



January 22, 2020

City of Ottawa
Planning Committee
110 Laurier Ave W
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

By email to melody.duffenais@ottawa.ca

Dear Planning Committee,

**Re: File Number: ACS2020-PIE-PS-0001
Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Control
19, 29 and 134 Robinson Avenue**

I have been retained by Wendy Duschenes and David Elden to make submissions in opposition to the proposed zoning amendment to 19, 29 and 134 Robinson Avenue. Both of my clients live in the Robinson Village neighbourhood and are concerned about the impacts this project will have on the area. I will also be making submissions on the proposal relating to 36 Robinson Avenue in a separate letter.

My clients' concerns we have with the proposal at 19, 29 and 134 Robinson Avenue are:

- (1) the application of the parking aspects of the Lees Transit Oriented Development Plan to the site;
- (2) the need for resident parking minimums in Robinson Village; and
- (3) the failure of the proposal to comply with the General Principles set out in the Sandy Hill Secondary Plan.

Lees Transit Oriented Development Plan

The Transit Oriented Development Plans for Lees, Hurdman, Tremblay, St. Laurent, Cyrville and Blair were approved on January 22, 2014. The Lees Plan envisages the area in which 19, 29 and 134 Robinson are located as a residential use area with a "maximum building height of six storeys." That plan formed the background for the 2016 Minimum Parking Standards Review, which resulted in the current parking provisions in sections 101 through 105 of the Zoning Bylaw. The transit aspect of

2530 St. Joseph Blvd, Suite 7, Ottawa, ON K1C 1G1
T 613.722.4448 F 613.722.4458
www.nextgenlaw.ca

those provisions is reflected in the areas on the Schedule 1A map that reflect parking minimum ranges. Robinson Village is in Area X, which has a minimum of 0.5 spaces per unit. It was explicitly excluded from Area Z, which waived the minimum requirements for parking spaces.

Staff say that “the recommended parking reduction is consistent with Area Z parking.” The 2016 decision to exclude Robinson Village from Area Z, and impose a reasonable minimum parking requirement, was based in fact and was a sound policy decision that ought not be reversed here. Robinson Village is a unique area that is not as connected to Lees Station as other areas in the Transit Oriented Development Plan area.

Parking Minimums Required

Robinson Village is an amenity dessert with limited access to services. There is no grocery store within a 15 minute walk. There are no doctors or other essential service providers nearby. There is one long road into the area and one graded walking trail. Lees Station is not far but it is not an easy walk for an able-bodied person let alone someone with mobility difficulties. It involves changes in grade and crossing Highway 417 at a wide point in the highway on a bridge that can be very windy. It is likely that many residents will desire a personal vehicle if they decide to live in Robinson Village.

The parking proposed here is shared across four proposed developments. It consists of 59 residential parking spots (2 at each of the three proposed towers and 53 at 36 Robinson) for 330 units (46 at each of the three proposed towers and 192 at 36 Robinson). That is a rate of 0.18, well below the 0.5 required by section 101 of the bylaw.

The impact of having insufficient parking for the reasonably expected number of cars is felt by the other residents in the area. There is not a great deal of private parking in the area for residents of this development to purchase. The practical impact is that people will find places to put their vehicles and that will negatively impact the neighbourhood.

My clients support the general reduction in parking minimum standards in the City of Ottawa. But this is not an area that has the amenities to properly support a car-free lifestyle and more on site parking is required for these projects.

Sandy Hill Secondary Plan

My clients also have concerns with the staff conclusion that the proposal complies with the Sandy Hill Secondary Plan.

My clients have concerns with the degree to which this development conforms with the general principles set out in section 5.3.1 of the Sandy Hill Secondary Plan. Clause 1(b) sets a policy to “provide for a broad range of socio-economic groups.”

This development will attract a large number of people in a uniform socio-economic group. It does not extend the range of housing in the area. Clause 1(c) states that Sandy Hill will “accept a modest increase in population.” This proposal will bring 138 new units to an area that is currently at a low population density. Combined with the 192 units at 36 Robinson, the population of Robinson Village will nearly double. That is not a modest increase. Such a population increase will irreversibly change the neighbourhood in ways counter to the policies set out in the Sandy Hill Secondary Plan.

For those reasons the proposal should be rejected for failing to comply with the Sandy Hill Secondary Plan.

I am happy to answer any questions you may have about our position at the meeting of the Committee tomorrow morning.

Yours truly,



Scott McAnsh
scott@nextgenlaw.ca