

Federation of Citizens' Associations of Ottawa
General Meeting of January 18, 2017
Tanglewood Park Community Centre
Draft Minutes

Present: Gary Sealy (Beaverbrook CA, President FCA), Praveen Arrora (Kanata Lakes CA), Christopher Barker (Rockcliffe Park RA), Shiv Bhasker (Kanata Lakes CA), Bob Brocklebank (Glebe CA), John Chenier (LowertownCA), David Clark (Citiview CA), Alex Cullen (Belltown NA), Lorne Cutler (Hampton-Iona CG), John Hansen (Katimavik-Hazeldean CA), Ali Ismaily (Bridlewood CA), Kul Kapoor (Katimavik-Hazeldean CA), Bruce Lindsay (Green Space Alliance Of Canada's Capital), Terrence Lonerean (Fisher Heights Area CA), Judy Makin (Huntley CA), Maria Luisa Marti (Centretown Citizens CA), Bob McCaw (Fisher Heights Area CA), Pat McLachlin (Glens CA), Rod McLean (Katimavik-Hazeldean CA), Graeme Roderick (Tanglewood-Hillscale CA), Sheila Perry (Overbrook CA), Natalie Salguero, Mark Seebaran (Old Ottawa East CA), John Stevenson (Citizens for Safe Cycling), Don Stewart (Westboro Beach CA), Phil Sweetnam (Stittsville VA)

Guest: Councillor Keith Egli

The Speed Daters:

Sandy Woodley (Nepean Rideau Osgoode Resource Centre - NROOC), Jill O'Riley (ACORN) replaced by 2 reps, names ??, Ray Sullivan (Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corp - CCOC), Donna Serafini & Suzanne Fraser (Youth Services Bureau and Salvation Army), Kim Hiscott (Andrew Fleck Childcare), Hugh Nelson (MacLure Cooperative Centre), Sarah Bercier (Council On Aging), Tammy Corner (Coalition of Community Health and Resource Centres of Ottawa), Dianne Urquhart (Social Planning Council, Janice Burelle (City of Ottawa Social Services), Donna Gray (City Of Ottawa (Service Innovation & Performance)

1. Call to order

Gary welcomed everyone (7:20 PM)

2. Adoption of agenda

Agenda was adopted unanimously.

3. Greeting by Councillor

Councillor Keith Egli greeted everyone. He briefed on council news, City of Ottawa projects, Canada 150 celebrations etc. (He mentioned about \$ 5000 allotted for each ward for Canada 150 celebrations). (7:38 PM)

4. Explanation of Rotational interviews (speed dating)

Gary and Bob presented responses from FCA initiated survey on social services. (7:45 PM); Survey is still ON. [<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7B85C2T>]

Gary introduced the process of rotational interviews (speed Dates), to small groups of 2-3, with reps from 11 representatives from various organizations providing social services in Ottawa area. Gary said

at the start of the meeting that ACORN was being represented by two people not the person listed on the agenda.

5. Speed Dating

- Rotational Interviews: (7:45 PM – 8:35 PM) There was enough time for 6 interviews, to each group, from 11 organizations. Last 5 minutes of the sessions were open mike to catch up with the reps not able to small group interviews. Useful information was exchanged and contacts were made. Everyone was encouraged to mingle, make contact and catch up with the resource people during Pot Luck break.

6. Local Community Issues - Open Mike

1. Alex Cullen noted that the Province is to provide some extra 100,000 childcare spaces over 5 years. Yet even with this addition it represents only 20% of the need for child care.
2. Sheila Perry identified the Provincial discussion considering an annual income trial project in some communities to see if this is better than welfare payments
3. Sheila urged FCA members to support the City's interest in seeking to stage the 2021 Canada Games. Phil Sweetnam stated that the cost/benefit of participants staying in University residences rather than hotels should be a factor in FCA considerations
4. Don Stewart invited one and all to make use of the Ottawa riverside cross country ski run even on snow shoes in Westboro.

7. Committee Reports

a) Planning / Zoning Committee – Bob referred to the fact that R4 Zoning is to be City-wide in impact. He pointed out that the effort on R4 Zoning regularization project is in view of the 26 different R\$ subzones. Essentially the R4 Zone identifies a low rise building which is set in the middle of single family homes, duplexes and triplexes, but may be matter of a land owner covertly transforming a building into a rooming house for college and university students. A land owner may build a three storey building which in fact includes a basement that is supposedly to be unused but is readily used by making the building a four storey capacity. A draft submission on R4 Zoning was circulated with the draft agenda (attached).

Motion by Bob seconded Sheila:

That the meeting accept the draft paper on the R4 review and request 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. The motion was passed with no votes opposed and one abstention.

Transportation Committee: Alex reported that Transportation will be the topic for the of the February 15 FCA meeting in Orleans hosted by Cardinal Creek. The meeting will focus on the Transportation Master Plan which was passed in November 2013 based on studies done in 2010 to 2012. Alex mentioned an upcoming Workshop on Transportation Master Plan in April 2017.

Communications Committee: Bob said Committee would be interested in whatever reactions we may have to FCA website changes at www.fca-fac.ca Responses may be sent to info@fca-fac.ca

Membership Committee: Bob noted that annual dues are due on January 1st each year.

Governance: Bob pointed out that he has been complaining that for some time the matter of contact with the City Manager about Public Engagement. This evening January 18 he was advised a City participant in our so called Speed Dating is interested in being the City partner in reviving FCA contact with the City on Public Engagement, so Bob is hopeful that revival will occur.

Next General Meeting: Feb 15, 2017 – Cardinal Creek; Theme: Transportation

Reminder: Upcoming Workshop on Transportation Master Plan in April 2017.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.



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