

As We Heard It Report

Around 60 participants attended the open house on Monday, February 11, 2019 at the Roy G. Hobbs Community Centre to review and discuss the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment ([D02-02-18-0089](#)) and Site Plan Control ([D07-12-18-0143](#)) applications for 8900 Jeanne d'Arc Boulevard North. The meeting was hosted by the City's Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department and Councillor Matthew Luloff.

Next steps

1. The applicant will consider all public and technical comments and resubmit revised plans and studies to the City for review in March.
2. City staff will present a recommendation report on the Zoning By-Law Amendment to Planning Committee in spring 2019.
3. City staff will prepare a decision report for the Site Plan Control application after Planning Committee's decision.
4. The applicant will submit a building permit application to the City for approval.
5. Construction will begin after the building permit is approved.

City staff will notify you of the Planning Committee meeting date, where you will have your next opportunity to comment on the Zoning By-Law Amendment. You may submit written comments and/or present to Planning Committee. For more information, visit ottawa.ca.

Summary of feedback

The following themes of comments and questions were provided during the meeting, including the written comments submitted after the meeting.

Issue 1: Flow-of-Traffic and Parking

Comment: Regional Road 174 will not be able to withstand the increase in cars on the west bound off-ramp.

Comment: At-grade parking and connecting roads in front of Tower 1 are not built with traffic in mind and as a result, not all traffic calming signage is obeyed by drivers.

Comment: The site is isolated from many amenities and residents are therefore required to own automobiles to access most of them, which increases their need of

parking spaces. An LRT system will connect the residents only to the east and west, while communal cars will not address all of the parking needs for Tower 5 residents.

Comment: In the event of an emergency, first-response vehicles will block the entrance into Inlet Private resulting in major traffic congestion. A solution to this, among other traffic concerns, would be to introduce a roadway to the south-east of Tower 5.

Issue 2: Resident and Visitor Safety

Comment: The fire route should not cross over the underground parking structure or on the lanes directly abutting south of Tower 1 and 2.

Comment: Visitors and residents coming into Tower 1 from the parking lot in front have to cross a path where there is low visibility for drivers, which results in a dangerous situation for the pedestrians.

Comment: The proximity of tower 5B to a 90 degree turn onto Inlet Private would further block the view of incoming traffic from the garage, the outdoor parking lot, and any incoming traffic from Inlet Private.

Issue 3: Site Plan

Question: The existing parking lot will see a lot more traffic, is it possible to phase out all current above ground parking into future underground parking? A proposed ring outside of the circle of towers could then be constructed for pedestrian use only.

Question: Are the proposed green spaces private to residents or public for everyone?

Question: Will this site offer any inclusionary housing?

Comment: If there is meant to be a change in demographic on the site, there needs to be a change in activity space for all ages as well, for example, a playground.

Comment: From an aesthetic perspective, the towers would be more appealing if they were slightly rotated from each other. With the current design, it appears many units will look directly across into other units.

Comment: If Tower 5 is a proposed retirement home, the likelihood of the residents walking to the LRT station is quite low and therefore the retirement home would fit better on the far east side of the site.

Comment: A multi-use pathway is an exciting idea.

Comment: The proposed park near Tower 1's underground parking will not have a clear pathway for pedestrians into the park and thus a safer location would be at the location of Tower 5B. This location would further benefit a clear sight-line for drivers turning onto the 90-degree turn at Inlet Private.

Comment: Bird strike mitigation features should be incorporated into the final design of the site and buildings.

Issue 4: LRT Connection

Question: Will the Trim LRT include a multi-use pathway connection over the highway that is protected from the wind?

Comment: In order to promote the use of the LRT year-round, residents will require an accessible path from all 5 towers as well as a feeder bus.

Issue 5: Geotechnical/Environmental

Comment: Bird habitats will be decreased as a result of the proposed towers.

Comment: The site's soil (Leda clay) is not capable of withstanding the density of the proposed towers. The unstable slopes and high erosion boundaries further question the integrity of the buildings and infrastructure and if they will be able to withstand a changing environment.

Comment: Petrie Island is a sensitive ecological environment and the proposed developments are near a Conservation and Natural Habitat. The development and land should reflect the natural surrounding landscape.

Issue 6: Other

Question: Were Tower 2 residents made aware of the public meeting held on February 11, 2019?

Comment: Intensification efforts should be re-directed to the development on lands west of Trim Road at the Cité Collégiale project.

Comment: The new density being proposed is not originally what the inhabitants of Tower 1 were promised when they purchased their units.