



March 12, 2021

Alain Miguelez  
Manager, Policy Planning  
City of Ottawa  
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department  
110 Laurier Street West  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Sent via email to: [Alain.Miguelez@ottawa.ca](mailto:Alain.Miguelez@ottawa.ca)

Copy to: [newop@ottawa.ca](mailto:newop@ottawa.ca); [Jim.watson@ottawa.ca](mailto:Jim.watson@ottawa.ca); [Rick.chiarelli@ottawa.ca](mailto:Rick.chiarelli@ottawa.ca);  
[Andy.reside@ottawa.ca](mailto:Andy.reside@ottawa.ca); [Stephen.willis@ottawa.ca](mailto:Stephen.willis@ottawa.ca); [Don.Herweyer@ottawa.ca](mailto:Don.Herweyer@ottawa.ca);  
[Rick.oconnor@ottawa.ca](mailto:Rick.oconnor@ottawa.ca); [board@fca-fac.ca](mailto:board@fca-fac.ca)

**Re: City View Community Association submission including detailed neighbourhood-specific concerns about the Draft Official Plan**

Dear Mr. Miguelez

The City View Community Association (CVCA), a not for profit organization, has reviewed the draft Official Plan (OP). We have concerns related to certain policies set out in the draft OP as they relate to our neighbourhood. We also provide solid recommendations that will strengthen the draft OP as a whole and result in a more livable, healthier and diverse City of Ottawa. As representatives of the City View Community Association (CVCA), we would like to submit this report.

We recognize that several of our fellow community associations, as well as the Federation of Citizens' Associations of Ottawa, have submitted comments. Their submissions may differ in style and approach with what CVCA is providing here but it should be noted that the CVCA supports their detailed analysis and recommendations.

We also want to recognize the extensive work of our draft OP Committee who prepared this document.

Our community has many concerns as we would be an "evolving" community in the Inner Urban Core. We believe that the draft OP should not be rushed through and it will be strengthened by incorporating insight and perspectives from a wide range of sources, including the residents in diverse neighborhoods whose daily lives will be impacted deeply by the policies. We hope that our comments will have a meaningful impact and bring to light our concerns with the draft Official Plan. We look forward to seeing an updated draft plan in the near future and we are available should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wilson  
Co-President

Jill Prot  
Co-President

# CITY VIEW COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION RESPONSE TO THE CITY OF OTTAWA DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

- Introduction ..... 3**
- General Concerns with Draft Official Plan..... 3**
  - Growth Targets ..... 3**
  - Language ..... 4**
  - Timing ..... 4**
  - Monitoring metrics..... 5**
  - Greenspace/Climate Change Impact ..... 5**
  - Intensification/Regeneration ..... 7**
  - Affordability ..... 10**
  - Social Impact and Wellness ..... 11**
  - Housing Design Issues ..... 11**
- CONCERNS SPECIFIC TO CITY VIEW ..... 12**
  - History of City View ..... 12**
  - Intensification Issues ..... 12**
    - Transects and Overlays..... 12
    - Algonquin College ..... 13
    - Intensification does not equate affordability ..... 13
  - Infrastructure Issues..... 14**
    - Combined sanitary/storm sewers beyond capacity ..... 14
  - Community Walkability..... 15**
    - Safety not being met ..... 15
    - Already in need of traffic calming measures ..... 15
    - No school crossings ..... 15
  - Greenspace and Environment ..... 15**
    - City View lacks parkland/greenspace ..... 15
    - Already diminishing tree canopy..... 16
- Recommendations for the City of Ottawa ..... 17**

# Introduction

The City View Community Association (CVCA), located in the former City of Nepean, has carried out a review of the City of Ottawa draft Official Plan (OP) and has comments on the available documents. The comments include general concerns with the Official Plan (OP) and specific concerns with how the OP will directly affect our community of City View.

The CVCA recognizes the importance of having an updated OP. However, the OP must consider what the individual community's needs and abilities for growth are as well as what is best for all citizens that choose to make Ottawa their home. The OP needs to have its vision respectfully benefiting all without allowing any one industry to govern.

The general themes of the OP is to make the City of Ottawa a more livable and greener city. However, in an attempt to limit the use of cars and urban sprawl, the proposed intensification as outlined in the draft OP will have a direct impact on various aspects that deal with addressing climate change and keeping Ottawa green. The previous OP's maintained the inner city while heavily investing in urban spread. To re-establish our regeneration focus inwards, it needs more than just a green light for development. We need an OP that reflects a community approach. The 5 Big moves are an ambitious update in how to view our future as a city, achievable, but only when a cautious and informed process is taken into consideration when determining the outcome as a success.

## General Concerns with Draft Official Plan

Several of the concerns pertaining to the proposed housing designs are in response to what was presented to the community members either within the draft OP and associate documents, or during the Walkability Study for City View that was carried out at the end of January 2021.

### Growth Targets

The draft Official Plan is based on assumptions and projections. Projections from the past, whether it be the previous Official Plan from 2003 or other studies, have greatly overestimated population growths. This current draft OP is projecting that the population of the City will increase by about 400,000 residents over the next 25 years. How is this number validated?

The 2003 Official Plan projected a population growth that, as of today, is missing the mark by about 38%. A 38% miscalculation in needed housing and services is a massive error. If a similar miscalculation is made this time, with the extreme changes being proposed in the draft OP, over intensification will occur in communities where there is inadequate infrastructure and will destroy the character of these neighbourhoods. The neighbourhoods which residents have enjoyed and remained invested in over the years will change forever without any recourse. Those that will benefit from high projections are the designers and developers that are pushing for greater intensification. This is particularly evident in neighbourhoods abutting large post-secondary institutions and on major transit routes.

The current pandemic has greatly changed the way people live and think. Although the pandemic may appear to be a short-term event, it has already changed the way many people work and likely will work in the future. The trend for many companies and employers to permanently close their offices is likely to continue. The need for office space is being reduced

accordingly, and office buildings may become increasingly redundant. With this, transit usage and patterns will shift as well.

It is recommended that the City take a phased approach when it comes to population projections and describe this approach in the draft OP so it is clear for everyone what to expect. Making smaller projections and examining the marketplace every few years and making adjustments when needed, will reduce the need for rapid intensification and it will give the City a chance to monitor the progress.

## Language

Making a document like this can be difficult but making it clear is imperative. The OP in its current draft form has language that can be misleading and carries no definitive value.

There are several provisions that use “may” or “shall”, but the use of the incorrect word can change the meaning and intent. For example, in Section 4.4.3.(1) “To provide new parks in the Downtown Core and Inner Urban Area, the City **will consider** the following: a) to f)”.

This is an example of where, because of the weak language, the City will **try** to find some park, but doesn’t have to.

The same can be said for Section 4.1.6.(1)(c) where the city will “explore” mitigation measures to take trucks away from downtown. The City has explored options now for years. It is time to “implement” mitigation measures. The City can’t wait to explore options for the next 25 years.

Another example, in Section 4.4.6.(1) “The design of parks **should** meet each of the following criteria:...”

What will happen if the design does not meet any of the criteria? The provision doesn’t say the design **must** meet the criteria. Again, weak wording such as this only allows the developer and City to do the bare minimum. There is no onus on either to abide by any of such criteria.

It seems like the majority of the provisions dealing with intensification are all a “shall” and other provisions dealing with other criteria that would benefit the well-being of the citizens, use “should” or “may”.

A complete Glossary in the draft OP is imperative. The Glossary should be expanded to include terms that are unique to this draft OP.

It is recommended that the provisions of this draft are worded so as not to lead to incorrect interpretations providing potential loopholes.

## Timing

It appears that the City of Ottawa is trying to push the draft Official Plan through the processes as fast as possible, towards implementation. However, due to the pandemic and improper notification, there is a lack of engagement by many citizens of Ottawa that would normally provide feedback. This feedback would provide recommendations to the City, ensuring that the individual communities and the city as a whole are fairly represented.

Learning about what will be in the draft OP and how it will affect those living here is a crucial step and the information sessions should be completed before the end of the review period,

leaving enough time for citizens and associations that are affected by the proposed plans to provide feedback.

In addition, approval of the draft Official Plan is progressing forward, but the other Master Plans (transportation, infrastructure, climate change, etc.) are still under development and these Master Plans all have a hand in ensuring that the Official Plan is implemented properly. Some of the existing Master Plans have statements that are contradictory to those in the draft OP.

Because of this lack of proper consultation and delayed development of the various Master Plans, it is recommended that the City of Ottawa delay the approval of the Official Plan until 2023 so that proper feedback can be received and the Master Plans completed so they may properly complement the Official Plan.

One of the very few engagement options for comments are the 21 one pager feedback forms. These forms are very selective in their choice of policy and information provided, and do not give readers a full understanding of what is being proposed. CVCA does not support this selective approach.

## Monitoring metrics

Many components of the draft Official Plan lack indicators to measure whether or not objectives have been met. Also, there is no mechanism in place to monitor expected or unintended consequences as a result of implementation. How can the success or failure of the OP be tracked without proposed metrics in place? If unintended or detrimental consequences are observed, the draft OP should include how the City will address them and who would be accountable

The way the OP is currently written, the developer will construct their buildings and if it is later observed that there is excess load on infrastructure, or effects on other operations, the developer has already walked away and it is the residents that have to deal with the consequences.

Intensification in the inner urban core at the levels proposed in the draft OP will bring permanent changes to many existing neighbourhoods.

## Greenspace/Climate Change Impact

Having adequate greenspace, whether it be parkland, or large spaces with mature trees, grass, and gardens within one's community provides many health and environmental benefits. More and more compelling data and research show the positive impacts to both physical and mental health and well-being. The opposite is also true: lack of accessible greenspace results in negative health implications.

The draft Official Plan has made a great effort to include greenspace within its long-term plans. With required parklands and urban tree canopies, it is encouraging that the City recognizes its importance. However, as great as these plans are, they don't always align with what is being proposed with the intensification of the existing neighbourhoods. In addition, there are no clear policies on how enforcement will be carried out to ensure there is ample greenspace and tree canopy. There are several issues with the intensification plans for residential neighbourhoods that will go against or make it difficult to implement what is being planned for greenspaces and the urban tree canopy.

A major issue with the draft OP is that the greenbelt and NCC lands are included in the required urban tree canopy of 40% for the city. By including those mentioned lands, there will be no requirement to keep any of the existing trees in the communities as the 40% is achieved with those lands alone. This wording needs to be changed to specify that the 40% urban tree canopy does NOT include lands in the greenbelt or owned by the NCC.

This way, builders and the City will have to make sure that the 40% canopy is realized in each individual urban community.

With the proposed “613 Flats” and “Missing Middle” housing designs, houses are planned to be much closer to the roadway and will cover the majority of the lot. Existing trees and vegetative cover will be removed to accommodate the construction of these houses and there will not be enough room to plant any type of tree that would be adequate enough to provide any urban tree canopy. A garden box on the front of the house or on a balcony doesn’t count as greenspace. A typical tree would need about 30-50 years of growth to provide any type of coverage that is needed to meet the proposed requirements. The proposed 613 flats and their lot coverage would be devastating for most communities that have a lack of existing green space. There is no space for trees to provide needed shade and add to maintaining a healthy community ecosystem. Trees need room for the canopy itself and for the root systems.

One problem with intensification is that most developers remove all existing trees on a site in order to build their new houses., In order to meet City requirements to replace removed trees, the builder usually plants one little tree on the front lawn that the new home owner is expected to take care of if it has any chance of survival.

From the enforcement side, builders are working around the requirement to have permits to remove trees by removing the trees once the property is sold and before any building permits are applied for. The City needs a policy that looks at what existing trees are on the property before the property is sold. An inventory should be carried out once the property is listed for sale. The City would then know if the trees were removed post sale and could deal with the individual/builder accordingly.

The City of Ottawa’s plan for addressing Climate Change and reducing the City’s Green House Gas (GWG) emissions is positive and very ambitious. Reducing people’s reliance on automobiles can help, but the City should realize that forcing the residents of Ottawa to change and get rid of their vehicles is unrealistic with plans to intensify and not include parking with new dwelling units. The current and proposed transit system is not adequate or reliable enough for all residents, especially those with busy families. It is not realistic to ask families to spend an hour or two on a transit system to go to a game or practice on the other side of town. Reducing emissions is one aspect but efficient use of someone’s time is more important for a lot of people and their lifestyles.

When building efficient homes, this will be regulated by Provincial Building Codes where requirements for energy efficiency are progressing all the time with improved performance levels. The City should look into establishing Green Bylaws, similar to what the City of Toronto has in place, which will allow some aspects of the building to go beyond minimum building code levels.

Building new is not the only way to be green. Many older homes were built to last and can be easily retrofitted to meet new efficiency codes. Older homes could be moved on site or to another site rather than demolition keeping the vast demolition debris from entering the landfill. A house has merit based on quality of construction, even if it is an older home. The term “lifespan, in reference to older homes goes against the “green” philosophy the City is trying to

achieve. For any demolished houses, the City should implement a mandatory recycling/material separation program at all construction sites, similar to the one already mandated on larger construction projects. This may lead to more homes being made affordable and it will reduce the amount of waste going to our landfills. The OP can easily include this 3T- type of requirement.

Communities with mature trees and more greenspace are effective in mitigating climate change; tree and greenspace removal will contribute negatively to the urban heat island effect, making inner urban areas experience higher temperatures than outlying areas. The proposed 613 Flats will reduce any naturally occurring greenspace by placing a building over the majority of the site. In addition, permeable surfaces mitigate storm water runoff flowing into ditches or storm sewers. Reducing greenspace increases the flow to the sewer systems, and at times of heavy rain storms the systems have been overloaded leading to failures. These events are only going to increase in intensity and frequency based on current available data.

Intensification does not necessarily mean greener.

The proposed intensification will not only be built closer to the roads, but will also be taller than existing structures. This will create a “tunnelling” effect and some roads may be in constant shade leading to more ice on roads during the winter and leading to more maintenance.

The proposed designs will have an effect on snow removal. By having smaller yards and more shaded roads, the snow will not melt on sunny days and there will be little space to pile the snow. This will create a neighbourhood that will require much more frequent removal of snow from the area similar to Barrhaven. The City may reduce the number of cars in these areas, but the increase in heavy truck and equipment use will create more emissions and will require an increase to the operational budget. Current neighbourhoods that have larger lawns have no issues with snow building up. This problem is also evident in new suburban areas where the development was approved with very little front lawns. A lot of these streets end up being reduced down to one lane as the snow keeps piling up on the street. This has a direct impact on walkability and the proposed 15-minute neighbourhood concept.

## Intensification/Regeneration

The proposed plan for increased intensification encourages most growth within the inner urban and downtown core. Preventing urban sprawl may be a good thing, but only if intensification of the existing neighbourhoods is shared smartly and respectfully. Several communities will be on the verge of losing the characteristics of their neighbourhood if this draft OP is implemented as currently written.

The OP states in several sections that areas near major transit will be the focus of increased intensification. One issue with this plan is that there are several areas where the transit system is still a plan and/or not in operation yet. Intensification in these types of areas should be put on hold until a working, reliable transit is in place. Without the system in place, residents will still require vehicles and if the new designs no longer include adequate parking, those parked cars will spill on to the neighbourhood roads causing additional safety and operational concerns. There is also the concern that the transit project either gets delayed or, as we have seen in the recent past, cancelled. The City has to be cautious when planning on the basis of concepts alone.

As part of the ‘Big Policy Move 1’ that is described in Section 2.1, and throughout the draft OP, “built form policies will also help to ensure that new housing in existing neighbourhoods complement the character of these neighbourhoods”. The wording here again is weak and

carries no mandate to actually respect the character of the neighbourhood. Engaging communities to help define the character of their neighbourhood should be the first task. The proposed 613 Flats housing design does not complement the character in many of the neighbourhoods and should not be acceptable as a template concept to be applied across the City. The City needs to explain how going from a neighbourhood with predominantly single-family bungalows to a lot with two, 3-storey buildings, each with 3 apartments, matches the existing character. This type of intensification is intrusive and eliminates privacy, drastically reducing the amount of sunlight on the other houses. What about those existing houses that have installed a solar array system knowing that nothing bigger than 2 stories could be constructed next door? Will the City take this into consideration?

In addition to the lack of character, the proposed designs which will be much closer to the street than existing homes, intensification of existing neighbourhoods does not make it livable. Residents have invested and chosen their neighbourhood based on its unique character.

A major push in the draft OP is for 15-minute neighbourhoods. This concept has its merits as it should increase walkability. However, it is critical that the City realize that this concept cannot always be applied everywhere, especially in existing neighbourhoods that are already limited with what can be done. The process for designing and progressing to a 15 -minute neighbourhood is not set out in the draft OP, yet it is central to the plan and too important to be left out. In general, each community will need to be properly studied, looking at the bigger picture. When planning is carried out only looking at a 15-minute walkable bubble, in several cases, if that bubble is extended to include perimeter hubs, all the wanted features for transit, shopping, and other amenities, are already available and being used. There are many examples of other cities in Canada that have implemented a similar program, but used a wider lens, and have been successful. In existing neighbourhoods, it will also be very difficult to entice commercial/retail to move into the bubble. This would mean removing existing homes and building an appropriate commercial/retail space. In most cases, products in these types of establishments are typically more expensive and if they are relying on only the local residents for survival, they will not last long. This can already be seen throughout Ottawa where these corner stores are shutting down. Ironically, that space is often developed into multi-unit dwellings. Small businesses that can exist within neighbourhoods should not add to traffic and parking issues. It is recommended that the City carry out a couple of pilot projects to truly study how these changes will work and what will their impact be on the existing neighbourhoods.

The draft OP has taken away the voices of individual citizens and community associations. Applications for housing that did not meet with neighbourhood bylaws and zoning, were able to be challenged by communities to ensure that developers continued to build houses/buildings that worked and complemented the neighbourhood. The draft OP has removed those maximum limits and instead, has set minimum requirements for densities and heights, and decreased setbacks to what is currently in a neighbourhood. there appears to be no policy for checks and balances to monitor and control intensifications rates. Will the City consider having limits on intensification for neighbourhoods? What will happen when the 60% increase in dwelling units has been reached,

There are also several new restrictions that prevent people from building housing types that are already in the neighbourhood, such as the building of bungalows and replacing single family dwellings with new single-family dwellings. The City may be forcing current long-time residents to move should they need to build an accessible, single-storey home in their community. Also, the new 613 Flats may not be able to accommodate those with mobility issues or be "visitable"

because they are multi-storey or do not have ground level entrances. This could be considered discrimination against the physically disabled.

In another example, what would happen if someone's single family bungalow was to burn down? Would the City allow them to rebuild as is? Insurance companies replace the damaged house with something of similar size and type. Issues like this need to be considered when revising the draft OP.

In some communities, the percentage of homes bought by those who wish to live there is much higher than those looking to redevelop the lot. However, in City View, that is not the case. Most of the houses that have been sold have been bought by developers or investors. Once the regulations are relaxed with this new OP the infill construction will start

In areas around the universities or colleges, most of the houses and apartments are being rented to students and the rent is too high for a family to afford. These apartment units and home conversions should be included in the numbers for intensification.

With respect to intensification targets, Section 3.2.(1) states that new residential dwelling units shall exclude institutional and collective units such as senior's and student residences. Student residences on campuses should be excluded, however, it needs to be made clear what qualifies as a senior's residence. Long Term Care homes are excluded from the density numbers. Seniors Residences should be included as there is no difference between these types of residences and regular apartments, except for the general age of the population. It has to be expected that in the future, the number of senior citizens will decrease as the age of the baby boomers passes and these dwelling units will most likely switch to become regular apartment units. If these senior citizens are not living in apartments, then they are living in houses.

The City should also recognize that there are currently a large number of development applications for high rise apartments and multi-unit housing developments. The number of dwelling units that these projects will accommodate may satisfy most of the intensification that is being sought. Until it is exactly known how much will be built, the City should wait and see if any further intensification will be necessary. For the communities that are expected to bear the burden of higher intensification rates the City needs to address the following:

- Development of Secondary Plans for those communities that will be adversely affected by the intensification plans. The draft OP is a general plan for the entire City but it must be recognized that each community is different and this should be recognized in a Secondary Plan and Area Specific Policies.
- Infrastructure, such as water, electricity and especially storm/sanitary sewers, should be studied to ensure that the current capacity can handle any additional loads that will be created before any intensification builds. This is a serious issue for some communities and if the City does not do its due diligence, it should not be the local residents that are held accountable.
- Current levels of greenspace will need to be determined, including the existing tree canopy and available parks. Some communities do not meet parkland targets and there may be no other opportunity to acquire greenspace, should the builders be allowed to go in first and start building on potential park sites.
- Street safety will need to be analysed. The aim of the draft OP is to make 15-minute neighbourhoods that are walkable. If there are insufficient sidewalks, it makes it very difficult to walk. Safety doesn't only mean the speed at which vehicles travel but also the physical walkability of the streets. Some streets are so sloped to the sides, for drainage, that it is very difficult to walk, especially for the elderly, those with mobility concerns and

parents walking with strollers, etc. In winter, this sloped roadway becomes even more treacherous.

- Snow removal should be addressed.
- Ensure that social infrastructure such as schools, recreational and community facilities are sufficient enough to support the additional families and children. Are there assurances that schools within communities have safe walkability for children of all ages especially at busy intersections?
- Establish policies to monitor the mental health impacts to residents in areas affected by significant change.

Section 11.8(2) of the draft OP states that the City may require additional information as listed in Table 10 (pg 239). In neighbourhoods that are new to the intensification, these reports (Urban design and Planning study requirements) should be mandatory prior to beginning any intensification. These studies will show what the impact will be on the existing homes should intensification be carried out.

## Affordability

Intensification does not lead to affordability. In many neighbourhoods housing prices have increased so much that the average family is now priced out of that neighbourhood. Intensification increases the cost of housing for a variety of reasons:

- A current home owner can raise the price of their house for sale, knowing that only developers will be able to afford it. This may outprice families from living in these family-oriented neighbourhoods.
- New dwelling units, especially in multi-unit buildings are student rentals in communities near post-secondary institutions such as City View. The rent is very high, so it can only be rented by several students sharing accommodations. Most families would not be able to afford it.
- In the name of intensification, developers in some neighbourhoods are building very large single-family houses with footprints that cover most of the lot. The price range of these houses is well above one and a half million dollars, changing the neighbourhood and squeezing out affordable housing, contributing to the housing crisis.

Developers are profit based and will never voluntarily lower prices or make housing affordable. The only way to have affordable dwelling units is to have non-profit organizations, such as Ottawa Community Housing, build and manage the buildings/sites. Co-ops would be another solution to address affordability. If the City is serious about having affordable housing, then mandated policies need to be established such as Montreal's 20-20-20 Diverse Metropolis bylaw. In addition, new housing developments of all types and in all locations need to include larger units with 3+ bedrooms to house families. This is particularly important along transit corridors. The city should mandate this by setting a certain percentage of units within a build as larger units. If every build contributed a few units or a small percentage to the City's goals of affordable housing, there would be a huge positive impact.

## **Social Impact and Wellness**

Section 2.2 of the draft OP states that one of the City's policy goals is to create healthy and inclusive communities. While this is true and a number of communities have already achieved this goal, the City needs to take a step back and look at the overall effect the draft OP may have on communities. The possibility of any of the changes would be very stressful for anyone facing them.

## **Housing Design Issues**

There is also the question of coach houses. It is shown on Typology #4 of the 613 Flats that some designs can accommodate coach houses along the back of the property. The City of Ottawa previously established a number of rules for building coach houses. This typology is a perfect example of where the house and parking areas have almost covered 100% of the lot.

Section 4.6.6.(7)(b) states that the buildings will have balconies facing the right-of-way in order to promote social interaction. This is a stretch, considering people would not be at street level. It would be doubtful that there would be more interaction from balconies

# CONCERNS SPECIFIC TO CITY VIEW

The following sections outline the City View Community Association's concerns about the effect the draft Official Plan policies will have on our community. Many of the previously discussed items are important enough that they deserve to be repeated and put into the neighbourhood context.

## History of City View

City View has nearly 10,000 residents in single homes, apartments, seniors' residences, long-term care facilities, condos, garden homes and townhouses, including many new infill developments.

In the early 1800's, City View was part of the Merivale Farming Corridor, where a handful of families owned large parcels of farmland. In 1913 most of City View was divided into 25ft garden plots with a grid network of roads (Plan 375). These farmers slowly sold their lands and by the mid 1900's, City View had a mix of owners and homes built by small independent developers. It was never a cohesive effort, but rather an opportunity for small scale builders or individuals. Typically, a few streets were built at a time, while larger parcels of land still had old farmhouses and working farms surrounding them. A typical lot had a minimum of 100 feet of frontage per home to accommodate a well and septic system.

City View is a community established around space, with modest homes, typically bungalows and 2 stories. As all the farms eventually disappeared by the 1990's the last areas of open space disappeared too. The community's vast greenspaces have now been developed. It also became evident that City View never really had a master plan for safe and enjoyable walking, parks or greenspaces.

In 1979, a report was issued by the CVCA to address this and an action plan was established. It never materialized and the opportunities we had were lost. Now in 2021, City View has homes built from the 1840's right up to new ones under construction.

## Intensification Issues

### Transects and Overlays

CVCA is now included in the Inner Urban Transect. Our community is concerned that under this plan City View would change from a suburban to a more inner-city-like area over the next 25 years. How the change will be managed is not yet clear. Impacts include:

- Increased density, which means more people living in the same area
- More two-to three-story low-rise housing forms, small yards
- Services within walking/biking distance – what is called a 15 Minute Neighborhood
- Greater flexibility for proponents of in-fill and redevelopment projects

Questions include:

- Does City View fit well in the Inner Urban Transect?

- Why is our neighbouring community Crestview considered Outer Urban when we are very similar?
- City View and Crestview are both in the Evolving overlay but in different transects, why?
- Are the measures to protect the desired features of City View strong enough?
- How will “regeneration” be implemented in City View?
- Will the tree canopy and “green” character of City View be maintained?
- Will services be improved at the same time as density increases?

City View has been experiencing increased intensification over the last 10 years typically occurring when owners severed a portion of their lot to accommodate another house or to replace an existing house with two. This has been occurring over the last 20-30 years but with increased intensification over the last decade.

City View has also been experiencing “hidden intensification” with multi-unit homes, rental units, student housing and new homes with basement apartments.

City View is being targeted for higher intensification rates because it is surrounded by major arterial roads (Merivale, Baseline, Woodroffe and Meadowlands). Baseline will have a rapid bus transit line and Woodroffe will have a station for the future LRT. Neither the rapid bus transit nor the LRT have been built yet and it is not known when these projects will be ready if ever. Intensifying the neighbourhood prior to the transit systems being installed could have damaging effects that may not be reversible.

### **Algonquin College**

With City View's proximity to Algonquin College, many family homes have been renovated into “rooming” houses. The City needs to consider what has already been done. It is our opinion that further intensification with the proposed housing designs will lead to more student rentals or short-term rooming rentals. The City currently has no mechanism in place to control how any dwelling unit is used and intensification will only worsen the situation.

### **Intensification does not equate affordability**

City View housing prices are steadily increasing, making the neighbourhood unaffordable to most. To give an example of the housing market in City View, five years ago, a house could be bought for \$400k. Today, new builds in the community sell for over \$1.3 million with current listings set over \$1.6 million. Original “older” homes marketed as tear downs for developers are selling for over \$800k. In these new houses, rent is not affordable with basement units listed for a range of \$2,000 to \$3,500 per month. One house on Lotta advertises that it generates a revenue of \$35,000/year off its basement unit.

It should also be noted that sites along the major corridors around City View currently have applications to build several high-rise apartment buildings (heights range from 15-28 storeys). Over the next 5-10 years, there could be at least 10-15 buildings built on the perimeters of City View (table 1). With this proposed intensification, the City should rethink any proposed re-zoning until after they are built to see what effect they have on our area.

**TABLE 1: Proposed high-rise apartments around City View Neighborhood**

ADDRESS	NUMBER OF STOREYS	NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS
1356 Clyde Avenue	28	258
1356 Clyde Avenue	24	210
1357 Baseline Road	15	374
7 Rossland Avenue	9	120
7 Rossland Avenue	6	70
2140 Baseline Road	11	144
19 Centrepointe Drive	22	188
19 Centrepointe Drive	24	219
19 Centrepointe Drive	26	178
1642 Merivale Road	12 (1st of six buildings, 4 x 6 storey and 1 x 9 storey to come)	253+
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS</b>		<b>2014+</b>

## Infrastructure Issues

### **Combined sanitary/storm sewers beyond capacity**

Infrastructure, such as water, electricity and especially sanitary sewers, need to be studied to ensure that the current capacity can handle any additional loads that will be created with intensification builds. This study should also be shared with the City View Community Association.

Most of City View's infrastructure for storm water is 'rural drainage', with a ditch system from the 1950s. This system was designed based on the type of small houses that were being built at the time.

These houses had larger lots and trees which helped control storm water runoff. Due to storm water entering the water system the load increased and the system eventually failed in the late summer 2003. The backup led to many basements being flooded with sewage. A trunk sewer was replaced along two streets to mitigate the problem, but no houses have been connected.

**It is suspected that the current system is either at or beyond capacity.** The property of 21 Withrow Ave. was originally planned for development featuring a large condo complex or multi-unit stacked townhomes. Those plans never materialized and surprisingly changed to allow 13

houses. The site was then required to have a storm water retention tank installed in order to control the load on the system during major rainfalls.

The City, after the OP has been approved, is planning to do an Infrastructure study to see what areas can sustain intensification. **This should be done first.** Should the system fail again with continued intensification, it will be very costly for the City to upgrade the whole system and the community will not be held responsible for the costs.

## Community Walkability

### **Safety not being met**

City View walkability safety needs to be addressed before approving further intensification. City View currently has ditches, no curbs and sloped roads. Sidewalks are needed for safe walking to schools, shopping, parks and transit.

City View has almost no sidewalks and the few that are here do not connect. During the Ward 18 OP information session, City staff stated that if there are ditches along the streets, then sidewalks may not be possible due to the need to revamp the underground sewer infrastructure and the prohibitive cost. If this is the case, then it will be a problem to make City View safe to walk as the majority of the streets have ditches to control storm runoff.

### **Already in need of traffic calming measures**

Section 4.10.1(2)(b) states that traffic calming measures shall be implemented along walking routes. With the original grid layout and proximity to Baseline/Merivale/Woodroof/Meadowlands, City View is being used as a “cut through” route for cars to avoid traffic on the major corridors. Speeding continues to be an issue and the lack of stop signs, sidewalks, sufficient street lighting and crosswalks makes it dangerous for all residents when walking.

### **No school crossings**

Section 4.10.1(2)(a) of the OP draft states that safe walking to schools shall be provided. It is recommended that this be addressed immediately as City View currently does not meet this. Schools and families have asked for help, specifically requesting a crossing guard at Meadowlands and Perry Street with no success. There are also no sidewalks or safe crossing within the neighbourhood (example no stop signs or path to cross Withrow at St. Helen's).

## Greenspace and Environment

### **City View lacks parkland/greenspace**

Before further intensification, green space and parks need to be allocated. Based on the current number of households, the ratio of total parkland in City View is below 1%. The current city requirement calls for 5%.

City View has no option for greenspace other than the City purchasing school property, private residential lots or creating linear parkettes on the hydro easement. The City had a viable opportunity to purchase additional parkland through a private sale at 21 Withrow Ave., a mature inner neighbourhood lot of 2.02 acres and home to a large, healthy mature tree canopy, but in 2019 a subdivision was approved. No cash-in-lieu from past developments has ever resulted in new parkland, even when there was a chance to obtain some.

### **Already diminishing tree canopy**

City View's tree canopy continues to be diminished even before the implementation of the draft OP's further intensification. With the development of 21 Withrow, City View lost over 110 trees, some, endangered butternuts. The draft OP claims to include greenspace within its long-term plans, but intensification will only remove more trees in our community, further diminishing our mature tree canopy. The City can preserve existing greenspace in City View by revising the OP policies to decrease the size of the new buildings to protect our environment.

In addition, the draft OP does not include clear policies to monitor or enforce ample greenspace and tree canopy.

An unintended barrier is being added, preventing direct access to further park land and greenspace in adjoining neighbourhoods. The proposed transit corridor along Baseline Road will force pedestrians to walk further in order to cross Baseline Road at only a few planned crossings over the transit way as the rest is fenced off. This is also true for residents that bike or walk to Centrepointe Park, where the proposed transit will block some of the existing walkways.

# Recommendations for the City of Ottawa

The City View Community Association is recommending the following changes to the draft Official Plan:

1. **Delay.** The implementation of the draft OP needs to be delayed. Due to Covid-19, communities have not been able to have proper engagement by community members. In addition, the OP works with the Master Plan documents. It is essential that those other documents be ready and reviewed at the same time as the draft OP.
2. **Individual Neighbourhood Assessments.** The OP needs to be revised so it addresses either directly or indirectly, the specific character of each community.
3. **Phased approach along transit timeline.** Development should be connected to completed transit projects. If these projects are delayed or canceled, it will change how a neighbouring community should be developed.
4. **Take current proposed developments into account.** Implementation of the OP should be carried out in phases depending on the completion of currently proposed housing developments. If plans for several multi-unit residential buildings are already in the works, the City should assess the impact on intensification resulting from these projects and then see if further intensification is even necessary.
5. **Study of existing infrastructure capacity, environment and safety.** The City must carry out various studies of existing communities prior to any intensification being approved. Studies need to be carried out on existing infrastructure capacity (sewer, water, and electricity), existing tree canopy and parklands, local school capacity, safety concerns such as lack of sidewalks, and impacts that intensification will have on the community and city operations within them (i.e. snow removal).
6. **Community secondary plans.** The City needs to allow Secondary Plans and Area Specific Policies to be developed. Localized Secondary Plans will control some of the intensification so the changes are not so severe and local neighbourhood character will be preserved. The draft OP is written in a way that existing communities will potentially be altered in drastic ways.
7. **Exclude Greenbelt and NCC from tree canopy.** The City cannot include the Greenbelt or NCC lands as part of the 40% tree canopy. It needs to be done on a community by community basis to ensure the protection of existing trees.
8. **Enforcement and monitoring of tree by-laws.** The City's Green Plan and Climate Change actions need to go beyond getting rid of cars. It is crucial that monitoring and enforcing tree by-laws must be done.
9. **Green space allocation.** Determine green space allocations before allowing development and revise the requirements for building height and setbacks to allow lots to maintain more greenspace, especially in those areas that do not have ample parklands.
10. **Separate program for affordable housing.** Develop a program in addition to the OP for building affordable housing. Developers are profit-based and will not voluntarily build

affordable housing. Using existing organizations like OHC will ensure that needed housing is built.

- 11. Family accommodations need to be considered.** The City needs to mandate that developers set aside a certain percentage of dwelling units as 3+ bedrooms to accommodate larger families.
- 12. Promote renovations and Recycling Construction** Older homes could be moved on site or to another site rather than demolition. Also, material separation and recycling programs need to be established for all construction sites, not just large projects. This may lead to more homes being made affordable and it will reduce the amount of waste going to our landfills. The OP can easily include this type of requirement.
- 13. Pilot 15-minute neighbourhoods.** Piloting the 15-minute neighbourhood concept in an existing and a new development will be a true indicator and a measurable metric of whether or not what is proposed in the draft OP will work. The unintended consequences of what could happen without supporting evidence from pilot projects could end up being very costly for the City and, in the end, for the people of Ottawa.