

Table 7a: Table of Submissions

| Submission Number | Submission Name |
|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd. |
| 2 | FoTenn Planning and Urban Design |
| 3 | Claridge Homes |
| 4 | Ottawa Food Policy Council |
| 5 | Ecology Ottawa |
| 6 | LAC & Associates Consulting |
| 7 | Trevor Davies |
| 8 | Kavanagh-Milne |
| 9 | Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital |
| 10 | Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd. |
| 11 | Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd. |
| 12 | Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association |
| 13 | SimpliCity Developments 2011 Inc. |
| 14 | Katimavik Hazeldean Community Association |
| 15 | Hunt Club Park Community Association |
| 16 | Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital |
| 17 | Ottawa Macdonald Cartier International Airport Authority |
| 18 | Conservation Partners |
| 19 | Bill Eggertson |
| 20 | Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority |
| 21 | Minto |
| 22 | Sunset Lakes Development |
| 23 | Tartan |
| 24 | FoTenn Planning and Urban Design |
| 25 | Preston Street Business Improvement Association |
| 26 | Ottawa International Airport Authority |
| 27 | Rideau Valley Conservation Authority |
| 28 | Shemeluck |
| 29 | Lowertown Community Association |
| 30 | FoTenn Planning and Urban Design |
| 31 | French Catholic School Board |
| 32 | Catholic School Board |
| 33 | Dalhousie Community Association |
| 34 | Westcliffe Estates Community Association |
| 35 | Debbie Witham |
| 36 | Ontario Stone Sand and Gravel Association |
| 37 | Israr A. Akhtar |
| 38 | Antonio Provenzano |
| 39 | Centretown Citizens Community Association |
| 40 | Charles Mckenna |
| 41 | Osmond Bakker |
| 42 | South Nation Conservation Authority |
| 43 | Richmond Village Association |
| 44 | R.W. Tomlinson Ltd. |

Table 7a: Table of Submissions

| Submission Number | Submission Name |
|--------------------------|--|
| 45 | NovaTech Engineering Consultants Ltd. |
| 46 | Walton Development |
| 47 | Malone Given Parsons |
| 48 | Urbandale |
| 49 | FoTenn Planning and Urban Design |
| 50 | R.G. Richards and Associates |
| 51 | North West Goulbourn Community Association |
| 52 | Riverview Park Community Association |
| 53 | South March Highlands – Carp River Conservation Inc. |
| 54 | Rideau Valley Conservation Authority |
| 55 | FoTenn Planning and Urban Design |
| 56 | Andrew Baldwin |
| 57 | Federation of Citizens Associations |

Councillor Submissions

- Councillor Chiarelli
- Councillor Deans
- Councillor Hobbs
- Councillor Holmes
- Councillor Hubley
- Councillor Qadri

Table 7b: Intensification and Tall Buildings

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|--|
| Submits a request to not direct intensification near transit. Concern is that this will ruin older neighbourhoods and that current processes to allow greater building heights in some identified communities have impacted the areas in a negative way. | 8 | This concern is addressed through compatibility and urban design policies as well as the Infill Zoning By-law, which seeks to maintain character in stable residential areas. |
| This comment raises a number of questions on how a secondary plan will be applied given the proposed direction in the Official Plan for intensification near transitway stations. The comment also requests confirmation of transit streets, how height will be applied for a specific parcel of land and how the vicinity of transit stations is applied. | 6 | The Official Plan supports approval of secondary plans which may allow greater or lower heights than contemplated in the Official Plan. A Secondary Plan process allows for an in-depth analysis of building heights and other planning and design matters. |
| Submission points out that some policies on height contradict one another, especially with respect to the roles of the Official Plan and secondary plans. | 16 | Policy 4.1(1) regarding secondary plans and site-specific policies indicates that, “The policies and plans in Volume 2 must conform to the policies and plans in Volume 1 of the Plan, except where policies in Volume 1 indicate otherwise.” This means that secondary plans must conform to Volume 1 of the Official Plan (i.e. they can be more restrictive, but not more permissive), unless another policy says otherwise. Policies 2.2.2(6) and 2.2.2(12) allow secondary plans to specify greater or lower heights and densities. |
| Future urbanization will have to bring more residents within the urban boundary in a way that fits into and supports the character and design of existing neighbourhoods. Compatibility has to be a criterion in the approval of new development. | 14 | Agreed. Section 4.11 includes a number of new policies to address compatibility. Compatible infill development is also supported in the Infill Zoning By-law. |

Table 7b: Intensification and Tall Buildings

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| <p>Concerns are expressed regarding the density targets of the Kanata Town Centre. Specifically, the comment states that the density is much too great as compared to the 2006 levels and is out of proportionate to the existing nearby single-family homes.</p> | <p>14</p> | <p>Development in the Kanata Town Centre is directed by a special set of site-specific policies that provide more detailed direction for each area within the town centre. These policies were developed in the 1990s for the former City of Kanata, and intend for the area to be the "downtown" of Kanata, where people can live, work, and play. The minimum density requirement for the area was brought into the Official Plan in 2009 and is not proposed to be changed as part of this Official Plan review. As well, the minimum density includes people plus jobs per hectare. Therefore, the minimum density is not just residents, but also employees. This density is consistent with the overall population and employment projections in the site-specific policies for the Kanata Town Centre. The concern regarding revision of the boundaries will be reviewed and considered.</p> |
| <p>The submission requests a portion of Walkley Road to be designated as Arterial Mainstreet. This designation would make Walkley a transportation area from its main "hub" at Bank and Walkley, right up to its intersection with Heron Road. Further, it is suggested that at a minimum it would make the surrounding neighbourhood closer to a corridor "well served by transit".</p> | <p>15</p> | <p>A new Mainstreet designation is proposed on Walkley Road between Bank Street and Heron Road, but not east of Heron Road. The Mainstreet designation includes land uses that are not consistent with the intended uses of adjacent land east of Heron Road. For example the south side of Walkley Road east of Heron Road is currently designated for employment uses (i.e. manufacturing, offices). The Province requires the City to reserve employment lands for employment uses. Creating an "Arterial Mainstreet" on this segment of Walkley Road would introduce additional uses (such as residential and retail) which would reduce the potential for employment uses. Note that the Transportation Master Plan proposes transit priority measures on Walkley between Bank Street and Heron Road and bus rapid transit east of Heron</p> |

Table 7b: Intensification and Tall Buildings

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| <p>This submission requests a land use designation change for the lands around the Bayshore shopping centre to go from General Urban Area to Mixed Use Centre. The proponent expresses a willingness to fund a community design plan to guide future growth.</p> | 24 | <p>Road. A site-specific policy is proposed for further study of the area to support redevelopment and increased use of transit.</p> |
| <p>This submission states that the tall buildings in the Transit Oriented Development stations are too high and should be reduced.</p> | 52 | <p>Intensification around light rail stations is done in a sensitive manner through a Community Design Plan process. This process allows for local circumstances to be considered when determining where height and density should go. Light rail is a large capital investment and ridership is needed around the stations to support it.</p> |
| <p>This comment put forward a number of suggestions on how Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Areas should be approached in the Official Plan. Some of the suggestions include: TODs be more prescriptive within the Official Plan; include key benchmarks (e.g. daycares, grocery stores) for TODs; include clarification that “anything built within 600 meters of a Transit station may be high and dense;” specify that TOD areas have a secondary plan that further defines heights and densities and their locations, with a comment that acknowledges the importance of protecting retail diversity; putting in place a moratorium on development until a Secondary Plan is completed, or the existing Secondary Plan must be adhered to.</p> | 25 | <p>Several of the directions supported by this organization are reflected in proposed policies, such as prescriptive policies on building height and requirements that these be approved through a secondary plan. The Official Plan and Zoning By-law support diversity within transit-oriented development areas by creating a framework that permits retail and a mix of other uses.</p> |
| <p>This submission raises concerns about the large population increase outside the Greenbelt and a resulting increase in automobile travel.</p> | 29 | <p>Although the Plan targets 40% of all new housing in the urban area to be built through intensification, a large share of population growth is projected to be in the urban areas outside the Greenbelt. Support for walking, cycling and transit in the Official Plan supports the Transportation Master Plan targets to increase the share of travel by</p> |

Table 7b: Intensification and Tall Buildings

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|---|
| | | sustainable modes and reduce car travel. |
| <p>This submission raises concerns as to why the Official Plan amendment includes changes to the radius around transit stations from 600 meters to 800 meters. This will increase the transit-oriented zone and include areas that are not conducive to intensification, such as areas around the 417 which do not allow walking.</p> | 29 | <p>An 800 m walking distance corresponds with a 10 minute walk and closely approximates a 600 m radius, but accounts for the fact that pedestrians use public streets and walkways and must respect barriers. The 800 m distance captures a different area than the 600 m radius but is not necessarily larger.</p> |
| <p>This submission makes a request to exempt Heritage Conservation Districts and their immediate vicinity from the density targets.</p> | 29 | <p>The intensification policies required that proposed development be compatible with the planned or current characteristics of the area and meet all other policies in the Plan, including those that apply to Heritage Districts. This approach supports preservation of the valued qualities of Heritage Districts.</p> |
| <p>This submission expresses that the definitions of high-rise building allow too great of a range of height. Introduce another category “high rise C and reduce the number of storeys for categories “A” and “B”. This will allow more flexibility to implement policies on compatibility.</p> | 29 | <p>Thirty-one storeys is proposed to define a second category of high-rise buildings because until recently, most high-rise buildings in Ottawa were below this height. Only two categories of high-rise are proposed, in order to maintain a level of detail appropriate to an Official Plan.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests that a specific view policy protecting the Beechwood Cemetery not be removed.</p> | 29 | <p>Agreed. This policy is not removed. It is placed in the "View" section of the design policies in Section 4.11.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests specific policy within the Traditional and Arterial Mainstreet designations to require minimum building heights and other design features.</p> | 29 | <p>Several policies in the Plan are proposed to address these proposals. The Plan addresses building design and sets a minimum height of two storeys for Traditional Mainstreets. Minimum density requirements are set for Arterial Mainstreets, although a minimum height is not specified. A minimum height of four storeys, as proposed in the submission, may not be appropriate for each location on a Mainstreet, depending on its context.</p> |

Table 7b: Intensification and Tall Buildings

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| This submission requests specific policy changes within the Central Area land use designation. | 29 | The Official Plan Review focussed on strategic policy areas and these did not include the Central Area. Staff is not proposing any text changes to this Section. |
| This submission requests future consultation where intensification on a designated mainstreet will take place, specifically consultation with schools. | 32 | When community design plans are completed for these areas, consultation opportunities will be provided. |
| This submission requests that elementary schools be added as an appropriate use to the Mixed Use Centre land use designation. | 32 | Policy 5 in Section 3.6.2 on Mixed Use Centres recognizes secondary and post- secondary schools as appropriate uses within Mixed Use Centres because of their ability to support the transit system and develop at the density of the other land use targeted for these centres. Elementary schools typically do not achieve the same densities required for these centres and are more appropriate in the surrounding General Urban Areas. |
| This submission requests a specific parcel of land be included in the Orleans Town Centre. | 38 | A new policy is proposed that requires any new or expanded Mixed Use Centre to be preceded by a community design plan, which will examine the appropriate land use designations in greater detail. The amendment proposes some minor boundary changes to the Orleans Town Centre reflect existing uses or previous plans; however, the requested boundary change is different from the proposed minor changes. |
| This submission states that in reading the Plan's sections, there are multiple references to different maximum building heights depending on location etc. The maximum height restrictions need to be consolidated into one section. | 39 | Agreed. The revised policies include some consolidation of policies for clarity, although cross-references to height policies remain. |

Table 7b: Intensification and Tall Buildings

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|--|
| This submission requests that the emphasis for designation of Mainstreets on established commercial centres and major activity areas. | 57 | Official Plan policies do not preclude opportunities for mixed use in Ottawa’s shopping centres. All but 1 of Ottawa’s Mixed Use Centres and Town Centres have undergone or are currently undergoing a secondary planning process to define heights, densities and overall function for these areas. New policies identify the need for a visioning process for the Town Centres to stimulate the next step in their evolution to high density, mixed use, transit oriented development areas. |
| This submission suggests that the use of metres and storeys in the Official Plan is confusing. Request is made to remove references to storeys and only use meters, in particular in Figure 2.4. | 39 | The proposed policies refer to building height in terms of the number of storeys. The Official Plan is a guiding document, and heights in metres are more appropriately included in the Zoning By-law, which implements the Plan. |
| This submission requests clarification on why the criteria for High-rise B are not the same as for the Tall Landmark Buildings in the Centertown community design plan. | 39 | The proposed policies provide guidance for the community design planning process in determining appropriate locations for High-Rise 30+ buildings. These policies include most of the criteria in the Centertown Secondary Plan. |
| This submission disagrees with new policies on building heights. Height limits are more appropriate for a Zoning By-law and an Official Plan should only guide development. The limit of 4 storeys in the General Urban Area is a concern, because the designation covers large areas and a height policy works against intensification policies elsewhere in the Plan. Concerns with the height limits on Traditional Mainstreets are also expressed. | 45 | The current Official Plan contains specific direction on building heights for certain areas, for example, in the Central Area where building heights are restricted by the foreground and background height planes related to the Parliament Buildings. Other municipalities in Ontario also set maximum building heights in their Official Plans, as well as in Zoning By-laws. The proposed policies recognize that a secondary plan may permit greater building heights than specified for each designation in Section 3 of the Plan, including the General Urban Area. A secondary plan, through the community design plan process, considers the unique qualities of an area and may |

Table 7b: Intensification and Tall Buildings

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---------|-------------------|---|
| | | determine that there are suitable locations for increased height. |

Table 7c: Urban Design and Compatibility

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| This submission requests to reinstate text on urban design and compatibility, specifically a statement in Section 2.2.2. | 29 | Some of the requested text has been reinstated, while other policies have been deleted to avoid cross-references in the Plan. |
| This submission requests amendments to the definition of "compatibility" so that it is not so general. | 29 | Thank you for the comments. The definition of compatibility has been expanded to address the existing and planned function of the area. |
| This submission requests that the By-ward Market be added as a design priority area. | 29 | The By-ward Market is already within the boundaries of the established design priority areas. |
| This submission requests a clear definition of transition be added to Section 4.11. | 29 | Agreed. Transition policies have been revised to include a clear definition. |
| This submission requests that Community Character be protected and to Plan for Ottawa as a City of Communities and Neighbourhoods. | 57 | New policies on community character have been written into the Official Plan. In addition, the city's Zoning and Intensification group are currently undertaking consultation with community groups and the development industry to develop a community character analysis tool to assist in establishing local criteria and fit for small scale intensification projects. |
| This submission requests that policy support to enhance the beauty of the City. | 57 | The Official Plan has recognized the importance of built form compatibility at various scales. New policy has streamlined urban design policies to make them simpler to use and be applied more consistently. A Design Brief is now required for all Site Plan Control applications, Official Plan amendments and Zoning By-law amendments so that each application must demonstrate compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood. New requirements for shadow and wind |

| | | |
|---|----|--|
| | | <p>studies have also been developed. Finally, a Planning Rationale terms of reference has been developed to accompany an Official Plan amendment, Zoning Bylaw amendment or stand alone plan of subdivision. This document requires an applicant to provide planning justification in support of the proposed development. Applicants are to accomplish this by using Official Plan policy, relevant secondary plans, Council adopted plans and policies (including all urban design guidelines residing outside of the Official Plan), the <i>Planning Act</i> and the Provincial Policy Statement.</p> |
| <p>This submission expresses a concern with the way development is proceeding in the city: Lebreton Flats is a disgrace, suburb expansion is unacceptable and infill projects are poor examples of how to do residential development.</p> | 35 | <p>The comments are received.</p> |

Table 7d: Community Design Plans

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| <p>This submission provides support for upgrading the status of community design plans, affirming the accommodation to pedestrians, cyclists and transit users, the designation of building heights in relation to the adjacent community and the defining and development of mainstreets.</p> | 14 | <p>These comments support many of the directions in the Plan.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests that a minimum building height be added in Section 2.5.6, policy 4 regarding the required contents of a community design plan.</p> | 29 | <p>Minimum building heights can help ensure that land is used efficiently. Minimum heights are set on Traditional Mainstreets (two storeys) and proposed for Mixed Use Centres (four storeys). Also, most target areas for intensification set a minimum density requirement. However, minimum heights might not be an appropriate requirement for all locations, since design, compatibility and other policies of the Plan need to be considered.</p> |

Table 7d: Community Design Plans

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|--|
| <p>This submission states that local community members be given more weight and respect when dealing with rezoning applications made through a Community Design Plan.</p> | <p>52</p> | <p>The proposed community design plan policies set new requirements for CDPs, in terms of issues and content that need to be addressed. This stronger framework will help focus the process and support effective participation by all parties.</p> |
| <p>This submission provides support for the changes in the community design plan section and the urban expansion study areas section as it pertains to parks and facilities.</p> | <p>32</p> | <p>These comments support many directions in the Plan.</p> |
| <p>This submission states that there is no commitment from the City to ensure that a plan to execute and fund public realm, recreation and services, traffic, walkability and other issues will be provided before approval of any major developments. Further, the Official Plan amendment also commits the City to “undertake condition and network capacity assessments to support community design plans in areas of proposed urban intensification, to support the development of comprehensive upgrade and renewal plans for these areas”. However past community design plans did not include such assessment, despite massive intensification having already been approved.</p> | <p>33</p> | <p>The policy requiring infrastructure assessments as part of community design plans has been proposed to address the need to better coordinate intensification and infrastructure renewal programs. It is often the case that development and additional population are needed to support public realm improvements and increases in municipal services such as recreation. A greater contribution to the public realm from private development is proposed in new design policies.</p> |
| <p>The submission questions whether adopted community design plans will be of any effect if there is language in the Official Plan which is contradicting. The submission also questions why the community design plan section used to include language around "collaborative community building" to one which is very much driven by the needs and wishes of the development industry.</p> | <p>33</p> | <p>Revisions to the community design plan policies create a more formal process where the outcomes are clearly defined for all parties. The proposals set new required content for community design plans and provisions on density, height, and other key aspects of the plan are to be adopted through a secondary plan. A more clear definition of the process and expected outcomes may help all stakeholders participate effectively.</p> |

Table 7e: Severances

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|---|
| This submission requests policy changes to allow severances in historic settlement areas that are less than the identified minimum 0.8 hectare in size. | 28 | Official Plans dating from the mid 1970s permitted rural residential lots by severance and subdivision provided that the new lots created were no smaller than 0.8 ha. The current policies do not vary from this standard. |

Table 7d: Country Lot Subdivisions

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|--|
| This submission objects to the conclusions of the Hemson report which indicate that country lots are a loss to the City. | 7 | Comment received. |
| This submission provides support for the moratorium on country lot subdivisions. | 9, 5, 53 | This comment supports the proposed policies in the Plan. |
| A number of submissions expressed opposition to Section 2.7.2 (General Rural Area), Policy 8, which proposes to discontinue 0.8 ha subdivisions in the General Rural Area. | 7, 22, 37, 40, 41 | Staff continues to recommend that the City no longer permit country lot subdivisions. The current supply of vacant and pending applications as well as village capacity and future severances provide a sufficient supply of rural residential lots to meet the projected needs. |

Table 7f: Rural Villages

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| This submission requests that the Plan maintain environmental integrity in its approach to rural lots and villages. | 27 | Policies on Environmental Impact Studies in the Plan support environmental integrity. In addition, in 2012 a natural heritage system schedule was added for 23 villages in the Volume 2C Secondary Plans. |
| This submission requests a boundary adjustment to the Greely Land Use Plan to accommodate a specific parcel of land within the village boundary. | 22 | The City has determined that sufficient development capacity exists among villages and no village expansions or adjustments are being contemplated during this review. |

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| This submission objects to Section 3.7.1 (Villages), Policy 10, which proposes minimum village lot sizes of 0.4 ha on private services. | 22 | The minimum lot size within the proposed amendments is based on the requirements in the Infrastructure Master Plan. This is a technical requirement to address the long term protection of the drinking water supply. |
| This submission requests that a specific parcel of land be redesignated to allow a rural subdivision. The land is adjacent to Constance Bay village boundary. | 56 | The City has determined that sufficient development capacity exists among villages and no village expansions or adjustments are being contemplated during this review. |
| This submission does not support policy 11 in Section 2.7.2 General Rural Area, which limits development within 1 kilometre of a village boundary. | 22 | No changes are proposed regarding the development restrictions within 1 km of villages. |

Table 7g: Mineral Aggregate Resources

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|--|
| This submission makes a number of comments on the supporting documentation released by the City on mineral aggregate resources. | 9 | Staff made some small refinements to the mapping prior to June 25, 2013. In addition, there was an error in the mapping east of the Village of Sarsfield. Some of the lands in this area are already designated Limestone Resource Area. The maps in the final mapping report (issued as Map 4 in the Document 7 Aggregate Mapping Report) have been refined to fix the error and match the June 25 proposed amendments. |
| This submission requests that a number of identified areas that are within the 500 meter influence to a mineral aggregate resource not be included as a future license area under the <i>Aggregate Act</i> . Further, requests that the mineral aggregate resource area remove any lands which are owned by a Conservation Authority. Concerns are also expressed with source water protection and mineral aggregate resources. | 18 | Agreed. The lands within the Kemptville Wellhead Protection Area are proposed for removal from further redesignation. The proposed amendments to Section 3.7.4 address hydrogeology concerns when an application is received. |
| This submission expresses concerns regarding a number of proposed mineral aggregate resource designations and the impact they will have on significant wetlands and other | 20 | Agreed. Provincially Significant Wetlands have been excluded from consideration. Any future application in the vicinity of a significant wetland would have to address the requirements |

Table 7g: Mineral Aggregate Resources

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| environmental features. | | of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan. |
| This submission requests that the municipality continue to partner with local conservation authorities to address technical matters related to mineral extraction. Improvements could be made in monitoring for cumulative impacts associated with these land uses and better co-ordination of data collection with the provincial approval authorities (MNR and MOE) together with the City and local Conservation Authorities (MVCA, RVCA, SNC). | 27 | Agreed. The City has proposed through amendment to the Plan greater coordination of applications with agencies as well as a cumulative impacts of extractions less than 1 km apart from one another. |
| This submission requests the City to identify any natural heritage features and/or natural hazards prior to the selection of new aggregate resource sites. If a natural heritage features and/or natural hazard is identified they should be addressed through studies in support of a proposed license application. | 42 | Agreed. The Plan requires an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for lands defined on Schedule L. These concerns are typically addressed when an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment is received. During the pre-consultation phase staff would identify the need for an EIS. |
| This submission requests further information around the mapping of candidate areas for designation be provided and how the City proceeded with the analysis of constraints. | 36 | Further information around mapping issues was provided by a letter to the Association. Document 4 provides more information about how candidate resource areas were mapped. |
| This submission strongly supports the City's position to not add any mineral aggregate resource designations as part of this Official Plan review. | 51 | The comments are received. |
| This submission requests that specific lands be included as a designated Limestone Resource Area. | 44 | The City has adequate resources designated in the Official Plan to satisfy the objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement and staff are not recommending additions to mineral aggregate designations. At any time, a proponent may apply for an Official Plan Amendment for a quarry or a Zoning By-law Amendment for a pit. |

Table 7g: Mineral Aggregate Resources

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| <p>This submission expresses concern with the approach taken to identify and protect significant aggregate resources. The City’s current proposals for Official Plan mapping do not identify many of the viable aggregate resource areas in the city. Combined with the City’s bedrock “opt-out” letter to residents, large areas with important deposits are being omitted. This lack of identification withholds important information that is necessary to provide notice, protect the resources and plan for long term availability. The City is proposing not to identify any additional sand and gravel areas. This is concerning as there are limited sand and gravel resources within the City and many licensed pits in the city are nearing depletion.</p> | <p>36</p> | <p>The Plan meets the test of the Provincial Policy Statement with respect to having a realistic supply close to market defined in the Plan. A realistic supply in the current study is about three planning horizons (or 60 years). To continue to add further designations would be to unduly restrict land use in the rural area. The Plan contains very strong policies with respect to the conversion of mineral reserve lands to other uses– therefore by designating additional lands beyond the three planning horizons may inhibit residential and economic development in the rural area.</p> <p>The residents were provided information about the designation and were given the opportunity to object. It should be noted that the Plan allows for sand and gravel pits through a rezoning in the General Rural Area without amendment to the plan. Prior to the next comprehensive Official Plan review, staff will convene a stakeholder group to discuss the mapping images and devise a strategy going forward.</p> |

Table 7h: Natural Systems

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|---------------------|--|
| <p>This submission expresses a number of comments and questions regarding height limits in secondary plans, airport policies, the City Annual Report card and proposed changes to land use designations on specific urban properties fronting the Rideau River.</p> | <p>9</p> | <p>Clarification was provided to the organization for each comment / question. The rationale for each of the subject changes in land use designation on Schedule B was provided.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests to keep stormwater ponds out of the flood plain.</p> | <p>9, 5, 53, 54</p> | <p>The City proposes to delete this policy. It is currently and will remain the general practice of the City to require that stormwater management facilities (SWM) be located outside the regulatory floodplain. Further, as indicated by the response of the</p> |

Table 7h: Natural Systems

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|--|
| | | <p>Conservation Partners (correspondence dated October 25, 2013), their policies do not permit stormwater management facilities within the limits of the regulatory floodplain. Exceptions to the City’s current practice may be considered in extraordinary circumstances for which sound technical justification can be provided, however, locating SWM facilities outside the regulatory floodplain will remain the general practice.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests that tree preservation policies be strengthened to protect the woodlands that are left in both rural and urban areas, including adoption of the significant woodland definition from the Provincial Natural Heritage Reference Manual (2010) and the adoption of a Site Alteration Bylaw.</p> | <p>9, 5, 53</p> | <p>The Official Plan definition of significant woodlands was approved by the Province in 2010 as part of OPA 76. Staff believe that it is more appropriate for the Ottawa landscape context than the definition suggested in the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (2010), and that it achieves the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement (2005). The suggestion regarding a Site Alteration Bylaw is noted.</p> |
| <p>This submission includes specific comments and questions on the Natural Heritage Overlay additions, country lot subdivisions, rural natural features, mineral aggregate policies, significant woodlands and the designation of specific urban properties.</p> | <p>16</p> | <p>Clarification was provided for each comment/question. Several of the issues are not the subject of the proposed Amendment. The rationale for the land use designations was provided.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests information on lands which are adjacent to the airport so that the Airport Authority can include them in their Airport Land Use Plan. Specifically, the Lester PSW complex identified in the Schedule B of the City’s Official Plan, so that they can accurately designate the portions of the wetland that intersect Airport property as „Environmental Area“.</p> | <p>26</p> | <p>The information was provided.</p> |

Table 7h: Natural Systems

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| This submission includes recommendations on a variety of natural heritage terms: normal high water-mark; top of bank, approved by the City and the Conservation Authority. | 27 | The City has initiated discussions with the Conservation Authorities regarding watercourse setback guidelines and associated technical definitions. This review will not be complete in time for this Official Plan Amendment. If the review identifies the need for changes to the Official Plan, these will be brought forward in the future as a stand-alone amendment. |
| This submission agrees with a number of the statements made in the Draft Official Plan noting that it is important that the City address protecting, improving or restoring the quality and quantity of water as outlined in Section 2.2.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement. | 27 | The comments support many directions in the Plan. |
| This submission identifies a concern on how significant wetlands are being approached in the Official Plan and notes some inconsistencies with the Provincial Policy Statement and Conservation Authority regulations. | 27 | Official Plan Policies 3.2.1 (4 - 7) address this issue and specifically reference the need to comply with the Conservation Authority regulations. |
| The submission requests that the City remove the Natural Heritage System Overlay from some specific lands to accurately reflect the existing conditions and an approved quarry. | 44 | Agreed. Some lands have been removed from the Natural Heritage Systems overlay. |
| This submission states that a new Natural Heritage System overlay at a specific parcel of land does not appear to meet the definition of woodland significance in Policy 2.4.2 of the Official Plan, or to connect to any significant natural features. | 44 | This parcel of land was reviewed and meets the definition of the City as being significant. Any future applications on these lands will require an Environmental Impact Statement to assess the impacts on the woodland. |
| This submission requests to protect nature and infrastructure. | 57 | Ottawa's Natural Heritage System and Official Plan policies quite advanced and have even been lauded provincially by the MNR. As with all municipalities in Ontario, Ottawa has been involved with the Conservation Authorities in developing Source Water Protection plans. Updates to Ottawa's Official Plan policies and standard practices will be implemented in 2014. |

Table 7h: Airport

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|--|
| This submission reiterates a previous letter received in April regarding concerns surrounding the function of the Ottawa airport. The comment requests that the issues put forward in the April letter be received as a formal submission on the June 25th Official Plan Amendment document. These issues cover requests for: land use plan harmonization between the OP and the Airport Plan; redesignation of some lands from general urban area to airport; identification of a Greenbelt link; an airport special study area overlay; and other policy modifications. | 17 | Through continued consultation with the Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority and the National Capital Commission, it has been agreed that the portions of the Greenbelt Master Plan relating to the airport lands and the Greenbelt link to the south will be implemented through this review. The lands leased by the Airport Authority are proposed to be shown on a new Official Plan Schedule M. |

Table 7i: Employment Lands

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|--|
| These submissions request to redesignate industrial lands in the Village of Richmond. | 11, 43, 47 | The proposed amendment includes provisions to protect 18.5 net ha of employment land in the industrial area and permit other uses on the remaining area. |
| This submission expresses concern with the proposed redesignation of a specific parcel of land from General Urban Area to Mixed Use Centre. The comment requests that the identified land remain as General Urban Area. | 21 | Agreed. The amending schedule to the boundary of the Mixed Use Centre has been adjusted accordingly. |
| This submission requests that the employment lands in Riverside South Community Design Plan be reduced to recognize employment land figures from the adjacent airport. Further a request is made to expand the boundary of the Community Design Plan to add land which is outside of the urban boundary. | 48 | Staff does not support this request because Council has confirmed that the Official Plan provides enough urban land for all purposes. |

Table 7i: Employment Lands

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|---|
| <p>The submission requests that a parcel of land 2.34 hectares in size located north of Hunt Club and west of Prince of Wales be redesignated from Employment Area to Enterprise Area to accommodate a mix of residential and employment uses.</p> | <p>49</p> | <p>The recommendation in the Employment Lands Study to remove the Enterprise Area designation was based largely on the concern that since the policy was introduced, development in those areas had provided little or no employment. The subject property is one of the few remaining vacant parcels of employment land in this area. It is therefore recommended not to change the existing Employment Area designation.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests a land use designation change from Employment Area to Arterial Mainstreet for a specific parcel of land. The submission says the change would permit the parcel to better fit the design and other aspects of the surrounding area, without removing options for employment use.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>The proposed redesignation of land from Employment Area to Arterial Mainstreet must be consistent with policies in the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan. The Arterial Mainstreet designation permits retail, service commercial, residential and institutional uses and is clearly not consistent with the PPS definition of "employment area". The current supply of employment land in Orleans is insufficient to meet the 1.3 jobs per household policy. The proposed redesignation would further erode employment potential.</p> |
| <p>This submission expresses a concern with the proposal to remove the Enterprise Area designation and replace it with an Employment Area designation. Further, the comment identifies a number of land use parcels which are designated Employment and requests they be changes to General Urban Area to facilitate residential development.</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>Some of the requests to remove parcels from the Employment Area designation are included in the schedules attached to the draft Official Plan. Regarding undeveloped land north of Johnston Road, redesignation from Employment Area cannot be supported under policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, specifically policy 1.3.2. These lands are considered to be well suited for employment development and form an important part of the shrinking supply of employment land in inner southeast Ottawa.</p> |

Table 7i: Employment Lands

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|--|
| This submission requests permission for retail uses in an Enterprise Area, where such uses are not permitted. | 30 | The Enterprise Area designation will be maintained north of Highway 417 at the Huntmar Drive interchange. Policies are proposed to permit a limited area of retail provided that minimum employment densities achieve the expected number of office jobs in this area. |
| This submission requests removing the proposed amendment as shown on Schedule S4 of the Official Plan Amendment which will result in the redesignation of lands from Enterprise Area to Employment Area. Request is made to consider a more appropriate land use designation such as Mixed Use Centre or General Urban Area. | 50 | The City is no longer proceeding with the changes to the land use designations in Kanata South and the area will remain as Enterprise Area. |
| This submission request to change the land use designation of a specific parcel of land in Leitrim from Employment lands to Residential Use (General Urban designation). Background information and data collected to back up the request is provided. | 23 | There is not sufficient employment land in Leitrim. These lands will be maintained as Employment. |
| This submission identifies areas for consideration which could be employment nodes at highway interchanges in the rural area. Five rural interchanges were found to have the potential to accommodate a rural employment node: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Highway 417 and March Road · Highway 417 and Boundary Road · Highway 417 and Rockdale Road · Highway 416 and Fallowfield Road · Highway 7 and Hazeldean Road | 1 | These interchanges cannot be designated as Employment Areas because they do not meet the definition of employment land, given the requirement for a minimum of 2,000 jobs. Further, employment land uses changes can be accommodated through changes to the Zoning By-law, except where there is a conflict. |
| The submission raises several issues: 1) the current supply of urban employment land is sufficient to well beyond the 2031 planning horizon, as concluded by the Employment Lands Study; 2) the PPS does not permit the City to designate land for more than a 20-year period; 3) Council has taken the position that no urban expansions will be considered as part of the current OP | 46 | Staff recommends refusal of these requests: |

Table 7i: Employment Lands

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|----------|
| review, as there is no need for additional urban land; 4) the area described as Southwest Ottawa is comprised of prime agricultural land and as such is protected by policies in the PPS which the submission does not address. | | |

Table 7j: Land Evaluation Area Review (LEAR)

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|--|
| This submission expresses concerns regarding the proposal to delete the only reference to the LEAR review in the current Official Plan (Section 2.2.1 Urban Boundaries). Request that the Official Plan continue to include a policy committing the City to complete the LEAR review. | 10 | The City and the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food (OMAF) are working to finalize the LEAR soils data. This partnership will include field work in various locations in the rural area, scheduled to begin in the Spring of 2014, subject to the availability of staff from OMAF. Due to the size of the areas being sampled, it is unlikely that the work needed to map and analyze the results will be completed in 2014. An amendment to implement any changes arising from the LEAR is targeted for 2015. |

Table 7k: Process Issues

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|---|
| This submission states concerns with the tight timelines for the Official Plan Review. Also, issues are raised concerning how the Official Plan is posted online and that it is unavailable in a PDF format. The comment also points out that the Official Plan lacks monitoring and follow up. | 9 | The comment is received. The Official Plan is available as a zip file online. New text in Section 5.5 refers to how City departments monitor the Plan's goals, which are taken from the City's Strategic Plan. Intensification and density policies are monitored through the City's Annual Development Report. |
| This submission states concerns on the tight timelines the City is undertaking and the ability for the City to consider and incorporate public submissions on issues in the Official Plan. | 16 | The circulation to technical agencies and community organizations went out early in July, with a request for comments by September 7. Comments that were not received in time to |

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| | | consider in this report have been forwarded directly to members of Council. |
| This submission expresses concern that previous comments have not been heard and incorporated into the Official Plan Amendment. | 25 | Many of these comments are addressed in the Plan or relate to matters not governed by land use policy. |
| This submission requests that consideration of the draft Official Plan amendment by Planning Committee be rescheduled until at least January 2014 to allow more time for public review. Further there are references to schedules and annexes that are not appended and, therefore, one cannot complete any thorough analysis. | 39 | Since this comment was received, the Official Plan review by Planning Committee and Council were rescheduled to November. |

Table 7I: Responses on Other Topics

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|---|
| This submission requests to amend the Official Plan to allow a water main connection to supply potable water to a specific site. | 13 | In 2008 Council agreed to provide water to the property in question for firefighting purposes only. Accordingly, a change to the Infrastructure Master Plan is being proposed indicating that this property is serviced for fire protection purpose only. This property is not in a Public Service Area (PSA) which provides for potable water. As such staff will not be recommending an amendment to the Official Plan as part of the current review to permit the extension of drinking water services the site in question. Similarly, staff will not be proposing changes to the Public Service Area for provision of a potable water service. |

Table 7I: Responses on Other Topics

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|---|
| <p>This submission requests that the City of Ottawa Official Plan be amended to reinstate Council approved Modification #347(June 12, 1996) Section 2.3.2.5 Open Space/Parks/Leisure Resources, as it appeared in the approved 1995 City of Ottawa Official Plan in its entirety.</p> | <p>12</p> | <p>The intent of the policy in the former City of Ottawa Official Plan was to ensure that areas residents and the local community association could participate in the eventual re-evaluation of the use of these lands. While this policy no longer exists in the Official Plan, the <i>Planning Act</i> requires that notification and public consultation take place as part of a Zoning By-law amendment application. The intent of the former policy is met by the requirements for public consultation in the <i>Planning Act</i>. Further, a report concerning the subject parcel of land went before the Finance and Economic Development Committee on July 9. In that report a lease arrangement is proposed, contingent on zoning and site plan control being approved for the construction of a parking structure. Consideration of these applications will include a public consultation process, as required by the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p> |
| <p>This submission expresses a lack of discussion and policy around seniors and the elements needed to make Ottawa a liveable city for seniors.</p> | <p>14</p> | <p>The needs of seniors are discussed fully in the Older Adult Plan, which is referenced in the Official Plan.</p> |
| <p>This submission provides a variety of miscellaneous comments, including: specific text additions to policies and introductions on: heritage districts, urban trees, bicycle lanes, setbacks, heavy truck traffic, greenspaces.</p> | <p>29</p> | <p>The comments are received.</p> |
| <p>This submission states they have reviewed the proposed amendment and have no objections.</p> | <p>31</p> | <p>The comments are received.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests that the development of new schools not be held up by City planning objectives.</p> | <p>32</p> | <p>It is not the intent of the Official Plan to delay development of new schools.</p> |

Table 7I: Responses on Other Topics

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|---|
| This submission requests that Robertson Road between Fitzgerald and Westcliffe, have the rural road designation removed and the urban designation applied. This land is in the middle of the city, this designation does not apply. | 34 | The lands along Robertson Road between Westcliffe and Fitzgerald are already in the Urban Area and are designated as Arterial Mainstreet, General Urban Area, and Enterprise Area, depending on the exact property. The zoning is a mix of Industrial and Arterial Mainstreet zones. The lands to the north of Bell's Corners are part of the Greenbelt and these are designated as Agricultural Resource Area, which is consistent with the National Capital Commission's Greenbelt Master Plan. That Plan is currently under review by the National Capital Commission. |
| This submission states that it is impossible for a lay person to wade through the Official Plan and comprehend the results of what is being proposed. | 39 | Comment is received and staff are able to assist if required. |
| This submission states that the City should require any development (or re-development) to be subject to significantly higher efficiency levels in a building or a region. | 19 | Comments are received. |
| This submission requests that policy be added to the Official Plan on complete streets. | 5, 52 | Agreed, the revised Official Plan includes text on complete streets that supports the larger directions of the Transportation Master Plan. |
| This submission requests that the existing policies on energy conservation through design (Section 4.9) be implemented when reviewing development applications. A concern is stated that these policies are not implemented into new development. | 5 | These policies are implemented through community design plans and design guidelines, which in turn are used to evaluate development applications. Also, planners who have pursued their LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Green Associate credential is assigned at the outset to assist in the review of proposals that involve new technologies and approaches. |
| This submission requests that 10 key elements be included in a complete streets policy. | 5, 52 | A complete streets policy has been added. |
| This submission requests that the Alta Vista Transportation Corridor be removed from the Official Plan as a car | 52 | The Transportation Master Plan will consider your comments regarding the Alta Vista Transportation Corridor. |

Table 7I: Responses on Other Topics

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|--|
| route. | | |
| This submission requests a number of statements and policies be added to strengthen food and agriculture goals. Specific wording and text placement in the Official Plan are suggested. | 4 | Some requests have been incorporated while others are beyond the scope of this review and out of the jurisdiction of the Official Plan as provided for by the <i>Planning Act</i> . |
| This submission requests amendment to the policy wording under Section 3.6.2 policy 7 to include of a new policy as it relates to the East Urban Community MUC lands. | 55 | Staff propose some changes to policy 3.6.2(7) to better reflect the need to allocate lands for employment uses through a Community Design Plan (CDP) process that establishes a new or expanded Mixed Use Centre, however this policy will still require a CDP process in order to establish a new or expanded Mixed-Use Centre. |
| This submission requests to put a moratorium on the practice of routine random spot rezoning. | 57 | The <i>Planning Act</i> allows proponents to apply to rezone a property as of right. It is up to the municipality to develop a policy framework that will enable planners to evaluate these proposals and provide recommendations to Council. This Official Plan has delivered much clearer policy on where growth should occur and why, how big that development should get, and how it should be incorporated within the surrounding community. |
| Submission requests to install Transport-Oriented Development as a key principle of the plans. | 57 | The Official Plan’s growth strategy much more clearly focuses growth toward nodes and corridors in this Official Plan draft. Scale of growth is directed to the corresponding level of transit service. I.e. the largest growth is expected at LRT locations (node) as targeted locations. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) plans are being developed along the LRT’s Confederation Line to incorporate high density (including high-rise residential and employment), mixed use options that will enable live, work, play destinations. More modest growth is planned for mainstreets (corridors) that are supported by bus service. Height |

Table 7I: Responses on Other Topics

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|--|-------------------|--|
| | | <p>classifications are being introduced within the Plan’s land use categories to provide more certainty when there is no community design plan. Corresponding to this growth are more focused urban design policies that will help new development fit within the existing neighbourhood context.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests to conserve land and avoid sprawl.</p> | <p>57</p> | <p>The clearer focus on growth management priorities serves to support complete communities. Focused locations for growth with accompanying supportive transportation and servicing infrastructure serve to provide clearer opportunity for medium and large scale intensification. With these focused populations comes the potential to built complete communities that include supportive services, improved leisure and recreational opportunities, increased opportunities to provide housing for populations that may not require a vehicle (eg. low income, seniors), a supportive retail environmental, places for worship, increased opportunities for employment, etc. In short, there is more opportunity to create liveable communities.</p> |
| <p>This submission requests to Provide Town Centres.</p> | <p>57</p> | <p>Ottawa’s new policies for the TC’s/MUC’s outside of the Greenbelt will enable the community to create a new vision for these areas to be able to reach their potential as complete communities. Additionally, Official Plan policy recognizes the value of employment lands in these areas and the remainder of Ottawa. Although the city has enough employment land, the City will be undertaking a review of the Employment Lands starting in 2015 that will more clearly determine the functional potential for these lands city wide. In September, the Economic Development and Innovation received</p> |

Table 7l: Responses on Other Topics

| Comment | Submission Number | Response |
|---|-------------------|---|
| | | approval to complete a Community Improvement Plan to assist the community with economic development opportunities in Orleans. |
| This submission requests to leave no one behind. This means plan for the elderly, disadvantaged and other groups. | 57 | The Official Plan is a plan that <i>contains goals, objectives and policies established primarily to manage and direct physical change and the effects on the social, economic and natural environment of the municipality... (Planning Act, Part III, 16)</i> . As the city's primary land use planning and development document, the Official Plan enables the policy foundation for regulating the development and use of land as outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). It also supports the provincial goal to enhance the quality of life for citizens. |

Table 7m: Responses to Councillors

| Comment | Councillor | Response |
|---|------------|--|
| Requests a reference in the Plan to the fact that a process is required for additional height in the Centrepointe Mixed Use Centre. | Chiarelli | An amendment is proposed to Section 3.6.2 to reflect this. |
| Requested that the Arterial Mainstreet designation proposed for Walkley Road between Bank and Heron be reduced to the portion between Bank and Albion Road because of the high density and lack of resources in the area. | Deans | It should be noted that the proposed redesignation to Arterial Mainstreet will also permit development of a mix of uses that can serve the community, such as retail, services, offices, and public uses. As well, the Mainstreet designation encourages the redevelopment of underutilized sites (e.g. parking lots), and could provide some new development in the area that could stimulate other improvements. Mainstreets are also included as Design Priority Areas, which means that both new developments and capital projects are required to achieve a higher level of design excellence, such as a more pedestrian-friendly streetscape, or inclusion of public art. The staff report |

Table 7m: Responses to Councillors

| Comment | Councillor | Response |
|---|------------|---|
| | | will not reflect any changes to the designation for Walkley Road. Staff are of the opinion that the Arterial Mainstreet designation will serve to give opportunity for the revitalization of this area. |
| <p>Asked whether a community association can change the designation of employment land.</p> | Deans | <p>A community association can submit an application for a Zoning By-law amendment, subject to the standard development review process. Alternatively, the Intensification and Zoning Studies Unit could carry out a zoning study.</p> <p>Re-designation of employment lands to other uses is only permitted during the comprehensive review of the Official Plan, which occurs approximately every five years. The City is currently proceeding through a comprehensive Official Plan review process. The Province, through the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), requires the City to protect lands for employment uses. The PPS requires that in order for employment land to be converted to another use it must be demonstrated that the land is not required for employment purposes and that there is a need for the proposed use. At this time, there is a deficiency of vacant employment land in the Hawthorne/Hunt Club/Conroy area, and therefore any redesignation of employment lands in this area is not supported.</p> |
| <p>Expressed support for a letter from the Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association requesting that the Plan include a provision from the Official Plan of the former City of Ottawa regarding the re-evaluation of a municipal property on the north side of the hospital for park purposes.</p> | Hobbs | <p>Modification #347 duplicated a right that is already provided under the <i>Planning Act</i>, i.e. the requirement to provide notice and to complete public consultation, and for this reason, it was not carried forward in the Official Plan in 2003. Because this is a duplicate policy, it serves no purpose to have it in the Official Plan.</p> |
| <p>Requested clearer policies on building height, appropriate transitions in building height, and permissions for stable, low-rise residential neighbourhoods.</p> | Holmes | <p>Staff propose some changes to the text and organization of the policies in Section 2 to make them easier to interpret. However, the organization of</p> |

Table 7m: Responses to Councillors

| Comment | Councillor | Response |
|---|---------------|---|
| | | <p>the building height policies must follow the overall organization of the Official Plan, which sets out the strategic directions in Section 2, policies for the specific land use designations in Section 3, and direction for review of development application in Section 4. The intent of policy 2.2.2(22) is to give stronger direction for recognizing community “character” in the Zoning By-law, which is currently being addressed through the separate infill study. Policies 11 and 12 in Section 4.11 provide the primary direction on how to achieve appropriate transitions. Policy 4.11(11) is proposed to be clarified to better direct transitions of high-rises to low-rise residential.</p> |
| <p>The OP needs a strong statement prioritizing sustainable transportation.</p> | <p>Holmes</p> | <p>Section 2.3.1 gives priority to walking, cycling and transit within walking distance of rapid transit stations and transit priority corridors. Section 1 links sustainable transportation with planning and design and captures social, economic and environmental qualities.</p> |
| <p>The OP must reference the City’s complete streets policy.</p> | <p>Holmes</p> | <p>Text on complete streets similar to that you have proposed has been added to the draft of the Official Plan, paralleling the approach in the draft Transportation Master Plan.</p> |
| <p>For Mixed Use Centres, the OP must require a “limited access” grid that increases connectivity for cycling and walking, but not for driving.</p> | <p>Holmes</p> | <p>As you’ve noted, walking and cycling are significant priorities for Mixed Use Centres as outlined in Section 3.6.2. The Official Plan supports these transportation priorities in more detail in a number of transportation specific sections throughout the plan including 2.3.1 and 4.3. Staff is hesitant to duplicate these in the Mixed Use Centre policy section as all Official Plan policy is considered in the context of developing Community Design Plans (CDP) and Secondary Plans for Mixed Use Centres. A concern is raised that a grid pattern would work counter to the goal of prioritizing walking and cycling and</p> |

Table 7m: Responses to Councillors

| Comment | Councillor | Response |
|--|---------------|--|
| | | <p>supports high vehicle speeds. Policies and design guidelines on transit-oriented development and the organization of parking lots in Section 4.3 better address these concerns. They provide for design solutions that can be adapted to individual sites and circumstances.</p> <p>The value of a grid system is that it allows for a linear line of site so cyclists and pedestrians, and cars backing out of their driveways can see vehicles approaching. In a Mixed Use Centre context, a grid pattern makes the most efficient use of land which helps promote the City’s objective to develop more compact, walkable, mixed use development that can support high volumes of transit ridership and merits the large investment in high level transit at these locations. Although on a grid pattern, traffic speeds can be managed by making the sidewalks wider, the roads less wide (think Elgin or Bank Street north), using on street parking, plantings, etc. The intention is that Mixed Use Centres be pedestrian scaled cores of their communities. Direction in the Transportation Master Plan, Pedestrian Plan, Cycling Plan and supportive policy in the Official Plan all point to this outcome and are used when developing or amending CDP’s or Secondary Plans for Mixed Use Centres.</p> |
| <p>The OP needs to address the downtown truck problem.</p> | <p>Holmes</p> | <p>A new policy has been added to the Plan that parallels the direction from the Transportation Master Plan. The policy recognizes the issue of truck traffic on King Edward Avenue and seeks tripartite cooperation until a new bridge location is secured.</p> <p>The comments also propose a study of truck traffic in the Central Area and the surrounding neighbourhoods. Staff have endeavoured to exclude individual work</p> |

Table 7m: Responses to Councillors

| Comment | Councillor | Response |
|---|----------------|---|
| | | <p>plan items from the Official Plan so that Council can approve department and branch work programs as a comprehensive package. The Transportation Master Plan tabled on October 9 provided further information and direction on the subject.</p> |
| <p>Policies that support walking must be preserved.</p> | <p>Holmes</p> | <p>They will be, in Sections 2.5.6 and 2.3.1.</p> |
| <p>Could a community design plan process begin for Kanata South?</p> | <p>Hublely</p> | <p>Requests for new Community Design Plans are only done through the annual work program discussions. Staff will consider this request in the drafting of the Departments 2015 and beyond work plans.</p> |
| <p>Requested that development proposals be required to provide a study of community Safety and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.</p> | <p>Qadri</p> | <p>Crime Prevention through Environmental Design is covered in the Official Plan through Section 4.8.8 – Personal Security. This Section references a number of important planning considerations with regards to design techniques to reduce crime in new development. Planners and developers are required to adhere to these policies. To the second question, requiring an additional development submission requirement solely to address CPTED may be too cumbersome. Instead CPTED considerations could be included in the Design Brief requirement for large development proposals.</p> |