



Minutes of the ASH Board of Directors

Monday, August 29, 2016

7:00 PM to 9:00 PM

Present from the Board: Chad Rollins, Bob Forbes, Susan Young, Larry Newman, John Verbaas, Ralph Blaine, Kelly McRae, Pat Archer

Emeline Sparks and Councillor Mathieu Fleury were present

1 Introductions were made

2 Review and Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as amended on a motion from Pat/Bob

3 Approval of The minutes of May 27, 2016

The minutes were approved as amended on a motion from Kelly/Larry

4 Councillor's Report

The report from the Councillor as submitted by Emeline Sparks is attached. In addition to this written report Mr. Fleury make the following comments:

Some improvements have been made to the landscaping near the new Odawa Bridge and the public is asked to keep the city abreast of any problems (garbage, etc) in this area.

The annual "walk about" to make students aware of bylaws, etc will be held at 6:00 PM September 6th (Tues) starting at the Sandy Hill Community Centre. All residents are welcome to take part.

Mr. Fleury agreed to follow up on the ASH letter suggesting modification to the Somerset Bike lane project.

The new speed limit of 40 km/hr on residential streets was discussed

Motion 4.1 That ASH support the designation of 40k/hr speed zones on all residential streets within the official boundaries of Sandy Hill. (Ralph/Bob) - Carried

Councillor Fleury commented on the new zoning and site plan initiatives that Council is taking. The details are in the attached report.



A member of the public (Linda Paul) reported that the configuration of the new curbs at the corner of Stewart and Nelson (part of the Stewart Street Greening) make it difficult for people in wheelchairs to cross Stewart Street. Mathieu agreed to look into this.

5 Matters Arising from the Minutes

a. Truck Tunnel Update

John presented a written report (attached) on the recent city proposal for a \$2 billion tunnel under Sandy Hill. City transport committee will consider this on September 7th. The next step will be to ask the province for funds for an environmental study of the proposal.

Motion 5.1: that ASH support the initiative to do an environmental assessment study on the most recent tunnel project. (Ralph/Larry) - Carried (one opposed)

It was agreed that John would stress at the committee meeting that Sandy Hill wants a solution to the problem of truck traffic on the downtown streets.

b Safe Injection Site Document

Chad will send the edited document out again for comments from Board.

c. Homestead Consultation

It was agreed that Chad, Pat and Jeremy would work out an approach to consulting the community on the idea of building a gazebo in Strathcona Park using the Homestead fund.

d. WebSite Maintenance

It was agreed that Bob and Ralph would work out a sharing of responsibilities for maintaining the ASH website.

e. Letter to Viscount Alexander - Chad has sent this letter.

f. Heritage Forum -

Larry is working on possible sessions featuring Sandy Hill for this forum.



On another topic Larry noted that Heritage Ottawa is open to suggestions from individuals concerning new heritage designation in Sandy Hill. Larry agreed to send a note to Cathy Major on this for the next community bulletin.

The Board agreed that we should ask that time be set aside during the Heritage Forum on October 15th so that Dave Maloney could do a presentation open to the entire community on Heritage Designations in Sandy Hill.

g. Letter Responding to Councillor Fleury on his questions about the ASH proposal for a council committee on unlicensed rooming houses.

Councillor Fleury had asked ASH to clarify how we saw the terms of reference and mandate for such a committee. There was a consensus that, given the new council initiatives on this matter (see Report attached), that there was no pressing need to pursue the proposal for this committee.

h. ASH Retreat- Chad will try again to establish a date for the retreat.

6. Special Items

a. Conflict of Interest Archives (item put off till next meeting)

b. Liability Agreement - Somerset Greening

Susan reported that there is still some wording to be negotiated with the city on this agreement.

Motion 6.1: that ASH representatives be authorized to sign this agreement once the wording of the liability clause is satisfactory. (Susan/Bob) - Carried

Motion 6.2: that up to \$1000 of ASH funds be authorized for the Somerset Garden project. (Susan/Kelly) - Carried

Planting will take place on September 24th - meet outside the tea shop on Somerset ready to work.

c. Prime Ministers Row

Suneeta Millington reported on the current status of this project. She asked if ASH could arrange for meeting space at the community centre for their Board meetings and mentioned a possible cash contribution.



d. Property Assessments

A member of the community (Nicole Girard) gave a report on the process of establishing property assessments.

e. Garage Sale

Pat reported on planning for this event and Chad and Nicole volunteered to put up signs the morning of the event.

Motion 6.3: that \$150 be authorized for garage sale expenses. (Pat/Ralph) - Carried

f. Ping Pong Table

Pat reported that the city had approved the installation of the table.

7. Block Rep Report

Jan Findlay was present but had nothing new to report

8. Executive Report

There seems to have been some confusion about ASH funding for Ayoub reception. The executive will take up this issue.

Chad reported that ASH will host the next FCA meeting on September 15th at 7:00 PM. Everyone is welcome to attend. The board agreed to approve \$50 - \$100 for refreshments for this meeting.

9. Treasurer's Report

As of July 31 2016 the following accounts had the balances noted below:

Homestead	\$26,473.55
Save Sandy Hill	\$ 9,163.55
Chequing	\$16,459.44
Total	\$52,096.54

10. Committee Reports

- a. **By Law Enforcement** - Sally was absent
- b. **Communications and Membership** - Jeremy was absent
- c. **Engagement with university** - The success of Bob's report on unlicensed rooming houses was noted.



- d. **Governance** - no report
- e. **Heritage** - covered above
- f. **Planning and Transportation**
 - i. **Transportation** - covered above

ii. Planning

The report is attached to these minutes. Kelly added some explanations for the items below

122 Daly - The Board agreed to support the objection Judith recommended in her report concerning the inadequate rear set back in the latest proposal.

OMB Hearing on 560 Rideau - the Board noted that we have about \$9000 for this initiative and asked that Judith report back on the probable costs for this process.

404 Daly - A meeting is to be held between the developer (TC United) and the neighbours on the proposed plan for this site.

Proposed Sign at 45 Mann - Ottawa U. - the Board noted that no one in Sandy Hill would be able to see this sign and so agreed not to object to it although it will be larger than bylaws allow.



COUNCILLORS REPORT - AUGUST 2016 - From the desk of Emeline Sparks

Street issues:

1. Somerset bike lanes - construction/installation was to begin in June, any update?

Construction was delayed due to University of Ottawa input. We expect construction to begin September 7th.

2. The proposal to lower speed limits in Sandy Hill to 40km/hr. With reference to John's most recent suggestions, please clarify how you plan to proceed.

Councillor Fleury will be available to discuss further this evening.

3. Truck tunnel study - wondering who specifically was "ecstatic" about its findings (as per quotes attributed to Councillor Fleury in news reports)? What is reaction at City Hall so far?

The general response has been cautious optimism. We look forward to the next step of an Environmental Assessment, if approved by Council.

4. Yay for the bike tunnel at uOttawa!

We're also very excited for the reopening of the tunnel.

5. Rats in Sandy Hill - there was an undertaking to install rat traps, has this been done?

We recognize this has been an issue. We have reached out to key players at the City to provide a more fulsome response.

Planning issues:

1. What are the results of the motion you put before Planning Committee on Site Plan and development costs for development in Sandy Hill?

Developers will be required to provide:

(i) A one-page planning rationale providing a summary of the nature and intent of the proposed development or redevelopment;



- (ii) A site plan showing site layout, the location of the building and all its entrances, details of landscaping, and the layout/location of any on-site motor vehicle and bicycle parking;**
- (iii) In the case of additions resulting in buildings of 275 square metres gross floor area and greater, a grading and drainage plan prepared by a certified professional engineer licensed to work in Ontario;**
- (iv) Elevation drawings and three-dimensional colour renderings (at a scale of 1:50) of the building before (in the case of redevelopment or additions) and after development or redevelopment;**
- (v) Details on cladding materials, windows, and other architectural elements proposed or, in the case of an existing building proposed to be modified, details on how these materials are being changed or replaced;**
- (vi) Floor plans of each floor of the building showing the use of all space, consistent with Building Permit application, including all rooms with their intended purpose, vaults, central storage and collection areas and other facilities and enclosures for the storage of garbage and other waste material.**

There will be a sliding scale of the fees:

For any residential use building that is proposed to contain three or fewer dwelling units, or fewer than seven rooming units, the following fees for site plan control apply to any new construction or addition to the gross floor area of the building, as follows:

- (1) Any alteration to the front, corner side or other street-facing facade: \$500, and**
- (2) Creation of any new dwelling units or rooming units, where the resulting count does not exceed three dwelling units or seven rooming units: \$500 per additional dwelling unit or per two additional rooming units, and**
- (3) Any addition or new construction, as follows:**
 - (i) Where the addition or new construction results in a building of 275 square metres gross floor area or less: \$0, or**
 - (ii) Where the addition or new construction results in a building of greater than 275 square metres but not more than 350 square metres gross floor area: \$500, or**
 - (iii) Where the addition or new construction results in a building of greater than 350 square metres gross floor area: \$2,500**



2. What is the status of 87 Mann Ave. and the site plan condition to pay for the installation of four planters and trees in front of strip mall?

There will be six planters, with drainage. Ivory silk Japanese lilac trees will be planted, please see the attached details. We are still awaiting a timeline from the developer.

Health and safety issues:

1. Do by-law officers have the authority to levy summary fines (in the same manner that they issue parking tickets) against landlords who store garbage in contravention of the city by-laws? If not, how can they be invested with this authority?

Our office has met with Bylaw and the legal department to discuss a variety of solutions to shorten both the response time on notices of violation and strategies to levy fines against property owners.

Community residents issues:

1. The City-sponsored painting by community youth on the west wall of the Mann Ave. strip mall has been painted over, presumably by the owner. Is s/he allowed to paint over what was likely a City-sponsored initiative?

The property owner is responsible for maintaining the mural. Through the Paint It Up program the property owner is required to maintain the mural for a minimum of 5 years. We have flagged this issue with the mural department with the City of Ottawa to investigate further.

2. What is the status of the SH Community Health Centre's request to host a safe injection site?

We have not heard from them since the consultation. This question would be best suited for the Sandy Hill Community Health Centre.

Additional:

1. We would like to know how much Takyan paid the city for this “privilege” and under what circumstances the city allows this and who supervises - e.g. under what authority do any of those men have the right to direct traffic? And why would the neighbours not be informed and how much do they have to tolerate?



There was no special privilege given. The developer applied for a road closure permit under the Road Activity Bylaw 2003-445, which was granted under delegated authority by City staff. Traffic Management enforces the clauses of the Bylaw and inspects the road cut permits. The contractor's work was delayed due to the severing of an unmarked line. What should have taken 3 days under the 4-day closure ended up taking 12 working days total to complete. When our office received complaints on day 3 of the initial road cut permit, we denied the contractors application for an extension to the road closure. It was the responsibility of the contractors to notify the neighbours at least 2 working days in advance.

2. Just one more ... an update on by law enforcement for all the addresses ASH has submitted to the City and how many fines have been levied for constant violators.

Derek Petch provided an updated list on July 12th. Our office has requested an update from Derek and will provide to ASH upon receipt.



Action Sandy Hill - planning report - August 2016 - Judith Rinfret

386 Chapel - despite assurances to respect the neighbourhood and neighbours, the owner of this property has almost completed construction on the maximum building envelope allowed on that property. He recently filed a committee of adjustment application to permit a 4 unit residence as the lot area and width are only sufficient for 3 units. The hearing was scheduled for August 17; several neighbours and J prepared to oppose and, interestingly the planning department not only wrote a significant opposition, but city planner Tim Moerman was prepared to speak against the proposal. However, the owner sent a messenger from Holzman planning consultants to request an adjournment which the committee reluctantly granted, after being assured that we (neighbours and ASH) had agreed to yet another meeting with the owner, Nick Legault, his designer, and his planning consultants. (As reported earlier, J had already met this owner three times previously - he consistently maintained his intention to create 4 units, despite the concerns of the neighbours and ASH. There may have been room for negotiation but he was not amenable.) Six neighbours, J, and Tim Moerman met two representatives from Holzman on the site on August 20. Nick Legault did not attend so neighbours and ASH questioned the point of the meeting but did articulate the main issues to the Holzman group at their request. The next hearing will be September 21 and ASH will oppose.

122 Daly - We have reiterated our main issue with the side yard development in this heritage district - the rear yard set back. Committee of adjustment applications have just been received and we will restate this position **provided the Board supports that position.**

560 Rideau - neighbours and ASH were invited to observe a design committee review of the latest drawings for this project (which ASH has appealed to the OMB - hearing dates - November 21-25). Since then we have reviewed the site plan. Letter to planner in that regard is attached. The site plan will be assessed by the planner and included as part of the OMB hearing.

ASH must consider how or if we will fund the OMB hearing.

590 Rideau - Since filing comments on the site plan, there has been no response from the developer so this project is currently "on hold".

Over the summer J and Chad met representatives from TC United at their request. We were told that TCU would like better relations with ASH and the community and would appreciate being contacted directly to file complaints about property standards or offer comments on development proposals.

203/205 Henderson - in July, neighbours, the architect (Susan Smith), and the contractor (Belagio) and a few members of DARC met on site to consider a proposal to redevelop to allow two units in each half of this semidetached. Variances will be required. Neighbours expressed concerns about possible balconies, garbage, and landscaping. So far, no further plans have been submitted.



505 Cumberland - a dentist contacted ASH as she plans to set up a clinic at that location and will need a minor variance or a rezoning. DARC, after viewing the site, decided that no comment was the appropriate response at this time.

404 Daly - a site plan has been prepared for review. Where once a three storey heritage house was home to several students before it burned down about five years ago, a four storey 14 unit apartment is proposed with cantilever over part of the driveway. (The proposed structure is less massive than the allowable development rights on this large lot.) Neighbours are not happy as the design does not fit the streetscape and is not in character with this cultural heritage district. ASH has concerns about the cantilevered section over the driveway and has contacted TC United to consider negotiations (at the request of the developer). **Kelly will report on the meeting between neighbours, ASH and the developer - TCUnited.**

Sign by law variance at 45 Mann: University of Ottawa sign at the top of the new residence on Mann Avenue - almost double the size permitted and illuminated which is not permitted in accordance with the sign by law. **Recommended that ASH oppose on the grounds that the regulations should be respected in the interests of light and sign pollution or urban noise.**

Pre consultations - Judy and Chad have been invited to attend these. J has attended one and found the process interesting and very respectful but, until this proposal is made public, no other information may be shared.

(Kelly may report status of various planning studies.)



Transportation Report - August 2016 - John Verbaas

Fellow board members...now that I have digested several hundred pages of the recently released downtown truck tunnel study, and in anticipation of discussing this issue at our upcoming board meeting, I thought I would provide some information for you to contemplate to help inform our decision making.

The proposed tunnel has the following characteristics:

- 2 separate tunnels, one for each direction, 2 lanes each tunnel
- 3.4 kms long each (so in total 6.8km of tunneling)
- estimated cost of 2B\$
- Attached is a map showing some of the tunnel routes that were considered....The chosen route is the one in **red**
- the south end of the tunnel is proposed to rise to the surface in the area of the RCMP lands between the Rideau R. and Vanier Parkway (ie. the tunnel would go under the Rideau River)
- the north end of the tunnel is right in line with how King Edward merges into the Macdonald-Cartier bridge
- at the south end, they propose to change the intersection of Coventry Rd and Vanier Parkway into a big roundabout so that the tunnel traffic could merge in and out of that roundabout on the way to the 417
- the route of the tunnel would go under Sandy Hill along Range Rd, Strathcona Park, and then angle over to cross Rideau St at around Coburg and then on into Lowertown
- the tunnel would be 8-10 stories underground and be tunneled entirely through rock (they did a fair amount of analysis of the levels of soil, clay, rock)
- there would be cross passages between the 2 tunnels every 250m. These would be safety features so that if there was a problem in 1 tunnel people could escape through the passages to the 2nd tunnel
- they proposed to construct the tunnel using a tunnel boring machine which is big cylindrical machine that digs it out entirely from underground (a fairly common method). This is different from the way the LRT tunnel is being dug out, but they propose this different method because it would have much less impact on draining the water table and thus less impact on any building foundations above the tunnel.

Traffic:



- they say that of the 2600 trucks per day on the Madonald-Cartier bridge that about 900 of those would not use the tunnel because they are stopping to do deliveries somewhere in the downtown. Therefore they conclude that 1700 trucks per day (2/3 of the total) would use the tunnel
- they also claim that 20,000 to 25,000 cars per day go directly from the bridge to the 417 and that these would use the tunnel too (that's a lot of cars to get off of downtown streets!!!! yeah!)

Alternatives:

- fairly early on in the study they discounted other possible tunnel routes including several different ones that start/end off Nicholas street. That is too bad because this route would be 1.5 km shorter (ie. a lot cheaper)
- even though the Nicholas options make for a much better connection to the 417 than the proposed Vanier Parkway/Coventry Rd, they felt that there was not enough width on Nicholas to add a tunnel, that the ground conditions under Nicholas were not as good for tunneling, and that it would be too close to the LRT tunnel
- they did not provide any cost estimates or do very detailed analysis for any of these other tunnel options that were dropped from consideration early on in the study.

Next Steps:

- the City is proposing to recommend to Mayor Watson to go to Queen's Park and ask them for the money (several million \$) to do a detailed environmental assessment for this tunnel.
- further public consultation would be part of an environmental assessment process

My thoughts:

- this would be the longest/biggest tunnel in the whole country...ie pretty big as tunnels go
- I am not very optimistic that upper levels of government will perceive the value/benefit of this tunnel to be worth the cost of 2B\$
- I wish they would have tried harder to find a workable solution for a shorter tunnel to Nicholas St, and only a 2-lane single tube tunnel (rather than twin tunnels). Such a solution would have been able to divert the same 1700 trucks/day and carry perhaps 60% of the 20,000-25,000 cars. To me that would be worth it if it came to a cost of 1B\$ instead of 2B\$...however the planners do not seem interested in pursuing such an approach

- nevertheless, we should support the current proposal and encourage the City to move forward with it
- and hope for the best.

If you have any further questions, I hope I will be able to answer them on Monday.

Below is a diagram to give an idea of what they are proposing:

