



Planning & Development Committee Meeting
Réunion du Comité de planification et de développement

Wednesday, April 16, 2014 7:00 PM to 9:30 PM Sandy Hill Community Centre	Mercredi le 16 avril 2014 19h00 à 21h30 Centre communautaire Côte-de-Sable
--	--

MINUTES / PROCÈS-VERBAL

Members in Attendance:	Chad Rollins, Susan Young, John Verbaas, Louise Shaughnessy, Diane Whalen, Eugene Derenyi, Sally Southey, Eiko Emori, Mat Genest (8:00 – 8:50 p.m.), Yves LeBouthillier
------------------------	---

Guest:	Melanie Knight, Planner, City of Ottawa Planning Dep't
--------	--

#	Item / Sujet	ACTION
01	Call to order	
02	Introductions	
03	Review of Agenda	Approved
04	Review of minutes from previous meeting	Approved
05	<p>Special Items</p> <p>1. <u>Presentation by Melanie Knight on the Upper Rideau CDP, Policy Dep't</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melanie is in charge of updating 2005 Uptown Rideau CDP (URCDP). A CDP translates down the City's Official Plan (OP) policies to the neighbourhood level. OP-designated Traditional Mainstreets (such as Uptown Rideau) now have more definition, design features than they did when the current URCDP was done. Push for update came from 1) Developers, and 2) City staff, in particular as the URCDP was never translated into a UR Secondary Plan (as is now done with all CDPs), and thus has less weight than its peers. The current CDP, according to Melanie, is not strong enough to fend off developer requests for height; and this is another reason why it should be reviewed. It is also missing the costing element that is now included in all CDPs. Also there was no building height analysis done the last time around; this would happen now and some 	

	<p>modelling will be shown at consultations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What in the current CDP would already go into a secondary plan; and what wouldn't? Building form could go in the secondary plan, and set backs, and defining where on the street could be more dense and where not. More subjective aspects such as architectural features, amount of street-level retail, percentage of windows and doors facing the street (see Montreal Rd. CDP for example of this) do not go into the secondary plan. • Costing missing; land use and building heights not as comprehensively examined, now analysis of heights, what could be "improved". • 20-year horizon for the CDP, as for the Official Plan. • South side of Rideau St may come out of SH Secondary plan and go into the UR secondary plan. • The planning policy context is v. different for the Central Area (Rideau St. west of King Edward) than for UP Traditional Mainstreet. There have been "lessons learned" from what has been built in the Central Area. • The revised URCDP and secondary plan go together to Council for approval. • Traditional mainstreets (TMs) do not have intensification/ density targets; arterial mainstreets do. • The Urban Design Review Panel (UDRP) is a must for all TMs; now developers can do a pre-consult, but must return to the UDRP following their zoning/bylaw amendment work where the session is open to the public to observe. • The UDRP will also now review Site Plans (although usually combined) • King Edward is a Design Priority Area even though it's not a mainstreet. • Anne Fitzpatrick of the City's Heritage Dep't is reviewing 13-14 buildings in and around Uptown Rideau for Heritage designation. 	
06	<p>Committee business / Affaires du comité</p> <p>1. Regular meeting night & sub-Committee updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chad 	

07	<p>Development Application Review sub-Committee / Sous-comité d'examen des application de développement (Judith Rinfret, Larry Newman)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 202 Henderson <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The letter proposed by Chad addresses zoning issues, where the stage is already at Site Plan control. We decided to note, at the beginning of the letter, that our primary concerns are with the zoning implications, as they set precedent for any other properties the University might buy in the neighbourhood. We will note that in 2007 the University had agreed that it would only develop frontage on King Edward, no further. 2. Eugene's updates: 47 Goulburn (approved with changes, no notice received yet); 323 Somerset (adjourned indefinitely, we should get notice if re-activated) 3. Yves wrote the conversion letter. 	
08	<p>Heritage/Patrimoine</p> <p>No report.</p>	
09	<p>Infill & Zoning sub-Committee / Sous-comité d'intercalaire et zonage (Sophie Beecher, Yves LeBouthillier)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised proposal on Residential Conversions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chad and Yves went to a meeting and Tim Moerman has sent back some changes, based on what some appellants (developers) had raised. 2. Infill 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same appellant situation; City has said it will not revise. 	<p>Yves will send T. Moerman's revisions to the Infill and Zoning sub-committee and we will see if we need to reply.</p>
10	<p>Transportation/Les transports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with the Mayor on the Truck Tunnel Study to be held week of April 21. • Pay and Display Parking Rates – broad City-wide consultation to come. Currently same rate everywhere, but argument could be made for higher rates in areas that have higher demand. John has volunteered to be on the consultation advisory group. • Chapel and Beausoleil: June and October post-Highway Traffic Act options. Likely will go with the June option. 	

11	Vacant & Derelict Properties/Propriétés inhabitées et délabrées Nothing to report.	
12	Next meeting (tbc) – Wednesday, May 21, 2014	
13	Adjournment	