

OOECA Board Meeting Minutes – January 10, 2023

Attendees

OOECA Board

Bob Gordon, Catherine Pacella, Phyllis Odenbach-Sutton, Don Fugler, Kristine Houde, Peter Tobin, Tom Scott, Jamie Brougham, Ron Rose, John Dance, Jayson Maclean, Courtenay Beauregard, Suzanne Johnston, Alexandra Gruca-Macaulay, Georgia Blondon

Other Attendees

Adriana Beaman, Anthony Zoccoli, Paul Goodkey, Jim Strang, Rebecca Grace, Justin Reist, Mitch Vlad, Wendy McRae

1. Call to order and Land Acknowledgement – Bob Gordon

2. Approval of Agenda

- For item 6. Regional Updates, Phyllis questioned if agenda item should be removed since Even does not plan to attend meetings. Bob recommends leaving as standing item.
- Motion to approve agenda moved by Tom Scott and seconded by Peter Tobin.
- All in favour. None opposed or abstained. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes – December 2022

- Board members have additional edits to propose for the December minutes.
- Group moves to defer approval to future meeting once revised draft is circulated.

4. Chair's Report – Bob Gordon

- One section through Greystone Village still does not have lights, causing safety concerns.
- Bob committed to coordinating with people he has been engaging with to resolve issue.
- Bob and John were asked to attend a recognition ceremony performed by Yasr Naqvi.
 - Both received commendations to recognize their work with the community.
 - If anyone from the community nominated Bob, thanks to them for the recognition.

5. Treasurer's Report – Don Fugler

- Current balance is \$21,582.26, an increase due to new and renewed memberships.

Comment – Bob: Will submit checks to Don from online renewals. Also flagged that he attended FCA meeting in December and there was some discussion regarding fee increase.

A – Don: FCA fee increase will not be an issue.

6. Councillor's Report – Capital Ward – Councillor Menard, Ariela Summit

Active transportation – Good news

- City will be plowing from Oblates to Springhurst, and Lees station to Springhurst towards Scholastic Drive.
- Street plowed, but not MUP yet. Positive change to improve winter connectivity.

Pedestrian crossing repeatedly taken out by trucks

- Asked City for interim solution. They looked at a number of factors – gas line under the street, line of sight issue with cars coming up Greenfield.
- City considering changing location of pole to avoid getting damaged by trucks. Delay in replacing pole due to 3rd party provider and parts. City will look to replace with their own parts.

Damaged, missing, and non-functioning streetlights along CBD

- NCC planning to replace lights by 2023 year end. Looking at funding for temporary street lights to increase safety along the sections that are not well lit.

Meeting with Recreation and Culture - Forecourt Park Truth and Reconciliation

- Consultative circle to be put together this Spring. Will put forward this issue with the group, and how to recognize Oblates involvement in residential schools. Timelines may need to be considered to align with construction timelines.

Upcoming consultations hosted by the councillor's office

- include GMH project consultation on February 1st, virtual consultation on City budget in early February, and two consultations for developments in OOE:
 - 12-24 Hawthorne – concerns include respecting setbacks, displacement of current tenants, amount of proposed parking, and other issues.
 - 180 Main street on January 23rd – 3 storey building will attach to current Sula Wok building. Asking for zoning bylaw amendment and there's a site plan control application submitted.

Comment – Ron: Sincere appreciation to Shawn getting City to agree to appeal CoA decision on 49 Mason Terrace.

A – Councillor: Clarification – we are bringing this to Planning committee which gives more time for relevant groups to prepare a response.

Comment: Regarding the pedestrian crossing – if we do the same thing, the same result will happen time and again. Strongly suggest putting much more substantial

A – Ariela: They are considering moving the pole and adding bollards.

Q – Jamie: Could you clarify your comment about the circle to guide Forecourt Park design. Is there any news on the forecourt park design or further consultations?

A – Ariela: That was in reference to an internal city meeting regarding consultation to meaningfully engage and consider indigenous peoples in the design of the park and future plans.

C1 – Tom: A big push from OOE following residents' participation in renewal of roadway, sidewalks and pathways maintenance standards working group (dating back before 2020) was to prioritize snow removal as opposed to snow. Would be helpful to revisit those suggestions.

C2 – Tom: Agree with Jim Strang's strong suggestion, and we also need to deal with heavy trucks that continue to move through the residential areas.

C3 – Tom: John and I continue to push NCC to restore trees that have been lost along CBD, and get response that lights needs to be fixed, and vice versa from lights team saying they need to know where trees will go. Somebody's got to develop an integrated solution, because we can't keep going on year after year with fingers being pointed from one group to another, and nothing gets done.

C4 - Tom: Working Group looking at commemoration for Forecourt Park considering Truth and Reconciliation, and what role the Community Association can play.

C5 – Tom: GMH Zoom meeting – we would like to see a better response from the GMH project team for questions we asked at the Zoom session, and better than what they presented to the PAC. Would appreciate if Ariela can bring this forward.

A1 – Ariela: Winter maintenance quality standard is coming back up for discussion with this new council and we are hoping to see some improvements in how snow is managed for pedestrians, cyclists.

A2 – Ariela: Agreed on Forecourt consultations versus Truth and Reconciliation discussions. They're related but need to be addressed separately.

Q: Wondering with the partial closure of LRT, how are OOE residents expected to use OC Transpo? Find it difficult to connect to major bus routes. Number of cancellations in OOE specifically, i.e. 55 and others.

A – Yes, R1 service is going (along Greenfield). Agree this is not a sufficient solution to address the LRT issues. Traveling takes more time, and not as many options now. Will bring concerns to transportation colleague in councillor's office.

Q – Bob: Regarding your budget comment, is this in general, for City, or specific to our ward? If not specific to ward, will there be opportunity to connect with councillor's office to go over budget specific to our ward? Even if the councillors office provides materials for CA to facilitate a discussion with residents, this would be helpful.

A: It is a good point. We are bringing forward Ward-wide and City-wide issue at those budget meetings. We could hold a meeting, and we have a pretty good sense of the issues. Budget draft comes forward in the spring. No plans to resurrect ward discussion at this time. We can ask the councillor to consider it.

7. Regional Group Update – No representative present

- Bob commented that Regional is not here this evening, and, as was briefly discussed at the start of the meeting, Evan Garfinkel does not plan to attend meetings more than quarterly, or unless we've specifically requested their presence at a meeting.

8. CAG (Community Activities Group) Report – Lee Jacobs

- In week 2 of winter sessions with 9 fitness classes. Getting back up to pre-pandemic operations in terms of volume of activities offered.
- Play group happens twice a week, Tuesdays and Thursdays at Brantwood starting this week, along with home school meetup, utilizing the Brantwood Field House facility.
- In summer camp planning to prepare for February registration.
- Hired program manager who is starting in mid-January and comes with recreation facilitation accreditation, and many years experience managing a gym, other retail-based experiences.

- Received another extension – now the 6th extension - in our agreement with the City. Had asked to renegotiate our agreement, but the city is not prepared to do that at this time, but are pleased to provide us with another extension for a year. This means CAG will operate as we have for the past 40 years, under the current agreement that's been in place, and pushing the city to help us understand how can play a major role with the new community centre.
- Outdoor rink at Brantwood - Important question was asked about insurance and coverage for anyone who injures themselves and blames it on inadequate maintenance of the rink. Since Brantwood rink is managed by volunteers, this posed a significant risk to them.
 - City set up meeting which Lee attended and contributed to. The city agreed to ensure anyone who's working on the rinks if they get injured, and protect them from libel if someone gets injured while using the rink. This applies to rinks across the City.

Comment – Bob: Want to mention that this was discussed at length at the FCA meeting in January and the group was instrumental in getting the City to act on this liability insurance issue, which was a huge loophole for these public outdoor rinks that were being maintained by volunteers. FCA is fantastic at finding these gaps in agreements like this, and fortunately Lee was able to jump into that meeting to represent OOE.

9. Committee Reports (*Submitted written reports included in appendix)

Membership – Suzanne Johnston

- No report, and no questions for membership.

Transportation and Infrastructure – Tom Scott

- Written report was complete but received feedback on 3 items over weekend:
 1. Notice - GMH project - Two key dates – February 1st and February 8th at St. Paul University with charts, city staff and consultants. Mailout around the project is a bit limited.
 2. Discussion about PXO at Concord and Greenfield – number of suggestions about how to protect this area, and prevent big trucks from coming down to area in the first place.
 3. MTO environmental assessment study completed recently for downtown bridges projects. We provided input and asked for face-to-face meeting. MTO had two face-to-face meetings before, but decided to go virtual. Asking for interim report.

The Corners on Main, Greystone Village, Lees – Peter Tobin*

- Mentioned in report that 2 OC transpo buses are stuck in the snow and required tows. Did not hear any complaints about buses impeding traffic. One bus was an extended bus.
- Disappointed that there is no action at the two retail spaces on Main.

Comment – Phyllis: Neighbours with 2 daughters at Au Coeur and they despair at ever getting to Deschâtelets building before kids move to junior high.

Comment – Kristine: Is there anything the councillor or city can do, or do we need to reach out to EQ to address hole and water/snow collection?

Action for Kristine – Send photos to Ariela, cc: Peter.

Comment: Density in Greystone Village is significant.

Planning – John Dance*

- See items within attached Planning committee report.
- A number of items have been covered.
- Public consultations
 - On the 18 Hawthorne, 6-storey building, planning committee would like Board consensus to agree to objection to zoning that goes against secondary plan, along with a few other items the councillor's office also raised. This consensus was granted.
 - 49 Mason Terrace minor variance was approved by CoA, but Planning committee didn't think too highly about that decision. Ariela explained that Shawn has to convince the City planners to oppose the decision. This is just a placeholder giving Planning more time to build a case against the request. Note - the City subsequently decided not to appeal. The planning committee will respond to this decision.
 - Greystone village Phase 3 changes
 - A note from a City planner seemed to suggest that a change had been made so that a parking garage entrance would be from Scholastic rather than from Deschâtelets. We followed up and it turns out that, as earlier discussed with Regional, the parking garage entrance will be from only Deschâtelets.

Comment – Jayson: In addition to the discussions tonight on development in our community, we have a lot of voices that are cautious about development. I just wanted to add that I and many residents in the area are welcoming of development, not only for the image enriching the community, but supporting our efforts in terms of climate change. Affordable housing would be a great thing to add to our community, so I don't know why I'm saying this other than to make sure that the airtime at our meeting is not taken up in the majority by thoughts or by voices that are saying that development may not be a good thing, that that we've reached our peak density. Just thought I'd add that to conversation.

FCA (Federation of Citizens Associations) – Ron Rose •

No report for January.

SLOE (Sustainable Living Ottawa East) Jayson MacLean

- No report for January.

Q – Bob: snowfall in December – were there any major damages, trees that were flagged affected from the snowfall?

A – Jayson: Not heard anything from tree group.

A – Ariela: Also have not heard anything from Forestry but can follow up with them.

Comment – Tom: following tree surgeon inspection in May and removal of a number of weak specimens and dead ash snags, the Dereco caused loss of 5-6 another five or six very large Manitoba maples along the MTO property line.

Comment – Lee: Significant tree loss in front of Immaculata near building, and other part removed. All the weedy Manitoba maples hard hit with large branches coming off. A few significant trees in Ballantyne towards CBD also have significant branch loss.

Comment – Paul: noticed trees in Windsor Park that form alleyway between tennis courts. They seem to thrive and don't appear to have damage. Maybe this is the kind of tree that should be planted in Ottawa if they can withstand Ottawa Weather.

A – Jayson: Good to know. Thanks Paul.

Communications – Bob Gordon

- No formal report but brief announcement and thanks to Catherine and John to migrate the OOECA website.
- If you notice content that is missing, please notify Kristine and Bob.

Comment – Phyllis: Would recommend Chair's reports stay posted on Archive page along with meeting minutes.

A – Kristine: I inadvertently removed the bottom section of Archive page but previous version can be accessed and republished it. Will add to website communications to-do.

Parks and Greenspace – Jamie Brougham

- When I got involved with the community, it was great to see the engagement and feedback to the developers who then came back with concrete plans based on feedback.
- When it comes to Forecourt park, I think it's important to provide our feedback to the developers. Circulated email yesterday to some board members with drawing. Has not received feedback yet. Also referenced Patterson bistro as an example. Pushing for a meeting on Forecourt park to gather input from residents and put together proposal to developer.
- Terms of reference for Parks and Greenspace being drafted by Dianne Caldbick.

C – Phyllis: I want us to focus on what can be done with that space.

C – Paul: Of opposite view from Phyllis. Agree with Jamie. Despite participating in surveys and consultations, has not received responses to his questions and comments. Thinks the school, parents will dictate how the space is used.

Comment: Community voice is important, but does not trump other voices in the community, including residents sending their kids to the school.

A – Jamie: If CA comes up with a plan of what we want in there, at least the city won't be able to ignore community. Suggest that we should put our best ideas on the table, ask for what we want, and get discussion started. If city is not going to do it, then we should do it ourselves.

C – Tom: Recommend that we defer to committee and that Jamie come back with recommendations.

Lansdowne – Alexandra Gruca-Macaulay

- No report for January.

9. New Business

- One item from Bob – Discussion started with Phyllis to leave in the agenda item – Regional Update from Evan.

- Impression is that Evan's engagement at recent monthly meetings has waned, and that his responses have been spotty.
- If we continue to engage Evan, we can reach out to him beforehand with an expectation that he comes to the meeting with responses.

C – Catherine: there were 2-3 people before Evan who participated in CA meetings. And their involvement was good. This has been going on for the last 8 years, although she can't remember how this started in the first place. Can we reach out to Evan's superior at Regional to get someone to replace him.

C – Phyllis: Have been finding Evan dismissive, and wonder if going to someone at Regional would be effective. Impression is that they no longer want to engage CA, community. Feel that there are questions at every meeting that would be helpful to get Regional response.

C – John: while there have been some bumps along the way, Erin and Taylor have done a good job. Agree with others that until all phases are completed, there should be Regional representation.

Comment – resident: I blame management. How can we not have someone from Regional that can talk for the company? This is an insult to the association, and I think you want to require that somebody be here, and if they don't want to, then that says something about the management of the company.

C – Paul: We should be fair to Evan – he does respond to emails sent to him. Going back several meetings, we asked him who is moving into the ground floor spaces. With recent concerns raised, he doesn't seem to action.

Bob – Proposed next course of action is for him and Catherine to have a meeting with Evan to .

C - Phyllis – I heard a number of questions tonight for Regional and wouldn't mind putting them together for Bob and Catherine to follow up with him. May be good for him to know health and safety issues about the road in front of Spencer, and Phase 3 – he mentioned no changes at the last meeting, but there ARE actual changes. Would you like me to take a crack at it?

C – Catherine – curious to know if this is coming from Regional, or Evan himself to dial back presence. If this is part of his job description, not satisfactory. Glad to hear that email has been successful, but he's not doing his job as community liaison. Happy to follow up with Bob to discuss next steps to engage Evan.

C – Tom: Thinks CA should be clear on what role CA plays with the developer, as much as what role the developer has with the CA.

C – Phyllis: We are not going to come to developers with a consensus representing the community re: 30m corridor and other issues.

Action item assigned to Catherine and Bob

- Schedule discussion with Evan on how Regional will engage with CA moving forward.

12. Adjournment

- Motion to adjourn meeting moved by Tom Scott.

- All in favour. Motion carried and meeting adjourned.

Appendix - Committee reports

TCOM, Greystone Village, Lees – Peter Tobin

- Corners on Main residents noted two different incidents in late December of OC buses needing tow truck extraction from snow build up after getting stuck on Deschâtelets.
- Both Deschâtelets and des Oblats are busy, narrow streets that seem to have a low priority for snow clearing.
- This concern was previously raised by the TCOM1 board but to no avail.

Planning – John Dance

1. Public Meeting for 12-24 Hawthorne - Application for Rezoning - January 16, 2023 - Question of Board Consensus on Opposition to Precedent-Setting Nature of Proposal:

- The Councillor's office is organizing a virtual public meeting to discuss the proposed six-story rental building to be known as 18 Hawthorne: Monday, January 16, 2023, 7pm – 9pm (EST). Specific coordinates have been sent by the Councillor's office in his e-update of January 6.
- Applicant's Proposal: A six-storey residential apartment building containing 67 residential units, indoor amenity space, 50 vehicular parking spaces, and 36 bicycle parking spaces.
- Five zoning bylaw amendments sought. All of them are contrary to the Old Ottawa East Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan.
- The original "comments due date" was set as December 21, 2022. We haven't heard what the new date is. Similarly, "the target date the Zoning By-law Amendment application to be considered by the City's planning committee" was January 30, 2023 but no revised date has been set.
- As noted in the previous OOE planning committee (OOEPC) report, the overriding concern with this application is that ***whatever gets approved will set the precedent for what happens on the rest*** of the south side of Hawthorne and will also affect what happens on the other side of Hawthorne and the rest of Main Street. For the most part, the "traditional mainstreet" developments we've seen along Main Street have respected the OOE Secondary Plan and zoning, however, the Hawthorne proposal does not.
- Although the OOEPC's position on the application will need to factor in what residents say at the public meeting, ***OOEPC seeks the Board's concurrence that we should oppose key elements of the proposal that do not respect tie OOE Secondary Plan.***

2. Public meeting for 180 Main Street (Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Control Application) - January 23, 2023

- The Councillor's office is organizing a virtual public meeting to discuss the proposed threestory rental/commercial building at 180 Main Street: 7:30 p.m., Monday, January 23. Specific coordinates have been sent by the Councillor's office in his e-update of January 6.
- **Details on the application:** <https://devapps.ottawa.ca/en/applications/D07-12-22-0160/details>

- **Description:**

Three storey (+rooftop amenity) mixed use building with ground floor commercial space (restaurant) and five residential units. Building designed and constructed to be attached to existing 184 Main Street (Sulu Wok).

- The applicant seeks to rezone the subject site from Traditional Mainstreet Zone, Subzone 7, Urban Exception 2182 (TM7[2182]) to introduce new site-specific provisions to permit the following requested relief:
 - o The required rear yard setback be reduced from 7.5 metres to 4 metres;
 - o The reduced percentage of glazing [windows] required on the front ground floor façade; currently the requirement is 50%;
 - o The Rear Landscaped Buffer be reduced from 1 metre to 0 metres to allow bike storage abutting the rear lot line;
 - o A relief from the requirement that the façade facing the main street must include at least one active entrance serving each residential or non-residential use occupying any part of the ground floor. The development proposes a principal entrance to the restaurant well setback from the street and the principal entrance to the residential use located in the interior side yard.
- The DevApps site says comments are due January 13 but we expect this to be extended, given the public meeting isn't until January 23 (7:30pm).



Image 2 - Proposed development at 180 Main (right) attached to the existing 184 Main (left)

- o Image 1: Existing at 180 Main
- o Image 2: Proposed development at 184 Main (right) attached to existing building at 180 Main (left)

- The public meetings on the Hawthorne and Main developments are being organized by Councillor Menard's office and will follow the standard format of the Councillor introducing the issue, the assigned City planner providing the context and timeline, the developer explaining the proposal and the community members and the association being able to pose questions and state concerns.
- OOEPCC will submit comments on the developments to the City following the public meetings.

3. Meeting with Councillor / staff + meeting on impact of Bill 23 and Official Plan amendments on OOE Secondary Plan: Some answers, but more questions and meeting not yet scheduled.

- OOEPCC opposed the now-approved legislation and will continue to assess its implications for OOE.
- We still hope to meet with Councillor Menard and City staff to discuss the impacts of the new provincial housing legislation and the provincial revisions to the Official Plan on the OOE secondary plan.

- Staff provided the following analysis to the Councillor’s Office regarding the impacts. “Blue text” are provisions from the OOE secondary plan and the following bullets are the City staff responses:

- Policy 18 c)

“Encourage a complementary architectural treatment of buildings, including finish, colour and materials, together with a consistent design treatment of common elements on the property, such as fencing, landscaping, gateway features, street lighting and signage.”

- Bill 23 has removed the ability for the City to comment on matters of exterior design related to architecture, character, materiality, design elements etc., and the aesthetic appearance. While design guidelines will still encourage sensitivity in design, there is no longer a regulatory tool available. Comments on building and landscape design are limited to the extent where these impact health, safety, accessibility, or sustainable design

- Policy 21

“Integrate Green Space and Ensure Connectivity: Provide a range of high-quality landscaped spaces within the development”

- Bill 23 has removed the ability for the City to comment on matters of the aesthetic appearance of landscaping elements on private lands, but the City may still require landscaping plans. The City is limited however to providing comments on functional elements of landscaping that touch on matters of accessibility, sustainability, or the protection of adjoining lands. Similarly, commentary on landscaping elements on the public ROW associated with the development are limited in like manner.

- Policy 23

“Maintain the general character of these neighbourhoods as expressed by the existing zoning.”

- Bill 23 or the ministerial modifications do not impact the regulations for zoning pertaining to height, setbacks, landscaping requirements, parking and driveways, or other regulatory form and function controls. The changes in Bill 23 do supersede existing zoning with respect to the number of units on a lot, which now provide as-of-right permission for up to three residential units per lot in a detached, semi-detached or townhouse, either in the main building, or in a combination of main building and accessory buildings.

- Policy 25

“Intensify these neighbourhoods primarily at their edge, as a transition to denser development sites and where they abut an arterial or collector road. Notwithstanding this, building heights will be maintained at low-rise levels overall.”

- While ministerial modifications to the OP have increased the height opportunity on Minor Corridors, height policies within Secondary Plans are not impacted and remain as-is per the Secondary Plan.
- Heights within Neighbourhoods, both within the Evolving Overlay and outside of it are not impacted by Bill 23 or OP modifications and remain subject to OP and SP directions which provide direction for low-rise.
- Intensification and future rezonings per the Official Plan and through the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Re-write to meet density targets are not impacted.
- Context of “intensify” at neighbourhood edge now starts at four or more units.
- Low-rise building height maximum at the “neighbourhood edge” does not change.
- These responses raise another set of questions which the OOEPC would like to discuss in person with City planning staff.
- OOEPC also has outstanding questions pertaining to the new Official Plan but these will be sorted out after the Bill 23 issues are clarified.

4. 49 Mason Terrace Minor Variances for Front-Facing Garage: Approved and But City has Filed Appeal. Still question of whether City Planning Committee will approve related expenditure to allow execution of appeal.

- The Committee of Adjustment approved the minor variances sought for 49 Mason Terrace. The variances will allow a front-facing garage for a new two-storey residence that would replace a small one-story house.
- In the view of OOEPC, the CofA justification of its decision does not address the “opposed” position raised by the Planning, Real Estate and Economic Development (PRED) department comments and the “objection” raised by the OOECA.
- As a result of the Province’s new housing legislation, third parties like a community association are no longer permitted to appeal Committee of Adjustment decisions. Consequentially, OOEPC asked Councillor Menard to request the City of Ottawa to appeal the decision which, to his considerable credit, he did, and the City filed an appeal by the deadline.
- However, there is still the question of whether the City’s Planning Committee will approve a budget for executing the appeal. If it doesn’t, the appeal will be withdrawn. Please note, this information is preliminary and may change once we hear more details.

5. Pending Issues: No recent updates on 15-17 des Oblats, 67 Springhurst or elsewhere.