



Meeting of the Old Ottawa East Community Association Board

Tuesday, February 9, 2021, 7p.m.

Zoom meeting

MINUTES

Attendance:

(Board Members) - Bob Gordon, Catherine Pacella, Tom Scott, Ron Rose, Brendan O’Kelly, Peter Tobin, Georgia Blondon, John Dance, Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, Courtenay Beauregard, Krista Broeckx, Don Fugler, Jayson Maclean, Ian Sadinsky

Jim Strang, Anthony Leaning, Tina Raymond (CAG), Mitch Vlad, Lorne Abugov (Mainstreeter), Heather Jarrett, Denise Inglis, Gloria, Tara, Lyn, Camrose Burdon, Rick Grimes, Carol, Lynda Colley, Kristin Kendall, Paul Goodkey, Carol Alette, Jamie, Ariela Summit (Office of Councillor Menard), Donna Killeen, Francine, Taylor Marquis (Regional), Councillor Shawn Menard, Alexandra Gruca-Macaulay, Linda Pollock, Cate Pentland, Richard Deadman, Peter and Adriana, Peter Froom, Bonnie Wepler, Kristine, Doug Macaulay, cburnett07

Agenda approval: moved by Tom Scott, seconded by Jayson Maclean

Approval of Minutes – January 12, 2021 – moved by Tom Scott, seconded by Georgia Blondon

Chair’s Report – Bob Gordon

Councillor’s Report – Councillor Shawn Menard

- Official Plan – ward council meeting on Thursday
- Still pushing for burial of Hydro wires
- Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland for Springhurst Park – plan is to start work in the spring/summer – shortage of ping pong tables
- 67-71 Chestnut demolition – keeping an eye on it, permits in place and watching excavation (history of soil contamination in area)
- Q – Mayor’s response re: burying of Hydro wires was weak – if Elgin Street got it, why didn’t Hawthorne
- A – Agrees that it limits development – some staff support it, some don’t. With Elgin Street, they found a technical reason to do it so Hydro helped to pay for the costs. That’s not the same for Hawthorne, technical reason for 1 of 8 poles.

Regional Update – Taylor Marquis

- The sale of the Deschâtelets building is complete – The building ownership was transferred to the CECCE last week.
- Regional filed a Lifting of Holding Zone application to lift the holding symbol on the site, as we have met all of the required conditions. Planning staff are preparing a report to accompany a by-law.

- A “Permit to Alter” was submitted by Regional in late December for the demolition of the chapel wing. We are working through our application with Building Services staff. Abatement work is on-going in the Deschâtelets building and the chapel wing. Chapel wing demolition is currently targeted to start at the end of March/Early April.
- The CECCE has submitted their Heritage Application for the Deschâtelets building and it has been deemed complete. We believe it will be going before Built Heritage Committee next month, but the CECCE is leading these approvals and would be best to provide an update on their progress and schedule.
- Q – Previously raised about reusing materials from building/demolition in redesign of building – what is the status on this?
- A – School board proposing using a different material for the “bump out”, but stain glass windows and some stone will be retained
- Q – How many more dwelling units are expected for Phase III?
- A – Will have that information for the planning committee meeting
- Q – Any update on upper floors?
- A – It is now the school board’s responsibility so can’t comment on it

Treasurer’s Report – Don Fugler

- Current balance is: \$17,974.13 (no transactions this month)

CAG report - Tina Raymond

- Offering after-school care again now that school is back
- March Break camps and summer camps are open – filling up fast
- Good Food Box will resume in February
- Still not sure what will happen with Main Event
- Looking for new members – in need of a treasurer

Draft Official Plan – Ron Rose

- Last Official Plan enacted in 2003
- New plan to be in place until 2046
- Plan is trying to manage new growth – expected extra 402,000 people by 2046, and 60% should be in urban areas
- Idea of “Trensects”
- Old Ottawa East split between two separate Trensects
- Original OOE Secondary Plan enacted in 2011 – new Official Plan will scrap that secondary plan – a lot of what we fought for in 2011 is missing in the new one
- What OOECA wants:
 - o A single secondary plan for the entire community that includes the features of the existing plan
 - o We want to be covered under a single transect
 - o We want tree canopy targets and strategy
 - o We want an affordable housing policy, as per existing SP
 - o We want implications of pandemic considered first
 - o We want meaningful consultation and engagement
- Comments close on February 17

- Council approves a revised plan summer or early fall 2021
- No appeals allowed if it comes into effect
- Q – When is four storeys possible over three?
- A – OP doesn't really explain that
- Q – Any specific intensification goals listed?
- A – Density targets are 80 units per hectare
- Q – North of the Queensway – under plan, technically no longer part of OOE – how do we get back into OOE?
- A – Right now, OOECA want this area back in OOE and will fight for it
- Q – Need for more park space, especially west of Main Street
- A – No coherent strategy in the OP
- Q – Any comments in OP on car sharing?
- A – Not aware of anything, it's a large document
- Q – Did you get a sense of how they would approach heritage?
- A – Lots of mentions of natural heritage, but not necessarily cultural or building
- Q – How does the city define a 15-minute neighbourhood?
- A – City has yet to give a good example of a 15-minute neighbourhood
- Q – Any other suggestions as to where to get information (other than one-pagers)?
- A – Will share a list of pages that people might find helpful
- Q – Anything in documentation that considers demographics of those who generally live in urban areas?
- A – Not aware of anything

Ward Boundary Review update – John Dance (*Please see attachment after committee reports)

- Action Sandy Hill not aware of it, Councillor Fleury said he did talk to consultants but no indication who initiated it, where he stands
- Next step would be LPAT – John thinks it should be done
- Tried to get information from city for Mainstreeter article – city would not share more details other than what was in the report
- Motion - Moved that the OOECA appeal the transfer to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and no lawyer will be hired should an appeal be made.
- Moved by Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, seconded by Tom Scott
- Motion approved

Committee reports (*all received reports attached below)

- Planning – Ron Rose (interim chair) – see attached report
- SLOE – Jayson MacLean
 - Invasive species group meeting soon – if interested, please email him
 - Q – can SLOE conduct a survey on issue of gypsy moths in OOE?
 - A – request for email discussion on that
 - Q – will SLOE be commenting on Official Plan?
 - A – yes, plan on submitting something
- Health and Safety – Courtenay Beauregard – no report
- Transportation – Tom Scott
 - Received response from mayor to previous letter, circulated to the board

- Will follow up
- Lansdowne – John Dance – see attached report
- Communications – Bob Gordon
- FCA – Ron Rose – no report
- Corners on Main and Greystone Village – Peter Tobin – see attached report
- Parks and Greenspace – Brendan O’Kelly – see attached report
- Membership – Suzanne Johnston

New Business

Date of Next Meeting – March 9, 2021

Adjournment – Motion moved by Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, seconded by Tom Scott

Attachments:

Committee reports:

Greystone Village / Corners on Main – Peter Tobin

I have been in touch with Danielle Chatelain, superintendent with the Conseil des Ecoles Cath du Centre - Est and expect that she will attend our March 9 meeting to provide us with a progress report on the CECCE's re-purposing of the Deschatelets building.

Lees Apartments

I have phoned Cogir, the management company for the apartment building at 190 Lees re the garbage that overflows the many bins close to the MUP connecting the River trail MUP to Lees Av. I will continue to monitor this situation.

Lansdowne Park – John Dance

OOECA Lansdowne Committee

No meeting of the committee nor of the Lansdowne Community Consultation Group (LCCG) took place over the last month.

Lansdowne Review

Despite the review being announced two months ago, the City has not contacted community associations or their members on the LCCG to discuss the terms of reference and how community associations are proposed to be involved. Yet the review is to be completed by June.

Proposed Changes to Aberdeen Square

As of this writing, there still has been no decision on whether to proceed with the “improvements” OSEG proposed back in August 2020 but were objected to by many who participated in the October 2020 consultation. None of the changes requested by residents or Councillor Menard has been reflected in proposals.

The legal agreement between the City and OSEG for Casino Lac Leamy's sponsorship of Aberdeen Square includes reference to a "performance structure" measuring 20 x 24 feet, however, OSEG has proposed a stage with a maximum size 2.5 times this.

Lansdowne and the Official Plan

The draft Official Plan proposes to make Lansdowne Park one of the new "special districts" (like along the Rideau Canal).

However, the wording included in the draft seems to give primacy to the professional sports and entertainment aspects of the Park, with community needs and interests subrogated to these (see extract below). We would recommend that in the OOECA input to the OP it be requested that the Lansdowne wording be revised and the OP's vision be inverted such that vibrant community life becomes the primary focus and goal, while professional sports and entertainment be recognized as only one of a number of components that, in their totality will make the Park a success.

This is important because in the pending review of the park possible changes should be viewed in the context of what's best for surrounding communities and users of the park who are not just there for attending events. There are two main reasons for this: 1. Lansdowne, while being a regional asset, is also a neighbourhood feature and therefore needs to serve neighbourhood needs 2. From the perspective of the fiscal success of the park, intermittent fan or tourist traffic cannot generate sufficient income for the Park. Even the Farmers' Market vendors will remark that a fair number of visitors come for the atmosphere but not to buy. We do not want the review to be focused on what's best for professional sports and large entertainment events at Lansdowne at the expense of what is best for the community and the viability of the Park in general.

From OP draft:

6.6.6 Lansdowne

One of Canada's marquee urban stadium developments, Lansdowne is a contemporary demonstration of the successful integration of a large professional sports facility within an established neighbourhood, on a site that also provides restaurants, housing, retail, heritage buildings and community facilities. Its setting is within a central, mature neighbourhood that is rich in cultural heritage and geographic attributes. Lansdowne is successful because it delivers year-round spectator sporting events and major national and international events which attract residents and visitors from across the city and beyond. Lansdowne also provides local residents with services and amenities to meet their daily needs. Enhancing links to pedestrian and cycle systems, advancing transit options and innovative transportation demand management are critical.

And a Footnote

"Just for fun," Lansdowne Committee member Alexandra Gruca-Macaulay created "two juxtaposed 'wordles' that show what words are prominent in the community life section of the proposed Union Park development in Toronto compared to the language about Lansdowne in 6.6.6 of the OP." See below:

Union Park Toronto, Proposed Development surrounding Rogers Centre, Oxford Properties Group, "The Community"

Parks and Greenspace Committee Report - Feb 9, 2021

The current membership of the committee is:

- Brendan O’Kelly, Chair
- Georgia Blondon
- Krista Broeckx
- John Dance
- Kristine Houde
- Rick Burrowes

The committee met in January and agreed that we want to know more about who is using our neighbourhood parks and how. The idea is to identify which parks and greenspaces in the neighbourhood people are familiar with, as well as which areas and recreational amenities may be underused. This will serve to not only highlight the importance of existing parks, but also to identify valued greenspace before it is potentially altered or reduced.

When the details are finalized, there is a plan to put out a public survey about neighbourhood greenspace use.

Given the new membership, the committee is also working on drafting a new letter reaffirming its opposition to the AVTC plans.

Springhurst Park

The tender package for the recreational amenities was posted last week. Bid results are expected by early March.

Planning Committee – Ron Rose

-Your Planning Committee has been particularly busy during the past month, partly in preparation for tonight’s discussion. We held a virtual meeting on January 26th.

-Courtney Beauregard has agreed to join the Planning Committee.

-178 Main Street. We discussed a proposed minor variance at 178 Main Street, (the Little Italy Fine Foods building). The owner plans to enclose the space under his second floor rear deck to create an office. The owner attended our virtual meeting and answered a few questions, and the members of the committee were generally supportive.

-Convent of the Sacred Heart, 15 Des Oblats, Avenue. The Councillor proposed a motion at the January 20th meeting of the Built Heritage Sub-Committee “to recommend the addition of 15 des Oblats Avenue to the Heritage Register, to ensure that the subject building with heritage significance is protected in Capital Ward”. The motion was accepted but debate postponed until the March meeting of the Built Heritage Sub-Committee, following staff assurances that it was unlikely any demolition would take place before that meeting. The Councillor’s motion was vigorously opposed by the current owner, Domicile, in a letter to the Sub-Committee.

-71 Chestnut Street. We discussed an update on request for minor variances for the redevelopment of this site. The variances were approved by the Committee of Adjustment, including the proposal to have a double-width driveway off of Springhurst. In the process however, we discovered that "Brunswick Street", isn't really Brunswick Street at all, it's the western edge of Springhurst Park! The Committee is exploring why we didn't know that and what implications that may have for dwellings on the east side of Chestnut Street.

-Regional Group has proposed to present an overview of their plans for Phase III of the Greystone development at our February 23rd meeting. They would then arrange a subsequent briefing with the community.

-We were advised of the Councillor's February 11th Ward meeting to discuss the Official Plan. We also heard that the City has decided it cannot attend a separate meeting with our Community Association, so the Councillor's ward meeting, which will feature a separate breakout discussion with just our Community, will have to do. That's this Thursday night at 6:30. Please attend and that gives you six days to send your comments to the City.

-Upcoming developments.

-99 Greenfield. We have received notice of a Site Plan Approval request for 99 Greenfield, with comments requested by February 23rd (and we managed a one day extension because our next Planning Committee is on the 23rd).

-Deschatelets Building. On February 3rd, we received a notice to alter the Deschatelet Building, with a deadline for comments tomorrow, February 10th. There was no way we had the time to do a comprehensive review of that proposal, but will do our best to get comments by the end of the day tomorrow.

Ward Boundary Change - Removal of uOttawa Lees Campus from Capital Ward:

Update and Next Steps

Issue: The City has shown no willingness to correct its mistaken removal of the uOttawa Lees campus from Capital Ward boundaries so the questions are should the community association make further attempts to correct the situation and, if so, what should they be.

Background:

- At last month's meeting the Board agreed to request that City of Ottawa cancel the proposed transfer of the uOttawa Lees campus to Rideau-Vanier Ward. To that end, President Bob Gordon sent the attached letter to Mayor Jim Watson. (Annex A)

- The Mayor's office responded, "Thank you for reaching out to Mayor Jim Watson's office. By way of this email, I am confirming the receipt of your correspondence and the attached letter. I have personally forwarded it over to the Mayor for his review and consideration. All the best." But there was no further correspondence from the Mayor's office.

- On January 27, 2020 a by-law was enacted that transfers the Lees uOttawa campus to Rideau-Vanier. The changed boundaries are to be in effect for the next "three to four" elections.

- Other new information pertaining to the ward boundary change is:
 - the University of Ottawa did not request the change
 - Action Sandy Hill (the community association of SH) was unaware of the change
 - Rideau-Vanier Councillor Mathieu Fleury emailed the Mainstreeter, "I did speak about the boundaries of the University to the consultants, but as you know, their conclusions were driven by multiple consultations including with my colleagues and other residents."
- At this point the only possible way of reversing the decision is to appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, something that must be done by March 15, 2021 and would cost \$400 (\$1000 if not accepted as a non-profit).
- Ward boundary changes are supposed to improve "effective representation" yet in this case all three relevant criteria for effective representation through a ward boundary change (Annex B) are better satisfied with the Lees campus remaining in Capital Ward. For this reason, OOECA should have a reasonable chance of a successful appeal (in my opinion). For a broader perspective on Capital Ward boundaries see Annex C, Clive Doucet's recent views.

Recommendation / Motion:

Moved that the OOECA appeal the transfer to the Local Planning Appeal Board provided that the cost of the appeal is covered by John Dance. No lawyer will be hired should an appeal be made.

Annex A



By Email

January 15, 2021

**Mayor Jim Watson
110 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1**

Dear Mayor Watson:

Poorly Conceived Ward Boundary Change (uOttawa - Lees Campus) Affecting Capital Ward

The Old Ottawa East Community Association respectfully requests that a change made during the course of the Ward Boundary Review be reversed before the by-law is proclaimed

January 27, 2021. The change does not meet the City's criteria required for a ward boundary change.

Specifically, on December 9, 2020 City Council approved ward boundary changes that included the transfer of the University of Ottawa's Lees Avenue campus from Capital Ward to Rideau-Vanier.

This transfer was introduced by an unknown party near the end of the lengthy ward boundary consultation process but the Old Ottawa East Community Association and the Old Ottawa East community were not made aware of the change until after FEDCO had blessed it.

Specifically, the "Recommendations Report" for Council recommended:

"Move the Gee-Gees sports field from W6-19 (Capital) to W6-17 (Rideau-Vanier). The reasons given refer to a better boundary (the River rather than Highway 417) and the area's association with sports facilities directly to the north in Rideau-Vanier. In the recommended ward boundary configuration, the Gee-Gees sports field is moved from W6-19 to W6-17. There are no residents in this area." (p23) The report later says: "At Robinson Park and Gee Gees Field, #417 is not a big boundary; use the River instead." (p34)

.../2

• 2 -

The fundamental criterion for making ward boundary changes is to "achieve voter parity." The transfer of the Lees campus will be detrimental to voter parity because Rideau-Vanier is forecast to grow faster than Capital. So why would you transfer an area with considerable development potential (it's part of the Lees transit-oriented development area) to a recipient ward that already is larger than the donor ward and is growing faster than the donor ward?

A second criterion is "respecting natural/physical boundaries." The recommendation's argument "#417 is not a big boundary; use the River instead," is ludicrous: the river doesn't become the new boundary - the LRT line does. In absolutely no way is the LRT line as significant a "physical boundary" as is Highway 417.

The third criterion pertains to "communities of interest" and the recommendation erroneously implies that the primary "community of interest" for the Lees uOttawa campus are users of "sports facilities" that are on both sides of Highway 417. The actual dominant "community of interest" is Capital Ward's Old Ottawa East that has included the Lees campus area for more than a century.

So the poorly-conceived Lees campus ward transfer fails to satisfy the three criteria required for a boundary change. Indeed, the transfer violates what ward boundary changes are supposed to achieve. The request for the transfer was from an unknown party and is strongly opposed by the Old Ottawa East Community Association.

One final point: the “Recommendations Report” spoke of just the “sports field.” Councillors were misled by this wording because, as the report’s map (attached) shows, the boundary change is for the entire Lees Avenue campus of the University of Ottawa.

We do not want to have to seek correction of this mistaken transfer through an LPAT appeal. Please correct the mistake now. If your officers wish to discuss this issue with the association please have them call OOECA Board member John Dance at 613 236 0650.

Bob Gordon
President
Old Ottawa East Community Association

Cc: S. Menard
M. Fleury
L. Dudas
Beate Bowron

Attachment - Map Showing “New” Boundary



Enlargement of area being transferred: south of 417, west of the Rideau River, east of LRT



Annex B

Ward Boundary Review Case Law and the Principle of “Effective Representation”

Representation by Population: In a successful ward system, every Councillor will represent generally the same number of people. This is often referred to as ‘voter parity’. Usually, population variations of up to 25% above or below the average size are considered acceptable.

Consideration of present and future population trends: A ward boundary review must consider future increases or decreases in population in order to ensure that wards continue to meet the representation by population criterion as the City grows. The goal is to design a system that can be used for three elections.

→ Rideau Vanier already is more populous than Capital and RV is forecast to grow at a faster rate. Although at present the Lees uOttawa lands currently have no residents, they are part of the Lees transit-oriented development which will have more than 10,000 new residents

Consideration of natural and physical boundaries: Natural and physical boundaries shape patterns of life in cities, and so ward designs should respect these features.

→ The new boundary is the LRT line vs the previous boundary of Highway 417. Highway 417 is truly dividing, unlike the LRT trench.

Communities of Interest: Ward boundaries should consider settlement patterns, traditional neighbourhoods and community groupings in specific geographic locations. Where possible, ward boundaries should not fragment a community.

→ The City argues that users of Sandy Hill's Robinson field constitute a stronger community of interest in the Lees campus than those who live just to the west of the campus. The reality is that the Lees campus has been part of Capital Ward's Old Ottawa East for more than a century and the nearby residents have a much greater interest in what happens on the Lees Campus than do any occasional users of both Robinson Field and the University's field. The City refused to divulge any information on whether there really were any such joint users.

Effective Representation: Considered the ultimate goal of all ward boundary reviews, effective representation aims at achieving fair and equal representation for voters to the greatest extent possible. The primary consideration is voter parity, but effective representation also takes into account the all other criteria.”

Annex C

Former Capital Ward Councillor Clive Doucet's Views on Ward Boundaries

Someone was always trying to take a chunk out of Capital Ward. I remember someone went after Heron Park. Someone else went after the high rises along Riverside Drive, all in the name of efficiency.

Fortunately, I was able to fight off both. If you look at shape of Capital Ward, it's the shape of a human heart. It is also at the geographic epicentre of the city. The ward itself has more train stops, more universities, more shopping streets, more community newspapers and world famous festivals and tourist sites. Most of the historic part of the Rideau Canal flows through it and all of the festivals connected to it happen there.

The ward is composed of six distinct communities and they have always been well connected and grown more so over the years with the pedestrian bridge over the canal, restored community centres, small boat launches along the Rideau Canal and the expansion of educational facilities.

No other ward can claim three universities as residents, Carleton, St. Paul and U. of O. The communities are tight within themselves and tightly connected between each other. It's the only ward I know of with that has its own shinny hockey cup. As councillor I could visit every corner of the ward from my house in no more than twenty minutes on a bicycle because of the heart shape and the density of population.

Capital Ward has always struggled against the city's desire to chop it up from the appropriation of its principal public space and the continual refusal of the council to respect its own zoning by-laws, Official and community plans.

Over the years, it has fought back valiantly to preserve its history, character and sense of a distinct place especially within the new amalgamated city. I love it, but don't think the current Mayor does as he has always done whatever he could to weaken it. I remember the first thing I did as a new Regional Councillor was present the case at old Ottawa's City Hall and to the present Mayor, the same one who is presiding today for not selling off a city work yard next to Windsor Park for more condos. We were successful and it was greened up and attached to the park.

This issue is no different. Different battle. Same war. The ward will be weakened if council arbitrarily slices off a piece and passes it over to another ward. It will help to break that sense of shared history, community connection and common cause. If he could I'm confident the current Mayor would dissolve

the entire ward by attaching each part to another ward. This is his style. Beyond being Mayor, what he cares about I do not know.