roof. Steve Gauthier noted at the Jan. 21 meeting with technical representatives of the working group that LIDAR studies and visual inspection showed the character of both to be overwhelmingly 2 storeys. Therefore, neither R1 nor R2 heights should allow for 3 storeys. One community association noted that numerous new semi-detached 2 storey sloped roof dwellings, built since 2010 in their R2, at 8.5 metres or less, have been successfully integrated into the neighbourhood. Two 2-storey flat roof buildings also are lower in height.
8. The proposal to globally rezone larger corner lots continues to be of great concern. (*Attachment 3* provides more detail). This will incorporate an “as of right” provision to sever corner lots without regard to Community Character or the environment. This provision conflicts with Section 53 (12) of the Planning Act re: consent. If accepted, it will set an undesirable precedent, which has the potential to creep into future By-law provisions. One community association has asked to be exempted from this provision, which, if applied, will result in the destruction of large numbers of mature pine and beech trees. Representatives appreciate that Staff are trying to make infill development on corner lots integrate better. This issue is too important, however, with too many ramifications to be adequately analysed and consulted on in such a short time frame. Therefore, the proposal on corner lot severances must be removed from the current By-law amendment package.
9. Representatives support integrating Infill 2 and Infill 1. “Your Street Sets the Rules: the Dominant Character sets your Zoning Rules” (City of Ottawa brochure dated March 25, 2014, handout to Planning Committee.). This was the original intent at the time when Infill 2 was split out of Infill 1. A requirement to respect the dominant pattern re: height / massing should be part of the streetscape character analysis.
10. The City needs to prepare a Terms of Reference for the proposed two year monitoring period and reference it in the Infill 2 By-law. So far, there is nothing concrete from Staff regarding the proposed two-year monitoring period.
11. Some terms need to be defined before meaningful comments can be provided. **Bolding** in the following text identifies two examples, for which definitions have been requested: a) “...

FCA Infill 2 Working Group Meeting Notes 5 Feb 2015

rear yard setback distance equal to the vertical building height **at its tallest point...**"; b) the meaning of **combined** as it applies to the total area of roof top access projections above the height limit.

12. Need to codify the intent behind each regulation, to help the development community and Committees of Adjustment understand the implications.
13. Communities have varied character, have evolved differently and in addition to some common concerns, they may have significant individual concerns. The Community Associations need to engage their communities and submit comments to the City and Councillors to make their views known.

**ATTENDEES**

**Infill 2 WG**

**List attended meeting 5 February**

**\*indicates notes reviewers**

**Wards: 8**

**CA's: 16**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>WARD</u>	<u>#</u>
Bob Brocklebank	Glebe CA	Capital	17
Caroline Crowe	Trend Arlington	Knoxdale-Merivale	9
Chad Rollins*	Action Sandy Hill	Rideau Vanier	12
Charity Bartlett	Carlinton CA	River	16
Don Stewart	Westboro Beach CA	Kitchissippi	15
Gary Ludington	Westboro CA	Kitchissippi	15
Gillian Salmond	Wellington Village	Kitchissippi	15
Heather Pearl*	Champlain PC	Kitchissippi	15
Judy Korecky*	Faircrest Heights	Alta Vista	18
Kathy Kennedy	Civic Hospital	Kitchissippi	15
Lynne Bankier*	Champlain PC	Kitchissippi	15
Maria Luisa Marti*	Friends of James and Bay	Centretown	14
Michael Teeter	Rockcliffe Park	Rideau Rockiffe	13
Paul Goodkey*	OOE	Capital	17
Phyllis Odenbach Sutton	OOE	Capital	17
Sheila Perry*	FCA Plann&Zone REP	Rideau Rockiffe	13
Steve McNamee	Overbrook	Rideau Rockiffe	13
Terrence Lonergan	FHACA & KMC	Knoxdale-Merivale	9