

FCA INFILL 2 Working Group Meeting Notes Jan. 18, 2015,

Champlain Park Fieldhouse, 7 to 9 PM

AGENDA

Overall Purpose of the Group: To encourage CA's to read and comment on Infill 2 zoning documents and to communicate within their communities, between communities, and with City of Ottawa Planning Dept, Planning Committee and their Ward Councillors

Goals and Purpose of the Meeting:

- provide opportunity to discuss Infill 2 By-law
- mature neighbourhoods and outer urban wards interaction
- follow-Up on Flat vs. Sloped Roof Height
- other issues identified for comment
- what provisions do individual CA's support
- what comments do we have in common that could be submitted via the FCA
- encourage written responses by Jan. 21 deadline
- define next steps during public consultation period
- discuss 2 year monitoring period

Timelines for Public Consultation:

Jan. 15 Info Session/Presentation at City Hall

Jan. 21 Preliminary Comments. The City considers this circulation the final step of the Infill II Study before the statutory Zoning By-law Amendment approval process scheduled to begin at the end of January, 2015.

April 14 Planning Committee: Our timing then takes us to a staff report that will need to be signed off by our General Manager in mid-March in order to get to a Planning Committee date of April 14th.

MEETING NOTES

Chair: Lynne Bankier, Co-Chair, Champlain Park Community Association; assisted by Maria Luisa Marti, Friends of James and Bay

Attendance: 8 Wards and 14 community associations were represented by the 19 participants. *Attendance List is attached.*

These notes are not intended as a complete transcript of the meeting, but rather to convey the highlights and points of consensus.

Several Infill 2 By-Law provisions were identified for collective follow-up during the public consultation period, as they affect many communities or a subset of communities in specific subzones. CA's were encouraged to write individual letters to the Planning Department if they identify other issues that are more specific to their communities.

There were some general comments as follows:

Does the Infill 2 By-Law address character?

The general consensus was that Infill 1 addresses character, but Infill 2 does not. Several experienced reps reminded the group that the Official Plan (OP) describes variables used to define character when designing zoning by-laws and addressing requests for re-zoning and minor variances.

Sheila noted that the FCA has studied the OP revisions, has actively participated in the public consultations and has written a brief.

Chad mentioned the City's LIDAR study, which mapped out actual heights, and would constitute a more accurate model for defining compatible heights by area.

The Zoning By-Laws should implement the Official Plan, and the intent of revising them is to accomplish this. Infill 1 and Infill 2 are applauded and supported in their intent in this regard.

The importance of community engagement during the public consultation process for Infill 2

The intent of the Infill 1 and Infill 2 By-Laws to mitigate the impacts of intensification is supported by community associations.

Two reps said that they did not want to delay the process of Infill 2 By-Law implementation. It was explained that the intent of this meeting was to identify common themes and to propose action plans for follow-up. We were not proposing to change the City's consultation timelines, but rather to encourage them to consult further with us during the public consultation period.

The general consensus was that it is important for communities to collectively and individually express both their support and their concerns, to go "on record" to ensure that their viewpoints are reflected in the report that goes to Planning Committee. These provisions will have great impact on communities as intensification continues.

Terms of Reference for the 2 year monitoring period need to be fleshed out

A specific process was identified for Infill 1 and this needs to be done also for Infill 2.

List of proposed Infill 2 By-Law provisions that were identified for follow-up:

The group participants identified that these proposed provisions do not adequately address the intent of the Infill 2 By-Law to provide mitigation, and in some cases the by-law in fact introduces provisions that may risk harm to some communities.

1. Height Reductions in the Residential Zones "Equitable Massing"

Although it was agreed that height reductions are supported by CA's, it was broadly agreed that the proposed provisions do not go far enough to mitigate the bulk/massing impacts that they were intended to address.

Data and examples were presented and discussed by some of the reps from the mature neighbourhoods that are already undergoing accelerated intensification and have therefore already experienced the adverse impacts that these provisions are intended to mitigate.

Equitable massing between flat and sloped roof buildings was identified as a significant issue of concern at the first meeting of the FCA Infill 2 Working Group (October, 2014). A formal motion was passed unanimously at an FCA general meeting (December, 2014). A number of community associations have already written letters to the Planning Department or are intending to do so. The FCA executive will follow up the motion with a formal letter. This issue was further discussed at the January 18 meeting. It was agreed that size of permitted projections was an important and related issue that is relevant to the massing of flat roofed buildings and equitable massing between flat and sloped roof buildings.

See PowerPoint presentation (attached) that was presented at the FCA general meeting in December, 2014, which includes the motion that was passed unanimously. A few possible technical models to achieve equitable massing were discussed at the Jan. 18 working group meeting and these will be explored further with the Planning Department.

2. Restrict Height for R4 Subzones M,P,S,T,Z to 11m (10m proposed). Sub-group of affected CA's (Description of the issue by Chad Rollins by e-mail following the meeting)

The maximum allowable height for most R4 subzones is generally 11m (10m proposed), and this height is generally in keeping with the character of these areas, at least in the Sandy Hill neighbourhood. However, in the M, P, S and T subzones this height is allowed to increase to 14.5 metres (13.5m proposed) for wider, larger lots (typically for minimum 15m width and 450m² lot area). In the Z subzone the maximum is even higher at 15m. This increased height is not in keeping with the character of our neighbourhood; in fact, it has the potential to greatly alter the character of the neighbourhood as it encourages the assembly of lots and demolition of existing buildings in order to achieve greater height for financial gain. This provision also allows for the construction of larger more monolithic buildings than the existing neighbourhood fabric. Allowing this increased height is not in keeping with the Official Plan's objective of

preserving the neighbourhood's existing character. Since Infill 2 regulates height, and to revise the height provision for the R4 subzone would not consist of a rezoning, ASH feels that this revision is within the mandate of the Infill 2 study. The fact that the City is able to consider a small reduction of this height provision is proof of this. Since zoning regulates height not number of stories, the resultant number of buildable stories should not be a factor. Attached are a few simple drawings to illustrate this issue.

I am hoping that we can get several communities with these subzones to all agree that this is a real problem and to press the City to address this issue through the Infill 2 study.

3. Corner Lot provisions, Sub-group of affected CA's

(Description of the issue by Judy Korecky by e-mail following the meeting)

Draft By-law proposal regarding corner lots

(10) On a corner lot in Schedule XXX:

(a) despite a minimum required lot area of 665m² or greater in Table 156A, a minimum lot area of 325m² may be applied if:

(i) permission to sever the lot into 2 lots is granted by the Committee of Adjustment,

(ii) only 1 detached dwelling is built on each of the 2 severed lots,

*(iii) each of the detached dwellings have their **front wall** facing **frontage** on different streets whether or not that **frontage** is the **front lot line**,*

(b) and in the above noted case the following further zoning provision applies:

(i) the minimum front yard setback as required in the subzone applies, but need not exceed 5.0 metres,

(ii) the minimum rear yard setback for the corner lot is 1.2 metre,

What does this mean in real terms

The baseline for the proposal would be lots that are required by the Bylaw Table 156A to have a minimal lot area of 665 meters squared – this would correspond to R1A to R1GG lots (except R1D, R1F and R1FF – although these subzones may fall into this category subject to being granted a minor variance).

Concrete examples of minimal lots that this would affect:

60 x 120 feet

85 by 85 feet

66 x 110 feet

72 x 100 feet

75 x 97 feet

The end result for an R1GG zones could be lots that are:

60 x 60 feet

42 x 85 feet

66 x 55 feet

50 x 71.5 feet

47.5 by 75 feet

Potential Impacts

- 1) A serious change of character of established neighbourhoods – not just in lot size but also in house massing and design. This could result in R1A-R1GG subzones starting to deal more and more with the height, massing, projections and roof top terrace issues that the inner urban core has been dealing with for the last several years.
- 2) As of right spot re-zoning in R1A to R1GG
This would result in severed lots that fit into considerably smaller sub-zones making its way **as of right** into the R1A to R1GG subzones. In the case of the R1GG subzone the severed lots would have the lot area of R1T/TT. An example of the R1TT zone can be found in Old Ottawa East west of Main Street and South of Clegg with lots that are circa 40 by 83 feet.
- 3) A resulting change to lot fabric – which may mean that the Committee of Adjustment is more inclined to allow further severances in R1A to R1GG neighbourhoods.
- 4) The risk that the Committee of Adjustment may look to the intent of this provision as opposed to the letter of this provision and allow severances of very large lots into several smaller that meet the 325 meters squared lot area. An example of this might be the severance of a 100 by 150 foot lot into four lots that each meet the 325meters squared.
- 5) A downstream potential risk that when the City of Ottawa re-zones it would have greater justifications to zone down R1A to R1GG subzones, for example that R1GG zones of Alta Vista might be zoned down R1T (if there are enough severances that have changed the character of the neighbourhood) – making all lots that meet the 665 severable as of right.

Follow-Up Action from the Jan. 18 meeting:

1. 3 reps from the Working group will request a meeting with Alain Miguelez and Steve Gauthier to convey the general issues identified at the two meetings of the working group, and to have a more detailed technical discussion on the equitable massing/rooftop projection issues.

The 3 identified “technical reps” were Chad Rollins (Action Sandy Hill), Paul Goodkey (Old Ottawa East) and Heather Pearl (Champlain Park).

Update: Alain Miguelez and Steve Gauthier met with the above 3 technical reps and with Sheila Perry (FCA Planning and Zoning) on Jan. 21. **Meeting notes to follow.**

2. Community Associations are encouraged to write individual letters addressing their specific concerns and supporting any issues that they share in common with other CA's. Letters should be addressed to Alain Miguelez, Steve Gauthier (Alain.miguelez@ottawa.ca, Steve.Gauthier@ottawa.ca), and copied to your Ward Councillor.

FCA INFILL 2 Working Group Meeting Notes 18Jan2015

3. Another meeting of the working group will be organized when the next set of documents is distributed and when the Planning Committee report becomes available.
4. Sheila Perry proposed a meeting with the Homebuilders and will follow up.
5. Participants should confirm that they are on the Planning Department e-mail distribution list for Infill 2. We will continue to forward documents, but if you didn't receive them from the City directly, please contact Steve Gauthier to add your e-mail address to their list.
6. Two sub-groups were formed (comprised of affected communities/subzones) to address the R4 height and corner lot provisions described above.

Update: discussions have begun and the reps at the meeting are reaching out to other similarly affected communities.

Notes prepared by Lynne Bankier, lynne_bankier@sympatico.ca

Attendees					
	NAME	CA	WARD	no.	Count
1	Caroline Crowe	Trend Arlington	Knoxdale-Merivale	9	1
2	Chad Rollins	Action Sandy Hill	Rideau Vanier	12	2
3	Sheila Perry	FCA Plann&Zone REP	Rideau Rockiffe	13	3
4	Steve McNamee	Overbrook	Rideau Rockiffe	13	
5	Maria Luisa Marti	Friends of James and Bay	Centretown	14	4
6	Lynne Bankier	Champlain PC	Kitchissippi	15	5 Wards 8
7	Heather Pearl	Champlain PC	Kitchissippi	15	CA 14
8	Gillian Salmond	Wellington Village	Kitchissippi	15	
9	Gary Ludington	Westboro CA	Kitchissippi	15	
10	Don Stewart	Westboro Beach CA	Kitchissippi	15	
11	Charity Bartlett	Carlington CA	River	16	6
12	David Hutchinson	Riverside Park	River	16	
13	Ron Stevenson	Riverside Park	River	16	
14	Bob Brocklebank	Glebe CA	Capital	17	7
15	Phillis Odenbach	OOE	Capital	17	
16	Paul Goodkey	OOE	Capital	17	
17	Anna Cuylist	OOS	Capital	17	
18	Judy Korecky	Faircrest Heights	Alta Vista	18	8
19	David Kidd		Alta Vista	18	