



Old Ottawa East Community Association Board Meeting

Tuesday, Dec. 13, 2022, 7:00 PM (Zoom details on [OttawaEast.ca](https://ottawaeast.ca))

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes with Addendum – October 11, 2022

- Revised draft with corrections from John, Peter circulated to Board on Sunday

4. Chair's Report – Bob Gordon

5. Treasurer's Report – Don Fugler

- Current balance: \$21,128.26

6. Councillor's Report – Capital Ward – Councillor Menard

7. Regional Group Update – Evan Garfinkel

8. CAG (Community Activities Group) Report – Lee Jacobs

9. Brantwood Gate remembrance Ceremony – OOECA Involvement, Support

10. OOECA Communications guidelines and etiquette

11. Committee Reports (* written report included with this agenda)

- i. **The Corners on Main, Greystone Village, Lees – Peter Tobin***
- ii. **Transportation and Infrastructure – Tom Scott***
- iii. **Planning – John Dance***
- iv. **FCA (Federation of Citizens Associations) – Ron Rose**
- v. **SLOE (Sustainable Living Ottawa East) Jayson MacLean**
- vi. **Health and Safety – Courtenay Beauregard**
- vii. **Communications – Bob Gordon**
- viii. **Membership – Suzanne Johnston**
- ix. **Lansdowne – Alexandra Gruca-Macaulay**
- x. **Parks and Greenspace – Jamie Brougham**

12. New Business

13. Adjournment and next meeting - January 10, 2023 - 7pm EST

Committee Reports

i. TCOM, Greystone Village, Lees – Peter Tobin

- The Pharmasave and Ears on Main are now open for business.
- Of the 8 potential retail units at Milieu, five are now leased including the JFUSE restaurant and La Tartelette Bakery and Cafe.
- The former trench at the convent site has been filled in.

ii. Transportation and Infrastructure – Tom Scott

1. The City staff and consultant team for the Greenfield/Main/Hawthorne (GMH) reconstruction project have responded to our request and are planning an update with the Public Advisory Committee meeting: the virtual TEAMS session is proposed for December 20, 2022, and current PAC members are being/will be contacted.
2. The pedestrian crossing signals at Concord N and Greenfield, finally back in working order after a long summer with none, was once again taken down by a very large transport truck. Thanks to Jim Strang who was quickly on-site and

took down important information, but also managed to engage the driver in a long conversation. Adequate and well-placed signage for Queensway (417) access was noted as an issue. For each of the four times this sign was taken out, a large truck coming north on Concord was attempting to make a right hand turn onto east-bound Greenfield. Jim then suggested more robust physical protection for the light standards when this one is replaced. Among a number of measures aimed at avoiding this circumstance again we also recommended 'no trucks' signs at the residential streets of Harvey, Concord, Havelock and Montcalm, since Greenfield remains a major truck route.

3. OOECA provided input to the virtual Public Information Session hosted by MTO for the 417 Downtown Bridges projects; a key item was the significant change to the build mode and scheduling for the replacement of the Rideau Canal high-level bridge. A copy of the response to MTO is attached. The mid-month launch of the virtual session and the cut-off at November 30 meant that the T&I committee had to work quickly without reference back to a regular session of the whole of the OOECA board.
4. We need to continue to ask the City and the NCC to do more research on a left-turn for northbound Main Street traffic at Col By. We need real data to show that, unlike the small stacking lane at Clegg, there is sufficient space on Main for room and then perhaps make a solid case for at least an off-peak-hour left turn. These two bodies would have to thoroughly investigate impacts and consult with the local communities to make that case to present to the City and the NCC. Unfortunately, over two months have passed since we made that request to the City and specifically to the GMH team - to raise with the NCC on behalf of OOECA and the neighbours living north of the Queensway in particular. There is nothing new to report. The Montcalm area and a strong delegation from King's Landing are in favour of us continuing to pursue whatever avenues we can to get reconsideration there. If the City and NCC want to put in road-based counter lines, then they would need to allow left turns temporarily to determine the resulting volumes. Keeping it closed to that left turn means traffic finds other routes: so, no real useful data would be obtained during the test - hard to measure what is not there.

Transportation and Infrastructure – Attachment

TOM SCOTT <tscot9401@rogers.com>

To: queenswaydowntownbridges@bteng.ca, Darcie Dillon

Cc: Bob Gordon, phyllis odenbach-sutton, Don Fugler, John Dance, Jayson MacLean and 4 more...

Tue, Nov 29 at 8:12 p.m.
Good evening Darcie

Thank you for your earlier reply about the updated environmental assessment and heritage study related to the Rideau Canal bridges complex. We had been looking for similar studies and lessons-learned from the already-completed Rideau RIVER bridge replacement project and hope those will be forthcoming.

At the outset, Old Ottawa East Community Association wants to be on record to say that, while we appreciate your efforts to engage the community over a few week period with a virtual Public Information Session, the outcomes are not going to be as satisfying as those from a live session where both consultants and MTO officials are made available to provide further details, explain the various rationales and answer questions.

There are larger numbers of new assumptions made for which prior consultation appears absent, not just at the community level but also with other key partners. It would have been very valuable for us to have heard first-hand what the federal government, including its agencies Parks Canada and the National Capital Commission, had to say about your proposed changes. We have to assume that your own Minister has been fully briefed, but then we might wonder if she had questions herself about municipal and local neighbourhood reactions and comments. These will all be missing until your next steps in the process, and perhaps too late for adjustments, so that makes it difficult for us to formulate our replies to expect to have any real positive outcomes for our community.

The amended proposals for your series of projects will also have a significant impact on the built infrastructure of the City of Ottawa: so again, we wonder what prior consultation has been held with City officials and elected representatives. For example, we appreciated the collaboration between the NCC and the City in creating a safe fully signaled cross walk at North Main and Colonel By Drive in advance of the major Greenfield-Hawthorne-Main reconstruction project and hoped for similar synergies with your 417-bridges' efforts.

First blush, we noticed that the O'Connor Street bridge replacement was missing from the scope of this new PIC for the Class EA Process; so, without other evidence, we have to trust that MTO is picking up this element elsewhere. The BTE presentation is silent on this matter.

The single most serious change from previous presentations relates to the replacement methodology, one that appears to still require a large number of contractor lay-down areas both north and south of the Queensway, but now also calls for a complete closure of the Queen Elizabeth Driveway and Colonel By Drive for 90 weeks (virtually two years). Those changes with the implied detours additionally put both greater pedestrian and cyclist traffic into known conflict zones at City intersections in the downtown core on both sides of the canal. It was not made clear

why such a long period of continuous closure was required or what other alternatives were available. If the roadway above can be closed for short periods only during critical construction periods, then why could not the same treatment be made for the community routes below: the appearance is given that 417 traffic impediments are more important to be avoided than disruption of local community and daily neighbourhood movements. The virtual PIC gives opportunity for us neither to voice these serious concerns nor to offer options and alternatives. In particular, your proposed plans would push all cyclists and most pedestrian traffic on the east side into a danger area already subject to roadway safety audit recommendations for which your own MTO project appears to offer no short-term or long-term solution.

A further contractor laydown area proposed to be located further east along the Queensway and the Vanier Parkway is in an area designated as TOD - transit-oriented development - and your proposal might preclude active planning for this site in the midst of a housing crisis, at odds with a Provincial Policy Statement. It was not made clear why such extensive areas were required for these contractor-related functions, nor was it described how many might be used in different bridge replacements and with what phasing over an extended period.

We should further note that your proposal not only removes existing on-street parking in a number of neighbourhoods (with no period defined) but also removes what little parking is available to businesses at 221 Echo and 3-5 Hawthorne (again for an unspecified period) with no mention in your revised proposal of alternatives or options for those businesses.

There is an odd comment in the presentation that requires further explanation at this time, not reflecting exactly what community input was being considered:

"The Refined Technical Recommendations of PIC 3 reflect community input from PIC No. 2. A Statement of Flexibility will be included in the TESR that although Alternative 3 is preferred, Alternative 2 may be implemented, dependent on further technical information obtained during the detailed design stage."

Certainly, the table and charts shows that either alternative comes with a recommendation to close the multi-use pathways. Both alternatives show on the charts that they would take all of the parking space behind the Gray Jay, although in #3 the crane moves north of the 417. It seems that the current restaurant tenant of that corner had no advance consultation of this PIC.

We might expect that either alternative offers the chance in the revised design and build to improve significantly the active transportation routes below the bridges with fully accessible pedestrian and cycling routes on both sides of Colonel By Drive and of the Queen Elizabeth Driveway; but also that the City would then take advantage with cooperation from the NCC to make these active transportation routes both safer and more efficient for the pathways leading up to the Queensway bridges.

All this to say, OOECA would appreciate an opportunity for an in-person public information session as part of the ongoing EA process; and, to amend page 35 of the presentation to include such a session, and a reporting-back procedure, in advance of the work to complete the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR). We would expect that any concerns and recommendations of other interested parties, as noted above, could be shared at that time.

Again, thank you for allowing us to participate in this vital communications and discovery exercise.

Cheers
Tom Scott
OOECA Transportation and Infrastructure

iii. Planning – John Dance

1. 12-24 Hawthorne - Application for Rezoning: Planning Committee opposes requested zoning amendments and will seek improvements to the proposal

- Applicant's Proposal: A six-storey residential apartment building containing 67 residential units, indoor amenity space, 50 vehicular parking spaces, and 36 bicycle parking spaces.
- The subject site is located on the south of side of Hawthorne Avenue, two buildings east of Colonel By Drive, and north of Graham Avenue. The site has a combined frontage of approximately 49.3 metres along Hawthorne Avenue and a depth of approximately 28.5 metres.



- 12 Hawthorne Avenue is occupied by a two-storey residential building, while 20 and 24 Hawthorne Avenue are presently vacant. The area surrounding the subject site consists predominately of low-rise residential and commercial buildings along Hawthorne Avenue and Main Street
- The 67 units consist of 42 one-bedroom units and 25 two-bedroom units. The building will include private indoor amenities including a gym and business centre.
- Two levels of underground parking are proposed, allowing for 50 vehicular parking spaces, bicycle storage, and an internal waste room. The garage will be accessed through a recessed door at the westernmost extent of the front building wall.
- Lots of changes to the existing zoning bylaw are sought and the deadline for comments is December 21.
 - The Zoning By-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 2 metres, whereas the development proposes a front yard setback of 0.7 metres.
 - The Zoning By-law requires a building step back from 2 metres after the fourth storey, whereas the development proposes a 2 metres building step back after the fifth storey.
 - The Zoning By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 7.5 metres, whereas the development proposes a rear yard setback of 6.7 metres.
 - The Zoning By-law requires a maximum building height of 14.5 metres, whereas the development proposes a building height of 20 metres.
 - The Zoning By-law requires to allow residential uses to take place at ground floor space across a maximum of 50% of the building frontage, whereas the development proposes residential uses to take place 100% of the building frontage.
- The proposal was discussed at the OOEPC meeting of December 6 with about 10 Graham Avenue residents attending.
- A critical question is whether the proposed six storeys is a “done deal” as a result of provincial government’s changes to the Official Plan and the OOE Secondary Plan provision “Maintain a maximum height of six storeys and mix of uses in the built form of the properties designated mainstreet, with a general lot depth of 40 metres.” Hawthorne is designated as a Mainstreet, however after considerable discussion, the south side of Hawthorne (between Echo and Main) was zoned as four storeys to limit the impact of the development on Graham Avenue residences.
- The planning committee’s consensus was that in a prioritized manner we will oppose all of the requested zoning amendments and we will seek a variety of

improvements to the proposal, including working with the City to have “canopy trees” (rather than relatively short trees) planted in the rebuilt and overhead-wires-less Hawthorne Avenue.

- The overriding concern of the planning committee is that whatever gets approved for this development will set the precedent for what happens on the rest of the south side of Hawthorne and will also affect what happens on the other side of Hawthorne and the rest of Main Street. For the most part, the “traditional mainstreet” developments we’ve seen along Main Street have respected the OOE Secondary Plan and zoning, however, the Hawthorne proposal does not.

2. Bill 23 / Provincial Revisions to OP: Planning Committee opposed Bill and will continue to assess its implications for OOE

- Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, is now approved, rammed through by the provincial government. Despite wide-spread opposition, few amendments were made and now developers are going to have a much easier time building residences. Conservation authorities, communities and municipalities will have less opportunity to influence new developments. Also, the bill overrides provisions in existing municipal plans and zoning while simultaneously downloading development costs to all municipal taxpayers.
- Many thanks to Dianne Caldbick for crafting the OOECA position (see Attachment 1) and writing the related *Mainstreeter* article. Ron Rose is drafting a *Mainstreeter* article on the financial impacts of the legislation.
- From the planning committee’s perspective, the new legislation is injurious to communities on many fronts and it is far from clear that it will result in more affordable housing.
-
- In conjunction with the new act, the Province unilaterally made revisions to the City’s new Official Plan. The general nature of the revisions is to allow taller buildings in many areas, make it easier for developers to have projects approved, and to override certain provisions designed to mitigate new development impacts on communities and the environment.

3. One-pagers to discuss with Councillor / staff + meeting on SP vs Bill 23 and OP provincial revisions

- We hope to meet with Councillor Menard on outstanding OOE planning issues in mid-February. Before then, there will be a meeting with Councillor Menard and City staff (Planning, Real Estate and Economic Development) regarding the implications of Bill 23 and of the Province’s revisions of the Official Plan on the OOE Secondary Plan.

4. 49 Mason Terrace Minor Variances for Front-Facing Garage: Planning Committee and City Opposed

- At the December 6, Panel 1 Committee of Adjustment hearing, the owners of 49 Mason Terrace sought approval of minor variances that would allow a front-facing garage in their proposed new two-storey residence that would replace a small one-story house.
- The OOECA planning committee and the City's Planning, Real Estate and Economic Development department objected to the requested variance because of their conflict with the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan and non-conformance with the dominant streetscape character of this block of mason Terrace. (See Attachment 2)
- Many thanks to Ron Rose who represented the planning committee at the hearing and to Paul Goodkey who did an enormous amount of research on the application.
- Novatech, one of the large planning consultants in Ottawa, represented the client and aggressively argued the client's case.
- The Committee reserved its judgment but we should know the outcome by December 17th.
- A number of neighbouring residents supported the proposed variances.



5. 387 Main: Proposals for Redevelopment of Double Lot

- At the December 6th planning committee, Jack Freeborn presented his ideas on how he might increase density at his double lot at 387 Main. Several of his options would involve minor variances, however, he says he is not proposing to pursue options that are inconsistent with the Main Street streetscape in the area near the Riverdale-Main intersection and across from the Cuban embassy.
- The OOE Planning Committee expressed appreciation that he came forward early in the process but said before taking a position it would have to wait until it saw the specific proposals and the City's analysis of them. He's proposing to make an application in the New Year.

6. 15-17 des Oblats: Still lots of opposition at second public consultation - Planning Committee's concerns remain

- A second public Zoom consultation session on Forum/SLP's 284-unit proposal for the redevelopment of the Sisters' former property was hosted by Councillor Menard December 7.
- The responsible City planner outlined next steps, then the proponents explained their proposal.
- A lengthy Q&A session followed. As before, many residents of The Corners on Main - just to the west of the proposed development - expressed their concerns with the location and size of the proposed addition at the northwest; the number, size and nature of the units; the fifth-floor amenity space; the public pathway that would run between the development and Corners; provision of 20 parking spots even though the bylaw requires 163 spots - not spots for residents and 20 for visitors; transfer of the Mary statue to the northeast quadrant of the lot; and the consultation process, specifically saying residents should have been involved much earlier. Some Corners residents particularly object to the relocation of the Mary statue and its parkette, saying that they were told when they purchased their units that the parkette would stay in the current location in perpetuity.
- The City seems to have agreed that the proposed covered amenity space above the fourth floor may be deemed a permissible projection and thus would not require a zoning amendment, even though the City admits that the current rules do not allow such space as a permitted projection. If approved without a zoning amendment, it would establish a dangerous precedent.
- Residents continue to be concerned that the traffic/parking analysis for the project is based on dated data that do not reflect the considerable growth of Greystone Village and the potential additional traffic that will result from the new school/community centre and from the unbuilt phases of Greystone Village as well as the potential for considerable residential development on the Saint Paul University lands to the south of the Grande Allée.
- In defence of the no-residential-parking proposal, several people argued that with no available parking those owning cars would not be likely to become residents so that the key result would be traffic would be increased less than if residential parking spots were created.
- In terms of the proximity of the proposed addition to Corners, Dayna Gilbert of Forum noted that its setback would be more than what is required.

- Others spoke in support of the proposal and the demographic that the development would bring. One participant noted that OOE's current housing stock is for "rich, older people."
- Dianne Caldbick suggested that not all of the units should be furnished so that people who wanted to make their permanent home in Old Ottawa East would be more likely to become residents in the new development.
- Forum/SLP said it will make revisions in light of feedback it received from the City and the community and will resubmit their application early in the New Year.



Old Ottawa East Community Association

Submission to the Ontario Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure, and Cultural Policy

Re: Bill 23, *More Homes Built Faster Act*, 2022

INTRODUCTION

The Old Ottawa East Community Association (OOECA) is an organisation of community-minded volunteers representing the residents and businesses of Ottawa's Old Ottawa East neighbourhoods. We are dedicated to supporting citizen engagement in issues that affect the livability of our community and our quality of life, including issues around land-use planning and responsible development. More information on our organisation can be found at the following link: [About OECA | Ottawa East Community Association](#).

OUR CONCERNS

Bill 23 is a critically important piece of legislation, with far-reaching and long-term impacts for communities and citizens across Ontario. We have reviewed the Bill's key provisions carefully and, while we support its intent to address the need for housing, we join other concerned groups in calling for major changes to the Bill before it is rushed into law. As a community association, we are concerned, first and foremost, with the Bill's assault on the right at the local level to shape the fabric of our neighbourhoods and communities. Like others, we are also alarmed by provisions in the Bill that neuter environmental and 'green' safeguards and download the financial burden of development to existing property taxpayers. We address each of these concerns in turn below.

Our right to shape the fabric of our communities

As a community association, we are dedicated to encouraging and facilitating citizens' engagement in local planning and development issues, and to giving them a voice in shaping the built and natural character of our neighbourhoods. We are particularly concerned about the provisions in the proposed Bill that constrain this engagement at the municipal level and stifle local voices, while giving undue influence and power to developers. Although provincial and federal governments can, and should, set broad parameters for land use, it is important that citizens have a voice in shaping developments in their own communities. As citizens, we have the right to expect that decisions around development respond to our local needs and

interests, respect the built heritage and character of our neighbourhoods, and enhance our quality of life.

Provisions in the proposed Bill constrain local engagement in two key ways:

- *Reducing municipal governments' authority over planning and development:* Provisions in the Bill limit a municipality's latitude to determine the specifics of its Official Plan, Secondary Plans, and Zoning By-laws, overriding planning and development decisions taken at the local level. These planning and development decisions are typically the product of complex consultations and collaboration among the municipal government, community associations such as ours, and other interested citizens and groups. They represent the 'fruits' of our democratic processes — processes that should be respected by the provincial government.
- *Denying the right of citizens to appeal planning/development decisions:* By denying the right of citizens to influence the decisions that affect them and their local communities, this Bill strikes at the heart of our democratic processes. While we 'think global', we *act* local because we *live* local. The way that new housing and developments relate to existing neighbourhoods and to the public realm is a subject of legitimate interest to all in the community, given their impact on livability and well-being. As local residents, we should not be denied the right to influence decisions around issues such as community design, site design, sustainable design, and landscapes, and to appeal decisions that do not meet our needs and interests.

Disregard for environmental and 'green' considerations

Like many other organisations, we are also deeply concerned about the Bill's reduced environmental oversight, which will lead to negative impacts on environmental well-being and access to green space in our communities. It is well-documented that greenspace enhances the livability of our communities and plays a significant role in our physical and mental well-being. Proposed measures — such as gutting the role of Ontario's 36 regional conservation authorities, restricting municipalities' ability to promote green building standards, and reducing parkland requirements for new developments — strike at the heart of responsible, sustainable development and increase risks of flooding, erosion, drought, and compromised water quality. We believe that Bill 23's attack on environmental standards is regressive and short-sighted, at a time when we need bold action to address the climate crisis, the increasing threats to natural habitats and biodiversity, and the environmental determinants of human health.

Downloading of the financial burden of development

Growth must pay for growth. Founded upon concepts of equity, this has long been the rationale for development charges. It is unfair and unreasonable to shift the financial burden of infrastructure and services for new developments to existing property taxpayers, or to jeopardize the quality and reliability of municipal amenities and benefits for new communities. Discounting some and outrightly eliminating other development charges will force one or both of these outcomes, while providing no guarantees that developers will pass their savings onto new home buyers and renters.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We acknowledge the importance of getting more homes built to house Ontario's growing population and address the challenge of affordability. However, we believe that this can be

achieved while still respecting both the legitimate right of local residents to shape their communities' future and the sustainable practices required to safeguard our environment and green spaces. To this end, we recommend that key articles of Bill 23 be amended to:

- Restore the authority of municipalities to determine the specifics of their Official Plans, associated Secondary Plans, and zoning bylaws, to reflect the context of their communities and interests of their residents.
- Protect the right of local residents to shape the fabric of their communities and the built and natural character of their neighbourhoods, including through the right of appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal.
- Restore environmental oversight measures, including protecting the role of regional conservation authorities and municipalities' right to impose green building standards and parkland requirements on developers and builders.
- Restore the principle of 'growth pays for growth' by reinstating development charges and instead focusing on finding process efficiencies in the system.

Given the critical importance of Bill 23 and its far-reaching impacts, we further recommend that the progress of the Bill through the Ontario Legislature be slowed, to allow more time for substantive public consultation and collaboration to address issues of concern.

On behalf of the Old Ottawa East Community Association,

Robert Gordon
President

Old Ottawa East Community Association

John Dance

Chair, Planning Committee

Old Ottawa East Community Association

c.c. Hon. Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Joel Harden, M.P.P., Ottawa Centre
Mark Sutcliffe, Mayor, City of Ottawa
Shawn Menard, Councillor - Capital Ward, Ottawa City Council

Bill 23 Committee Submission - OOECA / November 17, 2022

Planning - Attachment 2



By email

December 5, 2022

Mr. Michel Bellemare
Secretary-Treasurer
Committee of Adjustment
101 Centrepont Drive, Fourth Floor
Ottawa, ON K2G 5K7

Re: **D08-02-22/A-00317**
Application for Minor Variances
49 Mason Terrace
Old Ottawa East
(CoA of December 7, 2022 - Panel 1)

The Planning Committee of the Old Ottawa East Community Association (OOECA) supports the Planning, Real Estate and Economic Development department (PRED) in its objection to the requested variances.

OOECA does not believe that a front-facing garage on this block of Mason Terrace meets either the test that "The general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law is maintained", or the test that "The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan is maintained".

As noted in the review by PRED:

Front-facing attached garages that are not concealed from the building and that form an integral part of it are not consistent with the intended built form for properties located in the Inner Urban Transect. Furthermore, the proposal is inconsistent with the policy direction of the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan, in terms of which front-facing garages are prohibited. The proposal is not desirable for the use of the property in this location.

OOECA worked long and hard with the City, developers and other parties to create and have approved the OOE community development plan and the derivative OOE Secondary Plan.

The complementary plans provide the template for substantial growth of the community in a responsible way. We expect that the Secondary Plan's provisions will be respected. Specifically, in the case of the 49 Mason application, note the following provisions of section 3.4 Policy Area 4 - Old Ottawa East Residential Neighbourhoods – including Archville, Spenceville and Rideau Gardens:

23) Maintain the general character of these neighbourhoods as expressed by the existing zoning.

24) Maintain the traditional pattern of pedestrian priority along the street with any garages relegated to the side or rear of homes and not projecting forward or otherwise dominating the building façade.

Clearly, the proposed variances do not maintain the intent and purpose of the aforementioned Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan policies.

In its argumentation, Novatech, the applicants' consultant, cites two properties (17 and 21 Mason Terrace) as examples of neighbouring properties with front-facing garages but these properties have much larger street frontages than the subject property (22m and 18m vs 12m) and are separated from the subject property by six lots. Furthermore, one of the cited properties is a heritage property that predates the development of the rest of the street.

The consultant states "... the proposed front-facing attached garage will enhance the streetscape by minimizing the visual impact of vehicles parked in the side yard." This presumes that the residents will keep their vehicle in the garage or that there won't be a second vehicle parked in the driveway. It clearly will not be an enhancement over the current situation with a complete ABA streetscape except for the two much larger lots at the western end of the street.

We are aware and appreciate that the applicants have reached out to neighbours and that a number of them are in support of the variances. However, the OOECA planning committee is of the opinion that the importance of streetscapes is something that should be defended. Mason Terrace is a unique street, with its well-treed six-metre front yards providing a beautifully framed view of Lansdowne Park's Aberdeen Pavilion dome. As Committee of Adjustment members can appreciate, neighbours generally wish to ensure good relationships so that it can be awkward for a neighbour to object to a requested minor variance application.

The general scale of the proposed new residence is reasonable, however, regardless of the decision on the application, the new residence might fit better were its entrance or some other feature to give a nod to the unique semi-circle above the front entrance door, that characterizes the neighbouring houses, all designed by Rupert McClelland. Also, we are pleased to see that the mature sugar maple in the front yard will be well-protected.

John Dance

Chair
Planning Committee
Old Ottawa East Community Association
john.dance.ottawa@gmail.com

cc Bob Gordon, President OOECA
Ron Rose, Past Chair, OOECA Planning Committee

CoA-49-Mason-OOECA-comments-revised-final-22341