



General Meeting of 18 January 2017 arrive 7:00

as meeting starts sharp 7:15 pm

Tanglewood Park Community Centre, 31 Woodfield Drive

Special New Year's Levee: Speed-Dating with experts and potluck desserts

Draft Agenda

1. Call to order; welcome to participants	5	5
2. Adoption of agenda	2	7
3. a) Introduction to Knoxdale-Merivale b) Greeting by Councillor Keith Egli	4 4	11 15
4. Explanation/organization of rotational interviews (speed-dating) Responses from our informal survey on social services	5	20
5. Series of rotational interviews (speed-dates)	50	70
6. BREAK Pot Luck Dessert Table - Networking	15	85
7. Local community issues – Open Mike a) b)	15	100
8. Committee reports / announcements - Planning/Zoning – FCA R4 review submission - Transportation - Communications - Membership - Governance	20	120

Next General Meeting: Wed. Feb. 15 – Cardinal Creek

Background information for FCA-FAC General Meeting of 18 January 2017

Agenda item 3 – Introduction to Knoxdale-Merivale

The various community associations in ward 9 (Knoxdale-Merivale) have formed an active ward council which meets regularly and, as appropriate, takes action in advocacy with City Hall and organizes joint community activities.

Agenda item 4 – Explanation/organization of rotational interviews

Ten experts have been invited to the January 18 meeting from various social service organizations. To prepare participants' thinking for discussion with these experts, an informal survey has been announced (go to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7B85C2T> to complete the brief survey).

Our plan is for small numbers of attendees (4 or 5 people) to engage in conversation with an expert for a period of about 10 minutes. At the sound of a bell participants are to move to meet another expert. We intend to have five rounds of 10 minute conversations. This process we nickname "speed-dating".

On arrival at the meeting, participants will be invited to book in for their short conversations (or "speed-dates"). At the conclusion of the rotational interviews there will be a networking break, providing an opportunity for further discussion with an expert already met or to meet experts with whom no "speed-date" was scheduled.

The list of experts who have agreed to participate in the rotational interviews is attached (and found at <http://fca-fac.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Expt0118.pdf> . Participants in the Jan. 18 meeting are encouraged to review the list prior to the meeting.

Agenda item 6 – Break and dessert pot luck

This is an opportunity to share with others the sweets you received (or prepared) during the holidays. Bring along your remaining cookies and similar temptations which you pledged in New Years' Resolutions to avoid. And yes, this is a chance for networking.

Agenda item 8 – Planning /Zoning committee report

The City is conducting a review of R4 zoning. Most of the areas with this zoning are in inner wards but the eventual policy will apply city-wide and has important implications for R3 zones as well. A general explanation of the review is found at https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/documents.ottawa.ca/files/r4_paper_en.pdf

Many community groups have submitted comments to the City already and some excerpts from those documents have appeared on the city website. A small subcommittee of FCA members has met to draft a paper to convey comments from the FCA. The draft is attached (and also found at <http://fca-fac.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/R4review.pdf>).

A motion will be presented to the Jan. 18 as follows:

The General Meeting accepts the draft paper on the R4 review and requests the Executive Committee to submit to the City a document substantially identical to that received with the agenda as representing the view of the Federation.

Background information for FCA-FAC General Meeting of 18 January 2017 (continued)

Agenda item 8 – Transportation Committee

The committee is proposing that transportation be the subject of the February General Meeting.

Agenda item 8 – Membership

Association membership in the FCA-FAC is by calendar year. Accordingly approaches will be made to existing members seeking membership renewal (\$30 per year) and invitations to join will be extended to other Ottawa associations.

Social Agency or NGO	Starter statement (short excerpt)	Speed Dater	Contact
Nepean, Rideau Osgoode Resource Centre	Resources to build a stronger community: children, youth, legal, rural, newcomers	Sandy Wooley, ED	613 596 5626; swooley@nrocc.org
ACORN	Driven by 22000 members in Ottawa. Currently fighting for landlord licensing, building inspections, and stronger enforcement of maintenance rules and by-laws. Many other, national and local programmes.	Jill O'Reilly, ED	onacornot@acorncanada.org
Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corp (CCOC)	Community-based, tenant and member directed, non-profit housing organization whose mission is to create, maintain and promote housing for low and moderate income people.	Ray Sullivan, ED	613 234 4065; cohousing.org
Youth Services Bureau and Salvation Army	How can we help you? e.g. housing? I am on the street I can't cope with my feelings I need to talk to someone I'm thinking about suicide I have been in trouble with the law I am looking for a job Where do I belong?	Volunteer Chair, Professor Donna Serafini	613 729 1000
Andrew Fleck Childcare	Comprehensive range of services that meet the diverse early learning and child care needs of families in the City of Ottawa	Kim Hiscott, ED	613 736 1913; khiscott@afchildcare.on.ca

Social Agency or NGO	Starter statement	Speed Dater	Contact
<p>Y's Owl MacLure Cooperative Centre</p>	<p>Creating daytime opportunities including employment for people with disabilities through partnerships. Individually-suited strategies for people with Autism is one of many specialties.</p>	<p>Hugh Nelson, ED</p>	<p>613 721 1500; hnelson@ysowlmaclure.org</p>
<p>Council on Aging</p>	<p>Improving the quality of life of seniors living in Ottawa. ... a special focus on the vulnerable and isolated. ...forums, research projects and partnership networks.</p>	<p>Sarah Bercier, ED</p>	<p>613 789 3577; coa@coaottawa.ca</p>
<p>Coalition of Community Health and Resource Centres of Ottawa</p>	<p>... involved in your neighbourhood! A wide range of programmes that serve the needs of the community. Also see Community Development Framework.</p>	<p>Tammy Corner, CDF Coordinator</p>	<p>613 820 4922; t.corner@pqchc.com</p>
<p>Social Planning Council</p>	<p>Research and Voluntary Sector Supports; creating inclusion; access to basics of food, education, health and engagement...</p>	<p>Dianne Urquhart</p>	<p>613 236 9300; dianneu@spcottawa.on.ca</p>
<p>City of Ottawa Social Services</p>	<p>City-wide strategies, and services. Daycare, long term care placement applications; immigration; employment, financial assistance housing; temporary help with funds for food, housing, medical; etc.</p>	<p>Janice Burelle</p>	<p>613 580 2424; Janice.Burelle@ottawa.ca</p>



9 January 2017

Tim J. Moerman
Ottawa City Hall
110 Laurier Ave W
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Re: Residential Fourth Density (R4) Zoning Review

Dear Mr. Moerman,

The Federation of Citizens' Associations (FCA), an incorporated non-profit corporation under Ontario law, is the forum for citizens' associations and similar non-profit volunteer groups in Ottawa. Our roughly 50 member associations share information about issues facing their communities and, when appropriate, take joint action. The FCA membership includes associations from the city center, the inner suburbs, the suburban communities outside the Greenbelt and rural Ottawa.

The FCA has formed a focus group of member associations implicated in the R4 Review to evaluate the City's discussion paper and develop this FCA position on it. The FCA takes positions on issues when there is significant agreement among member associations and when we can express strong principles shared by our member associations.

There are several key principles that the FCA believes all planning and zoning decisions should support, these include:

- Preservation of individual community character;
- Conservation of our built and natural heritage;
- Environmental sustainability; and,
- Respect for public input and engagement.

Just as we espouse certain principles herein, we believe that any changes made to the zoning bylaw must be accompanied by a set of guiding principles. Such principles aid in the future interpretation and understanding of the bylaw.

Following are the common concerns shared by the members of our focus group, an assessment of whether your discussion paper addresses these concerns, and our comments on anything additional required.

1. Community character / compatibility / heritage preservation

The discussion paper talks about community character and compatibility, but doesn't address the important issue of heritage preservation. Lack of compatibility of new

development is one of the biggest concerns of our member associations. Despite Official Plan language encouraging compatible design, respect for community character, and heritage preservation, most of the development we are seeing in areas zoned R4 throughout the City do not meet these objectives.

The Residential Infill studies, parts 1 and 2, were both intended to address compatibility and community character, but so far seem to have had little impact on development. Part of the problem being that not all types of development in R4 zones are subject to the requirements of these by-laws, in particular the streetscape character analysis. We recommend therefore that the streetscape character analysis be applied to all forms of residential development in the R1 through R4 zones.

Staff were to monitor the implementation of Infill 1 and 2, and to report back to Council. We have yet to see any such reporting, has this been done? If yes, when will the results be shared with the public.

Finally, another issue affecting community character is the loss of mature trees. Much more must be done to preserve our urban tree canopy. One of the objectives of setbacks should be to ensure that there is room for mature trees. Generally speaking setback requirements as they currently are do not support the maintenance of mature trees nor the expansion of the urban tree canopy.

2. Diversity & versatility

The most significant concern we have besides protecting community character is the loss of diversity in our neighbourhoods. Healthy communities need a diverse mix of people, including families, seniors, youth, etc. However, due to the proliferation of one type of dwelling, varying by neighbourhood, our communities are becoming denser but less diverse. In some neighbourhoods the problem is that virtually all new builds consist of only micro-units, while in other neighbourhoods the issue is the opposite, that virtually all new development consists solely of oversized dwelling units. The outcome though is the same, that neighbourhoods are slowly but surely losing diversity and versatility. There is nothing surprising about this, the economics of development make it very difficult to maintain diversity in our neighbourhoods unless the City adopts diversity supportive planning policies.

Therefore, more must be done to encourage a mix of unit sizes, as this offers opportunities for more diverse demographics. It's also worth noting that studio, one-bedroom apartments, and units with four or more bedrooms, are very limited in terms of their demographic market, while two and three-bedroom apartments offer much more versatility. So, some way to ensure a mix of units, particularly more two or three-bedroom units, is needed.

We have two other suggestions for how to preserve diversity. 1) The City must adopt a policy of not supporting minor variances to lot frontage or lot area requirements. 2) The City should work with communities to identify the major and minor streets in each neighbourhood and assign where apartments (and small mixed use buildings) may go, and by extension where they are prohibited.

Inclusionary zoning is also critical to ensuring diversity. Our communities need to offer housing for people of various socio-economic means. We would like to see a requirement that all new developments over a certain number of units provide a percentage of those units for affordable housing.

3. Scale & permitted uses

The discussion paper identifies some of the issues around scale, but the associated recommendations don't seem to help to protect community character in any way. The issue being that most new development in the R4 zones is out of scale with neighbouring properties. In some cases the issue is height, while in others it is the construction of new buildings or additions that reach much more deeply into rear yards. Therefore, we ask that more consideration be given to reducing out of scale height limits and increasing rear yard setback requirements.

The Official Plan already says the right things about scale, in that it calls for new development to be compatible with existing development. Scale in terms of height and setbacks is one of the most critical ways to ensure compatibility. However, the zoning bylaw does not reflect this requirement and the discussion paper doesn't seem to make any recommendations in this regard.

The discussion paper proposes decreasing minimum lot sizes for apartment buildings. We have concerns about permitting apartment buildings on undersized lots and feel that this would need to be modeled before such a change was made.

We are open to reviewing the subzones, as the maximum and minimum lot sizes don't always make sense, but this would require much more time and community engagement.

We support restricting dwelling units to a maximum of 4 bedrooms. We believe oversized dwelling units should not be permitted.

We remain concerned about affordability of housing for families in urban areas, and don't feel that any of the recommendations in the discussion paper would do anything to encourage construction of new housing geared to families or to affordable housing.

We would also add that just as we have minimum density targets, we should identify maximum desired densities by zoning type in order to help ensure dense but livable neighbourhoods.

Committee of adjustment applications are frequently used to achieve a virtual rezoning of a property. This issue must also be addressed.

4. Site servicing

The discussion paper addresses some issues related to site servicing, like garbage and air conditioning units, but fails to address others, including noise and light pollution, and on site water management. We would encourage you to review these issues as they can have significant impact on quality of life. We would also stress that consideration must be given to the link between the lack of urban tree cover and the need for air conditioning. If we can rebuild our tree canopy this could help to naturally cool areas thereby decreasing the need for air conditioning.

We concur that site plan control should apply to more forms of development and that issues of the overall square footage and the number of bedrooms should be taken into account, not just the number of units. We suggest that any development with 4 or more units, or with 10 or more bedrooms in total, or exceeding 3,500 ft², should be subject to site plan control.

We would also encourage you to examine the possibility of requiring a minimum amount of common space (living room, kitchen, bathrooms, etc.) based on the number of bedrooms. Such a formula could help to ensure more versatile and livable units.

We support the move to require indoor garbage storage. We ask that this be reviewed in conjunction with responsible staff at the City to see if something can also be done to ensure that oversized dwelling units have to pay more for garbage pick-up since they naturally produce more garbage.

Finally we want to ensure that the outcome of this review will not reduce any currently applicable amenity space requirements.

5. Lot consolidation

This issue is raised in the discussion paper, but no real solution is offered. This is an important issue with potentially huge impact and we hope to see it studied and thoughtfully addressed. Ultimately, we would like to see some measures related to lot consolidations that consider the impact and ensure the new lot fabric would still be consistent with the existing lot fabric.

6. Rooming houses

“Defacto” rooming houses have become prevalent in many parts of the City, including in areas that are not zoned R4. We agree that the definitions and rules regarding rooming houses need to be cleaned-up and clarified. Ultimately though, we feel that any changes brought in relation to rooming houses will not prevent those operating “defacto” rooming houses from continuing to do so. As such, rental property licensing must be introduced in Ottawa and must include a requirement for an annual inspection of all rental properties.

Finally, we note the interconnectivity and interdependence of many of these recommendations. For example, removing the limit on the permissible number of units in junior R4 subzones would not be beneficial unless limits on oversized dwelling units, and on the permissible number of bedrooms on a lot were also adopted. Given the ease with which the number of bedrooms could be misrepresented, licensing of all rental properties is also necessary to permit inspection and enforcement of this limitation. As such, it is critical that all recommendations be adopted together.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. We look forward to collaborating further.

Sincerely,

Gary Sealey
President, FCA