

NICHOLAS – MANN GATEWAY

Public Comments on Options for Future Development

February 4, 2008 Public Meeting

Introduction

The City of Ottawa, Action Sandy Hill and the University of Ottawa have initiated a collaborative community planning process for the Nicholas Mann Gateway lands bounded by Mann Avenue, the Queensway and the Rideau River.

Two public meetings were held in October of 2007, and questionnaires were available from the City of Ottawa web site, to elicit the public's vision and guidelines for the future of these lands and adjacent areas.

A Design Charrette was held in December. Design professionals and community representatives volunteered their time to work in small groups and produce scenarios for development. They were given the public's vision and guidelines to take into consideration.

A public meeting, consisting of an open house and presentation, was held on February 4, 2008. The public was invited to comment on four options for future development, based on the results of the Design Charrette, prepared by the consulting firm Urban Strategies Inc. Approximately 100 people attended and 38 people completed the questionnaire.

This report was prepared by David Sherwood of Brunet Sherwood Consultants, for Action Sandy Hill, the City of Ottawa and the University of Ottawa. It includes the verbatim public comments on options for the development of the Nicholas-Mann study area. It is based on the completed questionnaires submitted at the February 4th, 2008 public meeting. It is written in the official language of the author of each comment. A bilingual summary document is available and was posted on the City of Ottawa web site. Maps of the four development options were also posted on the City site.

Introduction

The level of attendance at the open house and public meeting, and the degree of analysis in the questionnaires, demonstrate a public engagement in the Nicholas-Mann Gateway design process. Four draft development options were presented. Participants were able to critique them in light of the public's vision and guidelines, which had been established at previous public consultations.

It appears that Sandy Hill residents are prepared for mixed use development on the subject lands,

provided that the density is compatible with adjacent areas. They see development as an improvement over the *status quo*, especially for those areas that were referred to at previous public meetings as “a wasteland”. In any future development, there is a desire for a reduction in the current dominance of roadways, the addition of a pathway network, an enhancement of open spaces, public transit access, and a design that integrates the subject lands into the community. There seems to be an understanding that significant investments will be required to implement a quality redevelopment in this “gateway” location.

The following list summarizes participants’ opinions on key elements of the options.

1-Proposed New Transitway Station

All options showed a new station along the Transitway. It would be approximately half way between the existing Lees and Campus stations, south of Mann Avenue. The response to this was generally favourable. It would reduce walking times to the existing stations and reduce the need for parking in the local area. Some people, on the other hand, noted that an extra stop would cause some delay to the transit system as a whole. Concerns about parking were noted with respect to an arena with two ice sheets (see item 5) or a stadium (in item 11, below).

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its disadvantages?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easier access to Transitway.¹ • New transit station. • Extra transitway stop. • Connection to Transitway. • Extra station de Transitway. • New Transit station. • Extra transitway stop. • Station de transit. • Station supplémentaire de OC Transpo. • Two OC Transpo stations. • Transitway just south of Mann Avenue. • The transit station could be very effective and useful. • More transit stations are positive. • Extra Transitway stop. • Ajout d'une station OC Transpo. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit station slows down the buses. • Another transit stop just slows down bus routes.

¹ Footnote on Format: in this report, comments from the public are presented in Arial Font, lightly edited for spelling and grammar. An unedited transcription of the comments is available on request. The original hand written comments will be retained on file for six months.



2-Proposed Pedestrian Bridge over the Queensway

All options showed a new pedestrian bridge over the Queensway, from Sandy Hill to the Lees Transitway station. This would provide a more direct access than the existing long walk around the curve of the Lees Avenue bridge. There was a slight variation in presentation: Options 3 & 4 show a stairway at each end of the bridge, whereas Options 1 & 2 show access and egress at grade. Public opinion was overwhelmingly in favour of the principle of a pedestrian bridge. The few reservations that were expressed were in terms of user security, especially at night, or cost.

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its <u>disadvantages</u> ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian bridge. • Pedestrian bridge. • Pedestrian bridge. • Pedestrian walkway over Queensway. • Pedestrian bridge • Footbridge over highway, safe, connects neighbourhood. • Pedestrian bridge to Transitway. • Pedestrian linkage to the Transitway. • Passerelle 417. • Pedestrian bridge • Pedestrian bridge. • Pedestrian bridge. • Pedestrian overpass. • Footbridge link to transit station. • Transit access, bridge to Lees. • Pedestrian bridge. • Pedestrian bridge over the Queensway. • Pedestrian bridge to Transitway • Pedestrian bridge to transit station. • Pedestrian bridge • Footbridge. • Pedestrian bridge. • I like the new pedestrian overpass. • Link to Transit station at Lees. • Pedestrian bridge. The bridge could be very effective and useful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am concerned about safety in the overpass to the transit station at Lees. The Lees Avenue bridge is not too desirable at night but at least there are cars going by as some sort of oversight. • Pedestrian bridge- safety issues. • Security concerns re: pedestrian overpass. • Will an overpass be safe at night? • I have security concerns about the pedestrian bridge over the 417. • I don't think the pedestrian overpass at this location is cost effective when there is already a bridge. I bet if you look down the 417 you will find a better place to put one. • Not sure about the need of a pedestrian bridge.

3-Opposition to Through Traffic on Chapel Street

When Strathcona Heights was redeveloped a number of years ago, intense community pressure led to the closing of Chapel Street to automobile traffic at Wiggins Private, between Mann Avenue and Lees Avenue. It remains open to buses, bicycles and pedestrians. In this project, it is intended to maintain that status quo. This was explained at the meeting, leading to a few



comments in support, but it was not evident from the maps, which led to a comments opposing any re-opening of Chapel to through traffic.

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its <u>disadvantages</u> ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapel blocked at Wiggins Private. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Chapel becomes a traffic corridor again. Need to control volume of traffic on Chapel. Attention de ne pas diriger la circulation vers Chapel. Must maintain the blockage on Chapel Street south of Mann Avenue. This was the 'deal' to get community support for the high density development of Strathcona Heights. Must redirect traffic off Chapel to Nicholas.

4-Preserve the Existing Community Gardens

Earlier public consultations indicated that the community gardens just south of Strathcona Heights were very important to conserve, so they were shown on the map for all four options. Some people took note and wrote positive comments on this. See also the favourable comments on Option 4, which provides more open space in the vicinity of the existing community gardens. There were no negative comments.

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its <u>disadvantages</u> ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thanks for including our community garden in all plans. Need community garden expansion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> n/a

5-Arena (with two ice pads)

Previous public consultations demonstrated support for maintaining a public access arena in Sandy Hill, and support for local sports facilities generally (eg. soccer, baseball). All options have an arena. Indeed, they show two ice sheets (the existing arena has one), based on advice from City of Ottawa staff that all new arenas are built with two ice surfaces, for cost and scheduling efficiency. Options 1, 3 and 4 show a new arena, with two ice pads, on the Southeast corner of Mann Avenue and King Edward, on lands that are currently parking lots. Option 2 shows the existing arena (or a new building in the same location), a short distance East of the corner, with a second ice surface added. The questionnaires show that the public is definitely in favour of an arena. Most people who expressed an opinion, support having two ice surfaces. However, many people expressed concern about parking if there is a second ice sheet and no surface parking.

Notes:

1- All options show the elimination of the existing surface parking lots at the corner of Mann and King Edward. There is an existing parking garage directly across Mann Avenue from this location. All options require a new transit station across Nicholas from the arena.

2- At earlier public meetings, a number of people supported a reduction in surface parking as a general principle, however, there was no suggestion of a second ice surface at that time.

3- Some people commented on the ownership of the arena. At the earlier public meetings, the potential for a new arena to result from a public-private partnership was raised.

4- Some people commented on sports facilities in addition to an arena. The map colour used to identify the arena complex was identified in the legend as “Community Sports Facilities”. The arena complex in Options 1, 3 & 4 showed some accessory buildings suitable for ancillary activities.

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its <u>disadvantages</u>?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arena near the corner. • The arena, important for the community to maintain this. • Rebuild sports arena. • Hockey arena. • Hockey arena. • Larger arena. • The best feature of this option is the increased sports services to the community through the building of a new facility. • Community sports facilities. • New rink. • Location of the sports facility. • Improved accessibility to arena, alternative to cars. • Taking out the existing arena and incorporating it with a new U of O facility. • Two rink arena: NOT to share with University. • Une place raisonnable pour sports. • Community sports facilities. • Sports facility. • New Transit station improves accessibility to the arena without need for cars. • Arena expansion. • Sports facility. • Position of arena. • Sports facilities. • The rinks are well placed. • Hockey arenas are still included. • Transit station near arena. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need parking for arena- should be underground. • Where is the parking garage for those people that use the two arenas? If one is to be built, it should be camouflaged. • With more sports facilities on the corner, traffic will increase on Mann (i.e. in front of the public school). Double ice rink = double cars. • Need parking for ice rink/ sports. • Requires underground parking for arena. • Need parking for rink. • The hockey arena worries me the most. Even with the proposed new OC Transpo stop, it's still a lot of traffic and people. • Parking is a must with an arena. • The hockey arena with another skating rink, this will increase traffic and use of the area immensely, noise, pollution. • The location of the sports facility may encourage user traffic through Sandy Hill. A hockey arena at Lees and Mann is not necessary. • No hockey arena, I'm all for that. • The retention of the old Sandy Hill arena doesn't seem like a viable option given the age of the building. • What are these sports facilities in addition to the arena? Will they be owned by Ottawa U or the City? Will they be expensive for local residents to use?

6-Traffic Circle (also known as a Roundabout)

Options 1 and 3 show a traffic circle, or roundabout, along the King Edward/ Lees axis, South of Mann Avenue, in approximately the same location as the existing complex intersection with traffic signals. Options 2 and 4 show an intersection similar to the existing one. Existing or proposed, this road nexus allows buses on and off the Transitway, it signals to drivers on the Queensway off-ramp that they are entering a local traffic zone, and it connects Lees and King Edward. Comments on Options 1 and 3 in this regard indicate pros and cons, with more in favour than opposed.

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its <u>disadvantages</u>?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic circle. • Traffic circle. • The traffic circle. • Round-about is also nice: to slow traffic, to make a central point. • Roundabout. • Round-about: breaks flow of traffic from Lees overpass. • Round-about. • Round-about helps "include" the new Transitway stop. • Rond point. • Round-about • Traffic circle to calm traffic and make it easier to navigate through the area. Traffic circle • Rond point. • The traffic circle is a nice touch. • Creating round about. • The roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traffic circle is a nice idea, but where will the traffic go? Changing the street route (like Option 4 with the tunnel) is necessary. • I am concerned about the traffic circle from the perspective of a pedestrian. Unless the circle is carefully designed (with pedestrian controlled lights) traffic circles are extremely hazardous to pedestrians. • Round about may cause traffic chaos. • Need more than one traffic circle to redirect Quebec traffic. Would recommend The removal of the road to Lees Avenue will mean more traffic will flow to Nicholas-Laurier-King Edward to get to Gatineau. (If a bridge is ever built to the East of the MacDonald-Cartier bridge this may be alleviated.)

7-Building Height / Density Gradient / Buffering

The previous public consultations had indicated a definite discomfort with tall buildings such as those existing the South side of the Queensway, visible from Sandy Hill. Those consultations also called for “compatible” building heights and densities near the existing neighbourhood. On the other hand, there was some support for at least medium height buildings near the Queensway, where they can act as a buffer for noise and light coming from the highway.

All of the options respond to this by proposing a density gradient with lower masses near the existing neighbourhood and taller buildings or more density nearer the Queensway. Each option did this in a slightly different way.

Note that there is an escarpment on a Northwest to Southeast axis along the edge of Strathcona Heights (whence the origin of the name). In each option, the lowest height and density is at the

foot of that slope (in the map legend this was identified as “Neighbourhood Scale Residential”, in a cream colour).

Southwest of that, and thus a little further from Strathcona Heights, each option shows, in a slightly different configuration, “Mixed Use Low to Medium Profile Buildings”, in yellow. (Note that Option 3 shows a Track and Field facility in part of this area.)

And further Southwest, fronting on that part of Lees Avenue that is parallel to the Queensway off-ramp, in the middle portion of the maps, Options 1, 2 and 4 show “Mixed Use Medium Profile Buildings, which may include residential, institutional, office” (coloured blue on the maps). Option 3 shows a Track and Field facility in this area.

The final sector, toward the bottom of the maps, is inside the arc of Lees Avenue, between Lees and the Queensway. Although not indicated on the maps, this land is the lowest in elevation, such that buildings would appear less tall when viewed from Sandy Hill. It is where all four options show the greatest height and density. All options show “Mixed Use Low to Medium Profile Buildings” in yellow along this portion of the Lees Avenue frontage. (Note that the road configuration in Option 4 is somewhat different than the others.) Options 1, 2 & 3 show three “Landmark Buildings” in bright orange with “Mixed Use Medium Profile Buildings” (in light orange) between them, along the Queensway to create a buffer for noise and light. Option 4 is a bit different, it has four of the bright orange “Landmark Buildings” but places “Mixed Use Low to Medium Profile Buildings” between them as the buffer (in yellow).

The following are the public comments on the height / density gradient, including all options. The number of comments are divided evenly between the pros and the cons. Many people agree with the density gradients proposed, compatible building types nearest the existing Sandy Hill neighbourhood and greater densities further away. But many others do not find the higher density areas acceptable.

Note:

It is clear that there is serious opposition to what people consider ‘high rise’ buildings. The options did not indicate an exact number of building storeys for each type of development, and the words ‘high rise’ do not appear in the descriptions of the options. It is probably fair to say that if the highest density category were considered ‘high rise’, then some of the persons who agreed with the density gradient would then oppose it; and if the highest density category were not considered ‘high rise’, then some of the persons who made negative comments could then accept it. This issue needs to be clarified in future public consultations.

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its <u>disadvantages</u> ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low to higher height of buildings from core to Queensway. • Good distribution of uses and building mass to form a buffer. • Small scale buildings in the residential area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Développement en hauteur. • The landmark buildings are not in keeping with the original desire of the group to have <u>no</u> high rise buildings. • The proposed high rise buildings are too high.

7

REPORT BY / PAR DAVID SHERWOOD, BRUNET SHERWOOD CONSULTANTS (613) 674-2042 FOR / POUR



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Varying level (height) of buildings. • Low density of the proposed buildings. • Density ok. • Low density of buildings • Like varying levels (heights) of buildings as long as not more than 8 stories. • Density OK. • Lower building profiles. • Medium size / height residential or office buildings are located directly on Lees Avenue closer to Mann. • Like the varying level of buildings. • Good buffer to Queensway. • Gradual housing level. • Human scale buildings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High rise buildings along Robinson Avenue serves to isolate Robinson Village. • Let's avoid high rises. • High rise buildings a bit more acceptable but still do not like them. • High buildings out of character. • Bâtiments répétés... combien d'étages? Suggestion: 8 maximum. • Proposed higher buildings will tend to isolate Robinson Village. • Density too high. No buildings above 10 storeys. • No buildings above 6 stories. • High density of buildings near Queensway and near Robinson Village. • Density of buildings is too high. • Density of development looks too high. • Unhappy with tall buildings on border of 417. • The danger is that a large group of medium/high buildings could be built, creating exactly what we do not want: an über urban landscape with little green spaces, and a "condo" city with little connection to its surroundings.
---	--

8-Mixed Use

Earlier public consultations indicated most people would be comfortable with a mixed use development. All of the options responded to this. All those who chose to comment in the questionnaires were in favour, there were no negative comments. There were fewer comments on this issue than most issues raised at the earlier meetings, which may indicate tacit agreement.

What do you like about this, what are its advantages?	What do you <u>dislike</u> about this, what are its <u>disadvantages</u> ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good mixed use. • Good potential for mixed use. • Mixed use. • Mixed use area. • Lots of mixed use. • Mixed use seems feasible. • Good mixed use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a

9-Removal of Lees Avenue Overpass; Tunnel under Queensway

In the earlier public consultations, Lees Avenue generated a lot of comment. People said it is built like a highway ramp: high speed traffic, not friendly to pedestrians, a circuitous walk to the

8

REPORT BY / PAR DAVID SHERWOOD, BRUNET SHERWOOD CONSULTANTS (613) 674-2042 FOR / POUR



Lees Transitway Station, and consumes a lot of land. This is part of a broader pattern in which many people noted that roads seem to be the dominant land use.

So it is not surprising that the public was clearly in favour of Option 4, which proposes to remove the Lees overpass and replace it with a tunnel under the Queensway in the King Edward axis. Many of the negative comments on the other options were about the fact that they did not deal adequately with the Lees issue.

Options 1, 2 & 3 show Lees Avenue in the same location as it exists at this time. Which does not mean a passive *status quo* approach, rather, Lees is designed as a pedestrian friendly urban street instead of an arterial road. The maps show black lines along the sides of the overpass, indicating enhanced pedestrian walkways, and a proper staircase down to Robinson Village to replace the current dirt track.

Finally, in Option 4, the Queensway off-ramp is also rebuilt, and “hugs” the Transitway. Together with the elimination of the Lees overpass, this would release more usable land area, most of which is shown as extra open space in the area near the existing community gardens.

OPTION 4: What do you like about this option, what are its advantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous plaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points forts?

- Getting rid of Lees overpass.
- No Lees overpass.
- Redesigned Lees Avenue - excellent.
- Eliminates a lot of the traffic on Lees Ave.
- Reduction of Lees Avenue and its grade.
- I know (Lees Avenue redesign) it is costly but it will do the most to improve the aesthetic of that part of Sandy Hill.
- Makes the most use of the space by eliminating the Lees Avenue bridge and creating an underpass instead.
- Removal of Lees overpass and replacement by a tunnel.
- Lees Avenue redirect.
- Minimize roads.
- Fewer roads, slower roads.
- The overpass is intimidating. It's also an eyesore and takes up too much space. It would be great to lose it.
- Removal of Lees bridge, it's imaginative.
- Removal of Lees overpass is a major advantage.
- Elimination of the eyesore Lees overpass.
- Gets rid of Lees Avenue overpass.
- Removal of Lees overpass.
- Gets rid of the incredibly ugly Lees overpass.
- Getting rid of overpass.
- Overpass gone!

9

REPORT BY / PAR DAVID SHERWOOD, BRUNET SHERWOOD CONSULTANTS (613) 674-2042 FOR / POUR



- Elimination of curved ramp to Queensway.
- Best option in terms of road work.
- Diminution du bruit si le viaduc disparaît.
- I like this one best because Lees has been removed.
- There is no need for vehicular access across the Queensway at all. The Greenfield ramp to the Queensway West can also be a ramp to the Queensway East.
- If traffic engineers reject the "radical" realignment, an option should still be on the table where the overpass is redone as a city street. Right angle turns are completely feasible for this road since traffic is light. The main goal is King Edward access to the Queensway East.

OPTIONS 1, 2 & 3: What do you dislike about this option, what are its disadvantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous déplaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points faibles?

- Problem of Lees overpass not addressed.
- Overpass is still there, curved street.
- Lees Avenue au Queensway prend beaucoup trop d'espace.
- Retains Lees overpass.
- I would prefer to have Lees Avenue reduced like in Option 4.
- More roads, not fewer.
- Lees Avenue and roadways in general still predominate the landscape.
- Roads continue to consume a lot of space.
- Does not remove the Lees overpass.
- Lees Avenue as is.
- Lees overpass retained.
- Overpass is still here.
- Does not address Lees Avenue overpass.
- Roads still take up too much space.
- Traffic on Lees not resolved (overpass kept).
- Lees and roadways still predominate landscape.
- Problem with Lees overpass not addressed.
- Overpass.

A few participants in the consultation wondered whether the elimination of the Lees overpass would create traffic management problems, as follows.

OPTION 4: What do you dislike about this option, what are its disadvantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous déplaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points faibles?

- I am concerned about where the traffic will go.
- Concern re: management of traffic.
- Disruption of the traffic flow, clearly not a student oriented option.
- Probably will increase traffic on Greenfields. A traffic study is required.

- The elimination of the Lees Avenue overpass will force traffic onto Nicholas, which would only be sustainable if it were balanced with a new east end bridge into Gatineau- which realistically wouldn't be likely to happen until long after this development was completed.

A few participants wondered if the expense of a tunnel and major reconfiguration of Lees Avenue, including re-grading the land, was affordable and therefore realistic.

- Cost is the only disadvantage I see.
- (Lees Avenue redesign) is costly
- Probably not feasible, too expensive, City will not approve.
- Cost is likely an issue. Perhaps a different realignment of Lees.
- More expensive and therefore more uncertain.
- Very expensive.
- Dispendieux. Beaucoup de construction. Travaux plus longs.
- Option 4 is “never-never land” (not doable).

10- Open Spaces, Pathways, Green Space

Previous public consultations noted a desire for pathway connections through this area, for example between the river and the canal or from the north to the south side of the Queensway. It was also clear that the public wanted all existing parklands conserved. In all options, there is no change to existing parkland and there are proposed new pathways. As is noted elsewhere in this report, response to Option 4 was favourable in part because it provides new open spaces, there was a positive reaction to the pedestrian mall and plaza in Option 2, and some people noted that Options 1 and 3 preserve the most land in the western reaches of the Strathcona escarpment.

The numerous public comments on this matter are listed in other sections of this report and are not repeated here.

11- PUBLIC COMMENTS on other aspects of INDIVIDUAL OPTIONS

The preceding comments are on elements which are common to at least two, and as many as four, of the options. The following comments concern those design elements which are unique to each of the options. Also included are those questionnaires in which the respondent made an overall evaluation of the option rather than comment on a specific aspect of it. Finally, comment sheets in which the person left either the “advantages” or the “disadvantages” section blank are tabulated.

Option 1

The central portion of Option 1 shows a new street at the foot of the Strathcona escarpment plus the potential for a parallel series of pedestrian pathways roughly half way between that and Lees Avenue.

The Mann Avenue frontage has an arena or sports facilities at the corner of King Edward (purple colour) and mixed use low to medium profile buildings further East (yellow).

Options 1 & 2 were, on the whole, rated by participants as better than the status quo, better than Option 3, but not as good as Option 4. They received a number of favourable as well as unfavourable comments. In both options, many comments pointed out that Robinson Village, although gaining a stairway to Lees Avenue and a formal pathway to Sandy Hill alongside it, would still be otherwise separated. Several participants wished for more open space in the final design.

What do you like about this option, what are its advantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous plaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points forts?

General Observations

- Redevelopment is better than the current use.
- Improvement over status quo.
- Low impact.
- Uses existing infrastructure.
- Low restructuring costs.
- Creation of new neighbourhood with own streets.
- More housing: good.
- Élimine un site qui est malpropre et permet de nettoyer le terrain et un site d'enfouissement.
- Meets university needs.
- The best of the four options. It is a realistic development and combines all the attractive features available in the other three designs without the drawbacks.
- This is the next best option after No 4.
- I like Options 1 and 2. They are the least disruptive and are the most doable.
- My second favorite after Option 4.
- If 4 is not feasible, next best option is 1.

12

REPORT BY / PAR DAVID SHERWOOD, BRUNET SHERWOOD CONSULTANTS (613) 674-2042 FOR / POUR



Pathways (see also dislikes and disadvantages, below)

- More pedestrian and cycling friendly.
- Better walking and cycling trails that provide more possibilities for navigating through the area at different times of day and night (less threatening)
- Pedestrian pathways.
- "Official" stairs from Robinson up the Lees bridge.
- (Plaza is ok, but I would put in a more usable location, like Option 2.)
 - n/a (12% of the respondents did not identify anything they liked about Option 1.)

(Option 1 Dislike / Disadvantages)

What do you dislike about this option, what are its disadvantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous déplaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points faibles?

Roads

- Get rid of the Lees-417 exit.
- Too much automobile access.
- No attempt to beautify the Lees overpass at all.
- Don't like non-rectilinear nature of new streets.

Pathways

- The cycling options are a little less good than Option 2.
- Don't see any improvement in bike paths or walking paths.

Open space

- Not enough public green space.
- Minimum enhancement of green space.
- Not enough nature.
- Add a park.
- I liked the idea of an urban forest.

Robinson Village

- Robinson Village still isolated.
- Robinson Village still seems a bit removed from the community.
- Robinson Village continues to be poorly integrated into Sandy Hill.
- Doesn't help Robinson Village isolation.

Other Comments

- Residential area bordered by Lees Avenue and Queensway will be really isolated, cut off because Lees Avenue is a thoroughfare.
- Increased emphasis on Mann Avenue will be detrimental to the neighbourhood if it means that Mann-Range-Charlotte will be even more used by those driving through the neighbourhood.
- Make it harder for through traffic to use Sandy Hill streets!
- Need to get rid of the City of Ottawa facility (public works yard). It is the "first view" of the community from the East.
- City garage stays put! No Way!

- The area is already too congested. The only access to the city centre Pretoria Bridge, Laurier and Rideau streets.
- Compensation costs for lost land for some stakeholders.
- What is the impact on parking?
- What are Mobin Foundation plans? What happens when the rest develops?
- Not exciting or imaginative. No visual appeal.
- Only a marginal upgrade in the quality of the neighbourhood.
- The priority seems to be the University's needs.
- Various surface elevations around the Lees overpass make it hard to envision what could be built in this semi-circle, it would need to happen all at once.
- Pas assez fini, il faudra refaire le processus dans quelques années, définissons tout maintenant.
- Aréna pour le coin de la rue... pas très beau, mieux d'avoir des édifices (comme Option 2).
- In any option, please keep the buildings back from roadways and keep buildings at six stories or less.
- "Passable".
- No consideration as national capital.
- Why not combine the Transitway station under the Queensway?
 - n/a (21% of the respondents did not identify anything to dislike about Option 1.)

Option 2

The central portion of Option 2 shows a new street at the foot of the Strathcona escarpment, and a formal pedestrian mall roughly half way between that and Lees Avenue, with a plaza at the North end, behind the buildings on Mann Avenue.

The Mann Avenue frontage has, at the corner of King Edward, “Mixed Use Medium Profile Buildings, which may include residential, institutional, office” (coloured blue on the maps) and an arena or sports facilities further East (purple colour).

Options 1 & 2 are rated somewhere in between the two others. In general, the participants responded positively to the more formal pedestrian mall and open plaza in the core of Option 2 (as compared to a series of informal pathway connections without a plaza in Option 1). A number of participants responded negatively to the massing and density along Mann Avenue in Option 2 (arena plus what people tended to assume was an extension to the university campus) and preferred Option 1 in that regard (arena plus what people tended to assume was residential development). On balance, there seems to be a slight preference for Option 2: it had more questionnaires with no negative comments (36%) than Option 1 (21%) and slightly more respondents who identified it as their favourite option.

What do you like about this option, what are its advantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous plaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points forts?

General Observations

- Interesting focal points, eye catching.
- Leaves a lot of room in the residential parts, but some housing and commercial.
- Like business/storefronts.
- This option has a good distribution of uses and building mass to form a buffer.
- This is my favourite option, aesthetically.
- This is my preferred plan.
- Le meilleur plan.
- I like Options 1 and 2. They are the least disruptive and are the most doable.

Pathways

- I like the pedestrian and cycling centre street.
- Walkway running through the village.
- Lots of safe spaces for pedestrians and less emphasis on cars.
- More pedestrian and cycling friendly.
- Better trails for walking and cycling that are safer and allow for better navigation.
- Plus de places pour les piétons.
- Meilleures interconnexions entre voies cyclables.
- Plazas.
- Nice use of a public plaza – creates a centre with the sports facility and a mixed use area.

15

REPORT BY / PAR DAVID SHERWOOD, BRUNET SHERWOOD CONSULTANTS (613) 674-2042 FOR / POUR



- Public plaza.
- The public plaza is attractive.
- Park, and treed walkways.
- Bike trails.

Other comments

- Les espaces dédiées aux sports ne sont pas dans le milieu de l'escarpement.
- More housing = good.
- Good links to transit.
- Roadways.
- Good use of hollow of Lees overpass.
- Bon emplacement pour un aréna.
- Use of Mobin Foundation lands for housing.
- Plus d'arbres.
 - n/a (13% of the respondents did not identify anything they liked about Option 2.)

(Option 2 Dislike / Disadvantages)

What do you dislike about this option, what are its disadvantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous déplaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points faibles?

Roads

- Queensway traffic to Quebec will still use King Edward.
- Strange angle of streets; aren't you supposed to be respectful of the current neighbourhood?
- Get rid of 417 Lees exit.
- No roundabout.

Open space

- The community square seems out of place. If it were decided to have an open area, green space would be a preferred option.
- Not enough public green space.
- No outdoor playing field.
- Buildings are too dense- not enough green spaces.
- Not enough nature.
- I loved the comment (from a member of the audience) about an urban forest here.

Density at the corner of Mann and King Edward

- It has greater density compared to Option 1.
- Possible higher concentration of office buildings.
- Massive U of O dormitories at Nicholas and Lees avenue – ugly.
- Disproportionate balance favouring the university.
- More encroachment of university (the campus feel off Mann is unnecessary).
- Make University of Ottawa facility lot into residential. Locate the facility on the other side of the highway on Lees.

Other comments

- Pas assez d'arrêt pour le bruit.
- Pas assez d'arrêt pour la pollution.
- Don't see any more bike paths or walking paths.
- Robinson Village is still too isolated.
- No detailed plan for better and affordable co-op housing- necessary in downtown Ottawa.
- I don't like this option.
- Surface parking doesn't work in this area.
 - n/a (36% of the respondents did not identify anything to dislike about Option 2.)

Option 3

The central portion of Option 3 shows a track and field / sports facility with seating for 3,000 to 5,000 spectators, which is much smaller than Lansdowne Park. The new street at the foot of the Strathcona escarpment could be downgraded to a service and delivery lane in the vicinity of the stadium.

The Mann Avenue frontage is the same as Option 1, an arena or sports facilities at the corner of King Edward (purple colour) and mixed use low to medium profile buildings further East (yellow).

Option 3 was very unpopular, mainly because of the track & field stadium. While a minority of participants were in favour, in keeping with the public's previously stated support for sports and recreation in the neighbourhood, the overwhelming majority were opposed, many vehemently so. The main concerns are that it would generate traffic without providing any parking, be a nuisance during major events due to noise, lighting or litter, not benefit local residents, not be compatible, or be too large to allow an integrated land use plan. Fully 46% of the questionnaires listed no positive features in Option 3, which is the highest of the four options. Only 11% listed no negative features, which is the lowest of the four options.

What do you like about this option, what are its advantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous plaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points forts?

General Observations

- This is the best option by far (student).
- This is OK, if Lees Ave cannot be moved.
- Improved land use over status quo.
- Augmenterait un peu l'apparence du lieu, qui doit partir une transformation, ceci ressemble à un site d'enfouissement actuellement.
- Wasteland will be used productively and create a lively neighbourhood.

Pathways

- More pedestrian and cycling friendly.
- Safer pathways with better connections for navigating through the area.
- Bike paths.
- Walking / cycling trails.
- Same positive aspects as other three designs: including access to Lees Transitway for students.

Track & Field Facility (stadium) (see also the comments under dislikes and disadvantages)

- Option 3 is the only one with a playing field. This is the community's biggest need in terms of facility need.
- Stadium would be fantastic and would allow for large events to be held on campus.
- Running track.
- Stadium would be great for the community and University. No longer have a CFL team, Ottawa U football is all the city has left.

- Running track.
- Student likes stadium option.
- Greater cohesion of university lands and uses.

Other comments

- More housing good.
- Low density of the development, due to the space required for the stadium.
- Improved garden/ greenspace
- Not much to like, except pedestrian link to the Transitway.
- Very little to like. New Transit station the only good thing
 - n/a (46% of the respondents did not identify anything they liked about Option 3.)

(Option 3 Dislike / Disadvantages)

What do you dislike about this option, what are its disadvantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous déplaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points faibles?

General Observations

- Not enough housing and local commercial (groceries and cafés, etc.)
- No storefronts / retail.
- Pas assez de résidentiel.
- Interconnection with neighbourhood.

Track & Field Facility (stadium)

- Stadium.
- The stadium.
- A football stadium.
- The stadium in the middle. No.
- Option 3 is a poor use of land (the sports oval). Should there be a need for the sports oval/field, it should be put in U of O lands on the South side of the Queensway.
- Stadium does not need to be located there. University has under utilized space at Lees campus.
- Too much sports facility.
- Not enough parkland and connecting pathways through the community.
- Sports field = potential traffic congestion and certainly more noise, more litter.
- Basically transfers all these lands to U of O for multiple sports activities.
- I hate the football stadium. It completely destroys the potential of the area as community space.
- I absolutely hate the new stadium unless U of O is willing to put residential on the existing sports field.
- A large stadium in this area is inappropriate. There are other options. This creates noise, traffic, and takes up space.
- The sports stadium is too many institutional buildings.
- A large stadium in this area is inappropriate. There are other options. This creates noise, traffic, and takes up space.
- It would not be used enough on a regular basis.

- Concern with the stadium is impact on traffic and noise level. However, it does lead to lower density of development.
- Concern regarding noise and traffic from the stadium.
- The stadium, though an excellent feature presuming it were to be properly shared with the community, would choke the area and make it overwhelming considering the room for parking and the available streets and transportation to and from the arena.
- What is the purpose of the big stadium? More housing would be a better use for the neighbourhood. A stadium just enlarges the University campus to the detriment of the residential nature of Sandy Hill.
- Makes a destination for motorists (stadium).
- Stadium, loss of mixed use, critical mass of area goes to University.
- Large track and field and student housing. The University would dominate and not balanced with community use.
- More noise (stadium).
- The University already has a large field by the sportsplex.
- This is a bad option: waste of space on a stadium, single use of the land, no real use to the public, no trees, real imposition on surrounding area.
- We already have enough sports facilities. A 3-5,000 track and field facility would either sit vacant and attract loiterers or by default end up being used for Bluesfest, Exhibition, etc. Heaven help us. Look at the paralysis of the Glebe.
- The stadium takes too much space and dominates the area. Where is the parking to accommodate all the cars that it would attract? Parking garages, by and large, are a blight and should be placed underground.
- Trop d'espaces revirés à un terrain sportif et les estrades pour 3 à 5,000 personnes se verra prendre la place de Lansdowne Park, amenant des personnes fêtant et un grand nombre de voitures qui polluent.
- Would the stadium include ample parking garage?
- Hodge podge of uses. Stadium doesn't fit.
- New stadium might pose a problem for nearby residents.
- Favours University mainly- good for University.
- For me, a track is only marginally better as a neighbour than a vacant field.
- I guess a stadium is preferable to a Wal-Mart or an airport.

Other comments

- No concrete suggestions for the housing co-op (and other affordable housing in the area).
- Neighbourhood bounded by Lees and Queensway.
- Bâtiments repères de 10 étages sur Robinson.
- Increased emphasis on Mann will be detrimental to neighbourhood if it means that Mann-Range-Charlotte are used even more heavily by through traffic.
- Robinson Village is still isolated
- Get rid of the City facility (public works yard) near the river.
- Where are the new bike paths / walking paths?
- Not as good for cycling as Option 2.
- Why aren't the streets N-S and E-W?
- Get rid of 417 Lees exit.

- Not enough nature.
- Not enough public green space.
- Has any thought been given to doing an option with a stadium and a revamped Lees/Robinson, as per Option 4?
- I dislike this option the most.
- Cette option me plaît le moins.
- This is the worst option. I vote no.
- Least favorite option.
- This is the worst option.
- À rejeter.
 - n/a (11% of the respondents did not identify anything to dislike about Option 3.)

Option 4

The main feature of Option 4 is that it eliminates the Lees Avenue overpass. Access to the lands south of the Queensway is provided by a tunnel parallel to the Transitway in the King Edward axis. The Queensway off-ramp is also rebuilt, closer to the Transitway. Together, these two acts would leave more usable land area, most of which is shown as extra open space in the area near the existing community gardens.

Like the other options, the central portion of Option 4 shows a new street at the foot of the Strathcona escarpment, but it also shows a street, rather than a pedestrian link, roughly half way between that and Lees Avenue.

The Mann Avenue frontage is very similar to Options 1 and 3, an arena or sports facilities at the corner of King Edward (purple colour) and mixed use low to medium profile buildings further East (yellow).

South of the Queensway, Option 4 differs from the others in having some “Mixed Use Medium Profile Buildings, which may include residential, institutional, office” (coloured blue on the maps), and a traffic circle at the south end of the tunnel, but these received almost no comments and are outside of the formal study area under review.

Option 4 was the most popular, mainly because the Lees overpass is removed, and a tunnel added in the King Edward axis. Another popular aspect is that it proposes that most of the land that is no longer required for roads be used for open space. Other participants commented that since this design was largely free of the constraints of the existing road network, it resulted in the best human scale community design. It was also noted that, thanks to the removal of the approach ramp to the overpass, Robinson Village would no longer be separated from the rest of Sandy Hill by a physical barrier. Only 3% of respondents failed to identify one or more positive features in Option 4, and 33% stated explicitly that it was the best option. The negative comments were on a variety of aspects, with no particular consensus among them.

What do you like about this option, what are its advantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous plaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points forts?

General Observations

- More of a "neighbourhood" feel.
- Beautiful and friendly community layout.
- Integrates community best.
- Human scale, integrated into neighbourhood.
- More community friendly - creation of a new neighbourhood.
- Excellent sentiment de quartier. Belle planification urbaine.
- Good integration with community.

- This is the best option.
- My favourite option.
- Best design presented.
- Preferred option.
- This option is the best choice.
- This is my preferred option.
- My preferred option.
- My favourite.
- This is the best option for me.
- My favourite option.
- Mon 2^e choix. Moins de pollution et bruit. Une bonne occasion d'utiliser un tunnel.
- Strong preference for this plan. This has vision and is in line with community views. Land use designations appeal.

Robinson Village

- Connection between all parts of Sandy Hill including Robinson.
- Better links to Robinson Village.
- Robinson Village will not be apart from the rest of the community.
- Integrates Robinson Village and river parklands.
- Connect Robinson Village.
- Robinson Village better connected.
- Good connections Robinson Village.
- Better integration of Robinson Village with the rest of the community.
- Reconnecting Robinson.
- Connects to Robinson community.
- Better integration of Robinson Village with the rest of Sandy Hill.
- Closer connection of Robinson Village to rest of Sandy Hill.
- Excellente connexion du Village Robinson au quartier.
- Robinson 'Crusoe' is no longer on an island.

Roads and Traffic

- Manages traffic best.
- Provides more traffic through the community and access to residential areas increases from different angles/pathways.
- Better traffic patterns.
- Likely less traffic.
- Better traffic pattern.
- Current functionality of roadways maintained with better land use.
- Redirects traffic away.

Gateway

- Creates a gateway.
- Good gateway to Sandy Hill.

- Belle entrée sur la ville, une vue sur le Parlement.
- Beauté d'un rond point et un tunnel donnant accès au centre-ville.
- More dramatic gateway.

Open Space

- Lots of open space.
- More open space, community gardens, soccer fields.
- Espaces pour jardins.
- More trees, urban forest.
- More open space.
- Lots of parks is good.
- More open space.

Pathways and Pedestrians

- More pedestrian and cycling friendly.
- Rues qui favorisent les piétons, éloigne la masse des voyageurs par transport en commun du secteur résidentiel.
- Pedestrian walkway.
- Plaza.
- Improved pedestrian areas.

Other comments

- Buffer sounds with taller buildings.
- Good buffer between 417 and community.
- Store fronts.
- Good commercial on Mann Ave.
- Good connections to transit.
- A tunnel would go a long way to making the area more visually appealing.
- More housing good.
- More available land for rational development.
- Creates a space with which you can really work and create something cohesive.
- More cohesive land area (elimination of some mixed grades).
- Removal of grade levels associated with Lees overpass makes for more community oriented development and more desirable property development.
- Grade flattened.
- The comments on this option costing more are misleading. The capital cost may be higher, but the avoided cost of rebuilding the overpass is significant, as are the increased land values.
 - n/a (3% of the respondents did not identify anything they liked about Option 4.)

(Option 4 Dislike / Disadvantages)

What do you dislike about this option, what are its disadvantages?

/ Qu'est-ce qui vous déplaît dans cette option, quels sont ses points faibles?

- No shopping.
- Buildings should not be taller than 6 storeys.
- Buildings out of scale with a walking community.
- Looking at alternative cross streets.
- Safety issues re: tunnel.
- Trop d'espace pour le Queensway, à craindre l'élargissement du Queensway.
- New streets don't fit existing neighbourhood.
- Get rid of 417 Lees exit.
- Could you get the roundabout from Option 1- I like it.
- Need to address parking needs.
- No new paths.
- May be less bike friendly than Option 2.
- Lots of green space not accessible. Surrounded by buildings.
- Not enough public green space.
- Not enough forest.
- Need more trees.
- The lack of new sporting facilities.
- Like the "idea" of opening Robinson Village into the Sandy Hill area, but not at the cost of more apartment buildings, more traffic, and an influx of students moving into our small area.
- Robinson Village: like the idea of connecting, but not at the cost of more apartment buildings, more traffic and more students.
- Move the City works yard. An eyesore.
- Traffic from City trucks.
- Move the City yard.
- Need to change City works yard to residential.
 - n/a (17% of the respondents did not identify anything to dislike about Option 4.)

12- GENERALIZED COMMENTS

- My comment applies to all options. My concern is with respect to tree plantings by the developers that are awarded the contracts. It seems that actual developments often are devoid of trees, despite the fact that the community plan, and perhaps even the actual construction drawings, include green space with trees. This has been my experience with local infills. Please include in the tender process strict requirements and enforcement of tree planting and maintenance.
- La revitalisation des espaces proches de l'autoroute est une excellente initiative. Il est cependant extrêmement dommage de voir que toutes les options proposées présentent une augmentation du réseau routier, or plus de routes engendrent plus de voitures et plus de voitures, plus de pollution et moins de sécurité. Encourager l'utilisation de l'automobile, même indirectement, représente une erreur majeure à court, moyen et long terme. Ces options sont teintées d'anachronisme, elles auraient été considérées comme prodigieuses dans les années 60. Nous avons changé de siècle, de millénaire, il est temps de prendre en considération les défis de notre temps. Ces options ne sont pas des options vertes! Il ne devrait y avoir aucune sortie d'autoroute qui se dirige vers Sandy Hill. Les espaces réaménagés devraient être des zones piétonnes (pour les familles et les étudiants) selon les exemples européens. Les espaces verts devraient représenter les 3/4 de la surface réaménagée. Ce projet représente un investissement majeur et devrait être l'illustration d'une volonté d'évolution et de progrès de la part de la ville d'Ottawa. Soyons verts!
- We moved to Sandy Hill 2.5 years ago to have a family - no option will help us do this. More Roads = More Cars. Status quo is just fine. I do not drive in the suburbs, why should they drive on new roads in Sandy Hill?
- I hate all your options- downtown should be protected. We own only one car and do not want/need another one.
- This comment applies to all options. There was only a one-line reference to "green community". I think all the development should be at least LEED certified, and possibly even carbon-neutral. This should be specified in tender documents.

- end -