



Infrastructure Master Plan

December 2013



ottawa.ca
City services **3-1-1**
613-580-2400
TTY 613-580-2401
@ottawacity

2.0 Summary of Submissions and Feedback

Table 2.1 below outlines a summary of the feedback received during all consultation events and tools as they relate to the IMP. Feedback from the following consultation events and tools are summarized in Table 2.1.

- Meetings and Forums:
 - Internal Agency Consultation Group Meetings
 - External Agency Consultation Group Meetings
 - First Nation, Métis, and Aboriginal Consultation
 - Developer Forums
 - Community Forum
 - Business Improvement Area (BIA) Meetings
 - Sponsors Group and Panel Meetings
 - Federation of Community Association Meeting
 - Interagency Pathway Committee Meeting
 - Committee and Council Meetings
- Stakeholder Submissions:
 - Comment Sheets received at the Building a Liveable Ottawa Project Launch, the Community Forum, and the fall Open Houses
 - Online Form Submissions through the Building a Liveable Ottawa website
 - E-mails received throughout the process
 - Submissions from organizations
- Tools:
 - Online Survey
 - Social Media
 - Focus on Rural Issues Survey

A description of each of these events or tools can be found in Section 3.0 below.

Table 2.1 - Summary of Submissions and Feedback that relates to the IMP

Topic	Summary of Feedback	Staff Response
1. Serviced Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City should review its overall planning objectives to give fair consideration to the neglected roads of the older sections of the City in terms of storm sewers, rates should be area specific, and reflect the services available. 	Renewal of infrastructure is prioritized city-wide. Intent is to normalize level of service across the City. IMP is recommending separate sewer rate.
2. Village Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain villages should be selected and serviced for them to grow • Ownership of land within villages should be considered when considering which village should be serviced • Alternate communal water services / technologies / delivery systems should be considered for villages. Modelling in the IMP uses traditional servicing 	<p>No new extension of public services in the villages is being considered in the current IMP.</p> <p>Specific technological options will be considered at the time that a decision is to be made regarding the servicing of specific village developments.</p>

Topic	Summary of Feedback	Staff Response
	<p>methods – there is an opportunity to use cleantech technology for servicing Rural area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When asked whether participants supported extending City water and wastewater services to those villages that currently don't have them, the opinion was generally divided between oppose and support, in two separate surveys (Focus on Rural Issues Survey: 42% of respondents supported or somewhat support this, and 44% opposed or somewhat opposed this; winter Online Survey: 48% of respondents supported or somewhat support this, and 29% opposed or somewhat opposed this). The former survey had much fewer participants answer this question than the latter (151 vs. 4,100 participants). A concern for additional village servicing is property taxes rising everywhere because the true cost of these services has not been passed on to developers or to the people who will actually live in these areas. 	
3. Drainage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern for drainage issues as it relates to walkers and wheelchair travel safety (i.e. puddles). Should consider use of permeable materials. 	<p>These issues are being considered where appropriate as part of the Stormwater Management Retrofit program.</p>
4. Well and Septic Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern relating to the cumulative effects of well and septic systems, especially in villages. 	<p>Conditions will be monitored on an on-going basis.</p>
5. Fire Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inquiry of whether the IMP would consider residential sprinkler systems for fire protection A new fire service standard should be produced. Potential need for changes to plans for rural villages (adding more fire halls with full time staff) as a result of anticipated population / density changes in villages which may result from the proposed rural growth strategy. 	<p>These issues may be considered as part of the review of City guidelines. City is supportive of residential sprinkling, but does not have authority to impose it through by-laws.</p>
6. Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inquiry for why there are no maximum density targets, and how it will be known whether there is sufficient 	<p>The Infrastructure Master Plan is reviewed every 5 years along with the Official Plan,</p>

Topic	Summary of Feedback	Staff Response
	<p>infrastructure to support intensification that exceeds the density targets set in the OP.</p>	<p>and always includes an analysis of the capacity of existing and planned infrastructure to deal with projected growth throughout the city, both in new Greenfield development areas and through intensification.</p>
<p>7. Green Infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be incentives for buildings to use on-site stormwater management using green design. • There seems to be a lack of consideration of the value green infrastructure (more trees, bioswales, green roofs, permeable paving) can offer. There is an opportunity to leverage intensification projects and next construction in the development of green infrastructure by supporting inclusion on site plans and/or providing incentives to developers. • Forwarding of Green Infrastructure Ontario Coalition correspondence to the City for consideration, as follows: “Many North America cities are rethinking infrastructure. Green infrastructure, including green roofs and walls, urban forests, wetlands, porous paving systems, rain gardens and healthy soil, is no longer viewed as a pleasant add-on but an essential part of the solution to over-burdened stormwater management systems, air pollution and the urban heat island effect.” • Concern for lack of planning or proposed guidelines for the use of green infrastructure in stormwater management plans. 	<p>City will be implementing related demonstration projects and developing suitable guidelines at this time. Further consideration will be provided as part of the next IMP process.</p>
<p>8. Affordability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry regarding the long-term implications of the costs of road cut-ins for connecting sewer and water infrastructure to new developments, and how this has been considered. 	<p>Costs of cut-ins are borne by the developer. Long-term impacts would be considered by the City’s Asset Management Program, rather than the IMP.</p>
<p>9. Federal Lands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City must have regard to the development or redevelopment potential of all federal lands when planning for servicing capacity. 	<p>Capacity planning is based on growth projections considering all public service area properties, including</p>

Topic	Summary of Feedback	Staff Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where infrastructure capacity has already been paid for and set aside for federal lands, this capacity must not be compromised to facilitate other potential development projects. 	<p>federal lands. Capacity is not paid for, per se. However, developers may front-end the cost of public infrastructure, or construct development-specific infrastructure that will be dedicated to meeting the needs of the development.</p>
<p>10. Other Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When asked what infrastructure projects the City should undertake to make Ottawa a more “liveable city”, “Improving and adding to Ottawa’s wastewater and sewage infrastructure” generated 10% of the mentions. These measures were seen as a way to reduce sewage in the Ottawa River and lead to cleaner beaches. 	<p>The City is committed to implementing the Ottawa River Action Plan to reduce the impacts of wastewater on the Ottawa River.</p>

3.0 Description of Engagement Events and Tools

3.1 Notice of Commencement

As part of the integrated public and stakeholder consultation for Building a Liveable Ottawa 2031, a “Five Year Review of the Official Plan and Notice of Commencement to update the Transportation Master Plan, Infrastructure Master Plan, Ottawa Pedestrian Plan and Ottawa Cycling Plan” notice was published in the Ottawa Sun and in LeDroit on both January 18 and 25, 2013 and included notice of the January 29, 2013 Open House. This notice was also posted on the City of Ottawa website on January 18, 2013. See Appendix A for copies of the Notice of Commencement.

3.2 Newsletters

The Building a Liveable Ottawa electronic newsletter was distributed to Ottawa residents and other stakeholders who signed up for the newsletter or expressed an interest in the review of the Master Plans. The subscription list totaled 2204 individual email addresses as of August 2013. Interested individuals were able to sign up for the electronic newsletter on the City’s website and staff also encouraged interested parties to sign up for the newsletter in their responses to public inquiries regarding the review of the Master Plans.

Between January and August 2013, five notices were distributed using this electronic newsletter, providing information updates and links to information or consultation tools on the Building a Liveable Ottawa website. The notices are summarized in Table 3.1 below. See Appendix B for copies of the newsletters.

3.10 Sponsors Group and Panel Meetings

As approved by Council on July 11, a Sponsors Group of Members of Council was established to ensure that OP and Master Plan reviews are interconnected and that all stakeholders are considered. Two consultation panels, the Development Industry Panel and the Community Panel, provide the Sponsors Group and staff with advice and connection to their affiliated stakeholders.

3.10.1 Sponsors Group

Membership: Chair and Vice-Chair of Planning Committee, Chair of Transportation Committee, Chair of Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee, Chair of Rural Review Sponsors Group.

3.10.2 Development Industry Panel

Membership: Three representatives of the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) – Ottawa, three representatives of the Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association (GOHBA).

3.10.3 Community Panel

Membership: Two representatives of the Federation of Citizens' Associations, two rural representatives (nominated by the Chair of Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee), one suburban representative (nominated by the Vice-Chair of Planning Committee), and one representative of the Ottawa Coalition of BIAs appointed to the panel after its first meeting.

Table 3.2 - Summary of all Sponsors Group and Panel Meetings

Meeting Date	Group Attended	Summary of Meeting
November 5, 2012	Sponsors Group	The discussion at this meeting was focused on the consultation strategy and residential land supply report. The decision was made not to expand the urban boundary for residential purposes.
November 9, 2012	Development Industry Panel	The discussion at this meeting focused on the mandate of the panel, the consultation strategy and review timeline, the scope of the review, and the residential land supply report.
November 15, 2012	Community Panel	The discussion at this meeting focused on the mandate of the panel, the consultation strategy and review timeline, the scope of the review, and the residential land supply report.
December 17, 2012	Sponsors Group	Staff provided a presentation of the preliminary policy proposals at this meeting. The members of the Sponsors Group were able to provide preliminary comments on the policy directions. Discussion also covered the consultation strategy for January and February.
January 15, 2013	Sponsors Group	The Sponsors Group provided staff with comments regarding the draft preliminary policy proposals. Discussion focused on the public open house and launch event schedule for January 29 th .
January 16, 2013	Development Industry Panel	The panel provided staff with comments regarding the draft preliminary policy proposals. Some panel members expressed concern regarding the achievability of the sustainable transportation goals, employment land and

Meeting Date	Group Attended	Summary of Meeting
		mixed-use development policies, and the development of a winter cycling network.
January 23, 2013	Community Panel	The panel provided staff with comments regarding the draft preliminary policy proposals. Some panel members expressed support for the active transportation policy directions. Concern was expressed regarding the suitability of proposed sustainable transportation policies for suburban communities.
March 5, 2013	Sponsors Group	Staff and consultants gave a presentation of the preliminary results of the Building a Liveable Ottawa online survey and social media activity. Staff provided an update on the proposed policies going forward to Planning Committee at the end of March, including a summary of what had been changed as a result of public consultation.
March 12, 2013	Community Panel & Development Industry Panel	The preliminary results of the Building a Liveable Ottawa online survey were shared with the panels. Staff also presented the policy directions going forward to Planning Committee at the end of March. Some panel members expressed concern that the policies were intended for more urban rather than suburban areas. Discussion between panel members and staff focused on the need to provide complete streets and improve transit connectivity within suburban communities outside the Greenbelt.
April 23, 2013	Sponsors Group	Staff presented an update on the status of the TMP, OCP, and OPP. Discussion focused on the proposed mode share targets and how to determine funding priorities, given a large number of projects in the plan and limited funding available. Staff also demonstrated the online engagement tool developed for the OCP and OPP, and the Sponsors Group discussed the consultation strategy for these plans in the upcoming months.
April 25, 2013	Community Panel & Development Industry Panel	Staff presented an update on the status of the TMP, OCP, and OPP. Discussion focused on the need for incentives to encourage residents to use active transportation and concerns regarding the feasibility of winter cycling. Staff also demonstrated the online engagement tool developed for the OPC and OPP.
May 15, 2013	Sponsors Group	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of intensification and tall buildings. Sponsors Group members provided comments regarding the draft policies.
May 16, 2013	Community Panel & Development Industry Panel	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of intensification and tall buildings. Panel members provided comments regarding the draft policies.
May 22, 2013	Sponsors Group	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of urban design. Sponsors Group members provided comments regarding the draft policies.

Meeting Date	Group Attended	Summary of Meeting
May 23, 2013	Community Panel & Development Industry Panel	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of urban design. Panel members provided comments regarding the draft policies.
May 29, 2013	Sponsors Group	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of rural development. Sponsors Group members provided comments regarding the draft policies. The decision was made to maintain the status quo with regards to policies on providing water and wastewater services to rural villages.
May 30, 2013	Community Panel & Development Industry Panel	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of rural development. Panel members provided comments regarding the draft policies.
June 3, 2013	Sponsors Group	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of employment and enterprise areas. Sponsors Group members provided comments regarding the draft policies.
June 6, 2013	Community Panel & Development Industry Panel	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the theme of employment and enterprise areas. Panel members provided comments regarding the draft policies.
June 18, 2013	Sponsors Group & Community Panel & Development Industry Panel	Staff presented parts of a draft amendment to the OP, focusing on the introduction, policies specific to suburban town centres, mineral aggregates policies, and stormwater management policies. Discussion also covered the proposed Zoning By-law amendment which will accompany the OP review, protection of community character, and the readjustment of the proposed timeline and consultation activities for the review of the TMP, OCP, and OPP.
September 10th and 11th, 2013	Sponsors Group and Development Industry Meeting	Staff presented a summary of the IMP, including key policy directions and changes, water and wastewater project recommendations, rural village servicing decisions, and stormwater management initiatives. It was noted the Drinking Water Quality Management Standard and Council accountability for safe drinking water is covered in the draft IMP document.
Week of September 16th	Sponsors and Panels Meeting	MO, Sponsors, Council and Panels briefing on TMP, OCP, and OPP - PLACEHOLDER
Week of September 30th	Panel and Sponsors Meeting	Review Feedback on OP - PLACEHOLDER
Week of October 14th	Sponsors and Panels Meeting	Review feedback on OP - PLACEHOLDER
Week of October 28th	Sponsors Meeting	Review any changes to TMP, OCP, OPP - PLACEHOLDER
Week of November 4th	Sponsors Meeting	Review any changes to OP - PLACEHOLDER