

Karen Way Rezoning – Community Submission

Manor Park Community Association

July 1, 2004

Introduction

This document outlines the position of the Manor Park Community Association on the Zoning By-law amendment proposal by Richcraft for a parcel on land at 1002 Karen Way (File Number D02-02-03-0208). The applicant seeks an R6 – Highrise Apartment zone with a height limit of 52 m. At a public meeting on May 5, 2004, the applicant indicated its intention to build a 12-storey apartment with 154 units and 8 three-storey townhouses. The original proposal for an 18-storey apartment was discussed at two earlier community meetings held on January 31 and March 10, 2004.

The main justification advanced by Richcraft to the community for the rezoning was economic: the value of the property warrants a high level of intensified development that would be achieved by a highrise. This is a circular argument since property value is substantially affected by zoning. It is also not justified by the actual price of \$615,000 that Richcraft paid for the property (as evidenced by the title documents registered on closing of the sale on April 30, 2004). Many other development possibilities are feasible given this price and the 0.5 hectare size of the property. There is no justification for basing a rezoning application on the developer's maximum return on investment.

The City of Ottawa's Official Plan 20/20 says that it

proposes to create more liveable communities by focusing more on community design and by engaging in collaborative community building, particularly in and around the Mixed-Use Centres and Mainstreets that have a great potential for growth. A focus on community design draws attention to how buildings and the spaces around them look and function in their setting, and away from arbitrary standards and rules that have sometimes been found to stifle creative design. Since the best urban design is informed by a solid appreciation of the place being built and the people in it, this approach opens the door to creativity and dialogue.

Residents of the community surrounding the proposed development site have been actively engaged in responding to this proposal. Three community meetings have been held to discuss the Richcraft proposals. Two were organized by the local councillor, Jacques Legendre; one was organized by Manor Park residents themselves. These meetings clearly demonstrated serious community concerns about the proposal, both in its original form as well as in its most recent form. Each meeting was well attended, with over 200 people at the third meeting, 40 to 50 of whom spoke and asked questions. Their comments were overwhelmingly opposed to the proposal on the basis of the following matters:

1. Intensification and Compatibility of the development with its surroundings
2. Effect on road traffic and parking

3. Privacy and Shade Effects
4. Effect on municipal services
5. Construction effects.

Each of these concerns is discussed in detail below.

Intensification and Compatibility with Surroundings

The Association supports the general direction of the City of Ottawa Official Plan (2003) toward intensification of development. However, we note that the Plan requires that intensification relate to the existing community character. It says

“ground oriented multiple housing forms, such as duplex, triplex and fourplex are one means of intensifying within established low-rise residential communities” (3.6.1 Urban Designations – General Urban Area).

The 2003 Official Plan also says

“Introducing new development in existing areas that have developed over a long period of time requires a *sensitive approach to differences* between the new development and the established area, in terms of building heights, setbacks, and other characteristics. ... Intensification must be designed to be *compatible with its surroundings*.” (2.5.1 Compatibility of Development; 3.6.1 Urban Designations – General Urban Area)

And although sites no longer viable for their original purpose are targeted for intensification, the Plan excludes school sites in this respect and says that they are to be treated “on a site specific basis.” (2.2.3).

Finally, we note that the previous City Plan (which is still in effect pending the appeal of the 2003 Plan to the OMB) says that Council is to ensure that the design of high intensity residential use “is compatible in architectural form with abutting neighbourhoods” and “forms a cohesive and unified cluster of buildings which are architecturally compatible with each other” (12.6.2.1(a)i and ii). It also says that the transition from high to low profile development should be “incremental” (12.6.2.2).

A 12-storey high-rise apartment does not relate to the character of the surrounding community, which consists of a low-rise residential community. The residential property abutting the Karen Way site is currently zoned R2A (on the east), R5A (on the south) and R4 (on the north): see the map in Appendix 1. The buildings in this surrounding area are a mix of 2-storey buildings that include semi-detached houses, row-houses and apartments. Ground-oriented housing would suit the Karen Way property and would fit into the surrounding community. A 12-storey apartment would disrupt the low-rise character of the surroundings and would establish a distinctly different community having little in common with the surrounding community. In the words of the previous City Plan, it would not be “compatible in architectural form with abutting

neighbourhoods” nor would it “form a cohesive and unified cluster of buildings which are architecturally compatible with each other”.

It is also worth recalling that the existing use of the site is as a school, surrounded by greenspace and playgrounds. In the past ten years, the school was leased by a private Montessori School and two day care centres. The owner of the Montessori School lost to Richcraft Builders in its bid to purchase the school. Such spaces do much more than merely host educational activities. Schools function as social and recreational centres for the surrounding community. The loss of this function should not be accentuated by a development that does not fit into its surroundings.

The incongruity of highrise development on the Karen Way site is accentuated by the proposed vehicular access on Karen Way. This is a residential street that provides one of three access routes into Manor Park Hill (the other two being Meadow Park and Bangs): see the map in Appendix 1. The proposed highrise traffic would reach into the surrounding residential streets and transform Karen Way into an access route for a different type of community. This feature does not occur in the highrises south of Brittany. They are accessed from non-residential streets: St. Laurent, Montreal Road and Brittany. Additional traffic impacts of the proposal on the surrounding community are considered below.

The incongruity of the proposed development with its surroundings is not limited to building form. It also occurs at the community level of human interaction. The residents of Manor Park Hill and Cardinal Glen consider themselves part of the Manor Park community. This point was constantly made by residents at all three community meetings. The natural demarcation of the community is the area of low-rise apartments, townhouses and single family homes around Dunbarton, in Manor Park Hill, and in the main part of Manor Park stretching north along St. Laurent to the RCMP stables, along Sandridge to Birch Street and up to Hemlock. This demarcation is evident travelling north on St. Laurent. As one passes the highrise towers and approaches the crest of the hill at St. Laurent and Dunbarton, the vista shows an expanse of open skyline with low rise development that includes not only residences, but also the RCMP Stables, the Beechwood Cemetary, the Aviation Museum and the Ottawa River with its recreational pathways.

The cohesion of the Manor Park Hill and Cardinal Glen communities with Manor Park is demonstrated by the participation of its residents in the Manor Park recreation and community associations and regular events, such as the Winter Dance, the Mayfair and the Manor Park Garage Sale. This is also where the community paper (*The Chronicle*) is delivered. In contrast, the residents of the high-rises on St. Laurent south of Brittany have little contact or interaction with this community. This is hardly surprising given that high-rise apartments lend themselves to more insular communities with their own community structures, recreation facilities and events. High-rise apartments are simply not compatible with the low-rise community-oriented development that surrounds the Karen Way site and is a defining characteristic of Manor Park generally.

The proximity of the proposed development to St. Laurent Boulevard does not justify a high-rise development on this site. Proximity to a street with high capacity for traffic is relevant only to

the traffic implications of the development, not to its compatibility with the surrounding community. This street provides access to a community; it does not define the character of its development. It is also worth noting that St. Laurent north of Montreal Road is not designated as a main street in the Official Plan, but as an arterial. The recommendations for the intensification of main streets in the Plan do not apply at the Karen Way site. It is also worth noting that buildings along St. Laurent from MacArthur north are generally low-rise, with many single family residences south of Montreal Road and north of Hemlock. The high-rise portion between Montreal Road and Brittany is an exception that should not be extended any further.

St. Laurent north of Montreal Road should not be lined with a continuous row of highrise, or even medium-rise, development. Such development destroys any sense of human scale and accentuates the transformation of this city street into a concrete-lined speedway that excludes pedestrian and cycle traffic. This point was made by many residents at the public meetings. Rather than accelerating the speedway effect through high-rise development, the city should be considering ways to recover this street for non-vehicular use. Section 2.3.1 of the Official Plan clearly supports the enhancement of pedestrian and cycle traffic. This will not be achieved by increasing the intensification of development along St. Laurent north of Montreal Road.

The fact that high-rise apartment towers are found to the south along St. Laurent does not change the disruptive character of a high-rise on the Karen Way site. These towers constitute an intimidating wall of high-rises stretching from just north of Montreal Road to Brittany. A similar development on Karen Way would aggravate this effect and disrupt the existing transition from highrise development south of Brittany to low-rise development to the north.

Many concerns at the community meetings have also been raised about the precedent-setting nature of this development and the potential for other high-density development in the area. High-density intensification has already been achieved along St. Laurent north of Montreal Road. This development was undertaken on an abandoned rock quarry that provided an area that is far larger than the Karen Way site and that is connected to a main street (Montreal Road). This space permitted the establishment of a distinct community without intruding on its surroundings.

High-density development is also currently contemplated by the existing zoning to the north of Karen Way, between Meadow Park and Hemlock. This property is zoned CG – General Commercial, permitting offices and apartment buildings to a height of 6 stories. We understand that a developer is currently interested in the site.

Yet another nearby area with potential for high-density development is the Rockliffe Airbase to the East (see the map in Appendix 2). This prime area is larger than LeBreton Flats and its development will vastly impact the surrounding area with as many as 50,000 new residents living on this site adjacent to Manor Park..

When the existing development and zoning along St. Laurent is considered, it is clear that Manor Park and the adjacent area have already achieved an appropriate mix of high, medium and low level development. Allowing another high-rise development on the Karen Way site would

disturb this mix and result in a concrete wall of high-rises stretching from Montreal Road to Hemlock. This would not be good urban planning. It was vigorously opposed by those who attended the community meetings. This was particularly demonstrated at the March 10 meeting at which the vast majority supported a motion to limit development on the Karen Way site to a maximum of 3 stories. There is a limit to the level of intensification that is appropriate within a given area. This level has already been achieved, if not substantially surpassed, along St Laurent north of Montreal Road and there is no justification for additional high-density development on the Karen Way site.

Effect Road Traffic and Parking

General comments and Introduction

Traditional transportation planning tends to emphasize vehicle mobility improvements over other community livability objectives. Streets were designed primarily to maximize traffic flow, and buildings were designed to maximize parking convenience. Far greater resources were devoted to automobile facilities (road and parking) than for nonmotorized modes. Funding was available to landscape freeways, but not neighborhood streets. Important environmental and social features, and sometimes whole communities, were destroyed during highway construction. There is now increasing appreciation of the importance of community livability objectives. Planners realize that roads often play multiple roles as both travel corridors and places for community interaction. Many communities now favor roadway improvements that reduce traffic speeds and limit traffic volumes for the sake of livability. Cited from "Community Livability -- Helping to Create Attractive, Safe, Cohesive Communities" TDM Encyclopedia, Victoria Transport Policy Institute (<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm97.htm>)

St-Laurent Boulevard, heading north from Montreal Road, represents an oddity in urban planning in Ottawa. Along the initial portion of the roadway, is likely (or close to being) the highest residential apartment building in the City. Le Parc is 30 storeys high and there are two additional towers immediately north, all of which can be seen very distinctly on the Ottawa skyline from many distant vantage points. The west side of this roadway is bordered by two of the largest and oldest cemeteries in the city. Starting at Brittany Drive driving northward, the roadway undergoes an abrupt shift in character. Opposite the Beechwood Cemetery are two small strip malls and a Dairy Queen. Built in the background are single-family homes. It is at this point in the scene that Richcraft proposes to introduce a 12-storey building.

This thoroughfare is the gateway to our neighbourhood and provides access for visitors to enjoy unique attractions such as the Aviation Museum, the RCMP stables and local sports fields. Manor Park's portion of St. Laurent Boulevard is vital to the character and livability that is felt as anyone enters the community. The proposed Richcraft site development at the corner of St. Laurent and Karen Way is at the doorstep of Manor Park. The Karen Way side street also happens to be a principal entrance to a small area of low-density, well-established, homes. It is one of only three entries into this pocket called Manor Park Hill, which contains approximately 70 detached and semi-detached homes. The second entry to the 'Hill' is located only a block

north (at St-Laurent and Meadow Park Place) which experiences equivalent traffic issues as Karen Way. The third exit is at Bangs Road and Brittany Drive, which is at the south easterly end of the subdivision. Brittany Drive is located at the south side of Manor Park Hill and is classified as a two lane, undivided collector roadway. The neighbourhood is otherwise sealed-off by green space, the Aviation Parkway on the east boundary and Hemlock Avenue on the north side.

For the community, traffic issues are among the most critical considerations in the proposed development. The Traffic and Transportation Site Impact Study undertaken by CastleGlenn Consultants for Richcraft Builders contains facts and figures that have helped the community to understand the problems. We have carefully examined the study and put forward the following conclusions for the consideration of the Planning Committee.

As a general comment, the community was dismayed that the dates of actual traffic counts were not documented in the CastleGlenn study. Residents noticed what appeared to be traffic counts being taken by individuals in parked cars or sitting in lawn chairs in February and March, which closely coincided with the period of university exams, days-off at local schools for professional development, and school mid-winter breaks. The community is concerned that traffic surveys taken during such periods would have been artificially low, given the corresponding decrease in traffic circulation when many residents are not in their normal travel habits during peak periods. For the record, the following are key scholastic dates where traffic would have been less voluminous:

- ⇒ University of Ottawa

Exams	January/February
Mid-winter break	February 16 to 20
- ⇒ Conseil scolaire des écoles publiques de l'est Ontario

Professional development day (elementary)	February 13
Professional development day (secondary)	March 12
Mid-winter break	March 15 - 19
- ⇒ Conseil des écoles catholiques

Professional development day	February 13
Mid-winter break	March 15 - 19
- ⇒ Ottawa-Carleton District School Board

Professional activity day	February 13
Mid-winter break	March 15 - 19

⇒ Educarium private school

March 22 -April 2

(Opposite the Richcraft development site)

School-related traffic did not receive any special consideration in the CastleGlenn study. Traffic and the safety of children are critical issues and the community is very concerned about the 150 children who attend the Educarium school across the street and the children attending the Manor Park School just a short walk away is also a concern. Even at the third community meeting, held May 5th, before some 200 people, the CastleGlenn consultant reacted with surprise to the fact that there is a private school (Educarium) directly across the development site. Nor did their analysis acknowledge the nearby location of the Manor Park Public School. The community feels that this was a serious oversight which should have been more carefully considered as a site development issue, both in terms of traffic analysis as well as in analysis of compatibility with the community. Traffic and the safety of children are not only issues during peak traffic hours. The schools use public sidewalks and cross streets at various hours of the day. It is not clear how the CastleGlenn study can be used to assess these impacts if it focuses only on peak traffic hours.

To test the possibility of underestimated results due to the timing of the CastleGlenn surveys during the February/March period, the community undertook its own traffic survey on June 7, 2004. The St-Laurent and Meadow Park Place intersection was chosen as the test case because it is used routinely by parents dropping-off and picking-up children at the Educarium School. Volunteers used the same methodology and forms presented in the CastleGlenn study. The following tables present the comparisons.

Table 1.1 -- Figures recorded by CastleGlenn study: date unknown

Intersection 5: Meadow Park Place & St. Laurent

Morning Peak Period – All Vehicles

Time from	Time To	Total	Northbound		Southbound		Westbound		
			TH	RT	LT	TH	LT	RT	
6:30	6:45	81	Not	0	2	79	0	0	
6:45	7:00	88	available	1	0	86	1	0	
7:00	7:15	135		4	1	126	1	3	
7:15	7:30	144		2	3	136	0	3	
7:30	7:45	137		0	1	128	0	8	
7:45	8:00	163		2	0	158	0	3	
8:00	8:15	166		7	5	150	0	4	
8:15	8:30	195		8	11	171	2	3	
8:30	8:45	143		0	2	137	1	3	
8:45	9:00	144		4	1	134	2	3	
9:00	9:15	111		2	2	103	3	1	
9:15	9:30	87		0	2	81	2	2	
7:45	8:45	667		17	18	616	3	13	Peak Hour

Table 1.2 -- Figures recorded by the community: June 7, 2004

Intersection 5: Meadow Park Place & St. Laurent

Morning Peak Period – All Vehicles

Time from	Time To	Total	Northbound		Southbound		Westbound		
			TH	RT	LT	TH	LT	RT	
6:30	6:45	58	42	0	0	58	0	0	
6:45	7:00	75	83	1	0	72	1	1	
7:00	7:15	92	72	0	1	89	0	2	
7:15	7:30	160	128	2	1	153	1	3	
7:30	7:45	154	138	2	1	147	3	1	
7:45	8:00	158	153	3	0	152	1	2	
8:00	8:15	122	119	3	8	107	0	4	
8:15	8:30	242	196	10	23	203	1	5	
8:30	8:45	159	141	0	2	152	2	3	
8:45	9:00	147	123	0	1	144	1	1	
9:00	9:15	140	144	1	1	137	1	0	
9:15	9:30	98	107	2	1	91	1	3	
7:45	8:45	681	609	16	33	614	4	14	Peak Hour

On June 7th, the community survey revealed that total traffic on St. Laurent Boulevard was approximately 6% higher than the CastleGlenn results. The community traffic count also revealed that 23 vehicles completed a left-hand turn from St. Laurent Boulevard onto Meadow Park Place between the hours of 8:15 and 8:30 a.m. The CastleGlenn record showed only 11 vehicles executing this manoeuvre (see shaded boxes in Tables 1.1 and 1.2). For the peak period, the community traffic count recorded a total of 33 cars making the left-hand turn, rather than the 18 recorded by CastleGlenn.

The added traffic that will result from the Richcraft development would add to a mix which is not fully represented in the study. Anecdotal evidence from residents of that area strongly suggests that the higher volume recorded by the June 7th survey is more realistic. It is more

reflective of the daily routine of parents entering Meadow Park Place to drop-off and pick-up children at the Educarium School on Peach Tree Lane, then exiting the area via Karen Way or by cutting through other side streets. Photos presented in the Appendix 3 to this report were taken on a typical school day and clearly demonstrate the traffic intensity and potential safety risks to children who get out of cars and onto the street.

These patterns are ever-present on Peach Tree Lane and occur in the immediate area of the Richcraft development site. Discussions with the school owner confirmed that approximately 100 cars drop and pick up children twice a day. The traffic counts alone are not sufficient to understand the full impact of competing traffic in and around the Educarium/Richcraft locations. For example, some parents choose to drive into the strip mall entries at the front of the school, which are not logged into road traffic counts. Another possibility is that the hours chosen to document the traffic volume do not coincide entirely with school comings and goings. These issues need to be further clarified because there are significant, yet not fully understood.

Conclusions on the Traffic and Transportation Study.

The following are the community's conclusions about the CastleGlenn Traffic Impact Study conducted for Richcraft Builders.

1. **The traffic flows on St-Laurent versus Karen Way clearly illustrate the sharp contrast in character that exists within the immediate development area.** The St-Laurent Boulevard is an arterial road, handling approximately 1,300 southbound and northbound vehicles in the morning peak hour and another 1,300 vehicles in afternoon peak hour. In contrast, the CastleGlenn study acknowledges that traffic into and out of the immediate low-density residential area east of the development site are approximately 50 vehicles in the morning and 64 in the afternoon peak periods. This sharp contrast is the root cause of key traffic concerns.
2. **Queue length at St-Laurent and Hemlock Avenue is presented by CastleGlenn Consultants as a key factor in favouring the development proposal yet it is not the most significant problem being created by the site development proposal.** This is a weak argument for the current project and would only become more serious for Manor Park, as other site developments occur in the same corridor.
3. **A queue length assessment was not conducted in conjunction with the existing and eventual increase of west-bound traffic on Karen Way.** CastleGlenn predicts an average waiting time of 3.3 minutes by 2009 for vehicles attempting a left turn onto St-Laurent Boulevard from Karen Way. Yet the study is silent on how many vehicles would be lined up along Karen Way to enter St-Laurent Boulevard flow during the peak traffic hour periods. This situation is very likely to cause congestion, accumulating eastward up from the development site along Karen Way. The study claims that the level of service would be adequate despite its estimates that 77 trips out (a.m. peak hour) and 56 (p.m. peak hour) would be generated by 2009.

4. **The westbound left-hand turn from Karen Way onto St-Laurent Boulevard is a critical issue. There are significant flaws in the study's conclusion in this regard.** The intersection is a major problem and residents agree that this situation is already frustrating and dangerous. The study determined that there is an existing waiting time of 51-62 seconds (without the Richcraft development) for westbound traffic on Karen Way to execute a left-hand turn onto St-Laurent Boulevard. The community maintains that this is artificially low. The current study fails to consider the current vacancy rate and future development potential for the commercial buildings immediately north of the proposed development site (presently 1-storey, but zoned to allow buildings to a height of 6 stories). Filling the available commercial space to full capacity would significantly add to congestion and diminish access to the southbound traffic stream of St-Laurent Boulevard from Karen Way as well as from Meadow Park Place. For example, local residents observed increased congestion in June 2004 due to the temporary rental of space to the Liberal candidate running in the June 28 federal election. Longer waiting times were also familiar to local residents before the Club 90 Bingo Hall closed last year. The potential underestimation of in- out-traffic raises serious questions about the validity of certain CastleGlenn findings:

- The study estimates that the development of the Richcraft site in 2004 would result in a 40 second increase in delay for a total wait of 91-105 seconds once the building is completed in 2004. *Could this wait be even higher if total potential commercial and residential traffic is added into the equation?*
- The study estimates that normal growth by 2009 would further increase the delay by 100 seconds. Local residents can therefore expect a minimum 191-205 second delay in executing a left-hand turn onto St-Laurent from Karen Way. *Could this wait be even higher by 2009 if adjacent properties are maximized and is it reasonable to expect a 3.3 minute delay for westbound motorists to execute a left-hand turn movement from Karen Way onto St-Laurent Boulevard?*
- The study only considered the red/green phases of the traffic signal at Brittany Drive and St-Laurent to assess gaps in traffic that would allow left-hand turns from Karen Way onto St. Laurent. The study did not provide analysis of timing and impacts of the red/green signal from southbound traffic moving from the signal-controlled intersection at Hemlock and St-Laurent. Residents know first-hand how the left-hand turn from Karen Way onto St-Laurent Boulevard is hampered by red/green signals from both intersections. This is a major oversight by the CastleGlenn study. *What additional delay is caused by the green signal at the Hemlock / St. Laurent intersection?*
- The CastleGlenn study did not estimate the effects of competing vehicular and non-vehicular entries and flows to the St-Laurent Boulevard roadway. These include exits at the Meadow Park intersection, three commercial property exits, and vehicles exiting Colford Place just south of Karen Way. Also, a bus stop on the abutting north corner of Karen Way, and cyclists/pedestrian traffic at the intersection create additional delays for attempts at making a left-hand turn. *Does non-vehicular traffic adds to waiting time for*

left-hand turns at Karen Way?.

- The community is disappointed that the study did not carefully examine and consider the option of placing a traffic signal at the Karen Way / St. Laurent intersection. However, the community is concerned that a traffic signal would add further congestion to the north and southbound traffic flow on St-Laurent. The intersection in question is also in a precarious location, with the northbound lane from Brittany Drive actually descending a sloped portion of roadway, which increases vehicle speeds and would impose more aggressive braking if a signal was installed. This situation is even more dangerous given the location of a bus stop at the foot of the slope – an even more precarious situation in winter conditions. ***Would a signal at Karen Way alleviate the problem or does the location of a bus stop and commercial establishments at the bottom of this slope pose negative safety concerns?***
5. **The community notes that the CastleGlenn conclusions relating to cut-through traffic are incomplete and based on only a partial scenario.** The study's analysis of cut-through traffic, based on license plate tracing, is poorly explained and therefore difficult to understand. Nevertheless, it is understood that the study defines the morning peak period main movement codes as being No. 13, 14 and 2 (see page 9, exhibit 4.0) and afternoon peak period movement as being No. 3, 4 and 15. This assumption therefore defines "cut-through traffic" as flowing from (green dot 4) the Karen Way / Apple Tree intersection, all the way to (green dot 1) Brittany and Montreal Road . In fact, cut through traffic should have also been monitored and documented for (Green dot 2) the Brittany Drive / Bangs Road intersection at movement No. 11, and 10) where cut through traffic is likely to occur for access via Brittany Drive to St-Laurent Boulevard.
 6. **It is the opinion of the community that the five-year build-out period should have been 2010 or beyond (not 2009).** Given the time required to consider the Richcraft re-zoning application and the construction time needed to actually complete a 12-storey building, the community feels that using the 2009 build out year is not realistic. The traffic analysis in the suggested build out period is not representative of the other expected major development issues that will face the Manor Park region over the ensuing five years after completion of the Karen Way project. CastleGlenn has not considered adjacent sites that have the potential for development within the same time horizon of 2009 or 2010. There is widespread speculation that a strip mall in the next block north of Karen Way is about to be sold and the developer has expressed an interest in meeting with the community to discuss a high-density development on that site. *In addition to these immediate development projects, the major development of the Rockcliffe military base will begin to unfold in 2009 or sooner. All of these will add dramatically to traffic problems and are not discussed in the CastleGlenn Study.*
 7. **CastleGlenn did not consider non-vehicular traffic patterns and safety. This is another major gap in the study.** Analysis of pedestrian and cycling traffic is vital at the development site, given that there is a private school directly across the street, with 150 enrolled children and an expected enrolment of 180 in the next two years. The school lacks

a schoolyard and as an alternative, takes students out two or three times per day to the local park, the sports field at Hemlock Avenue, nature walks, the Aviation museum or the St-Laurent Sports Complex at St. Laurent and Coté. There are also non-vehicular considerations relative to two churches on the east side of St-Laurent, and two strip malls within the two blocks north of the development site. The Educarium private school and a public elementary school (Manor Park School) a short walk away on Hemlock are key examples of facilities that adults and children need to access by foot or bicycle. Such public facilities are also vital to the Cardinal Glenn subdivision on the west side of St-Laurent at Brittany Drive, and to residents living in high-rise apartment buildings south of Brittany Drive. All of these citizens would have an interest in how the Richcraft development might affect volume and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. The CastleGlenn study paid no attention to traffic impacts on walking conditions, streetscape aesthetics, safety of cyclists, children walking to schools and parks, shoppers walking to the strip malls (e.g. Dairy Queen at Hemlock and St-Laurent) or to visit neighbours in other parts of Manor Park, and other special community attributes. This aspect of the study would have helped stakeholders to better understand such impacts.

8. Narrow vehicle lanes and high vehicular traffic on the St-Laurent Boulevard roadway are not conducive to cycling and sidewalks abutting directly to the street are intimidating to pedestrian traffic. The community would like an analysis of roadway allowances, in particular, to assess the adequacy of on-street space for bicycles. There are also concerns about the present allowances for sidewalks which abut the roadway, other sidewalks (e.g. on Hemlock) are situated away from the curb and are more conducive to pedestrian traffic. In contrast, Hemlock has dedicated on-street space for cyclist. The location of a bus stop at Karen Way, without a side ramp to isolate bus passenger movements without hindering on-going vehicles and cyclists are also serious concerns if traffic is to increase at that intersection. Given the predicted increase in vehicular traffic, can St-Laurent Boulevard, at and near the development site, accommodate an increase in non-vehicular traffic?
9. **Existing roadway conditions and land uses are poorly described and not illustrated in the CastleGlenn report.** The community has concerns about land uses in the area, including the range of acceptable development proposals for a site such as Karen Way, which is located near a cemetery and other important city green spaces. There is little consideration for road conditions, lane assignments and speed limits. The location of bus stops at the Karen Way exit and across the street are conspicuous yet not addressed, raising questions about how the obstruction of views of on-coming traffic and safety of pedestrians crossing St. Laurent Boulevard.
10. **The Report's estimates of "vehicle trip generation rates" are presumed to be acceptable, although this calculation is beyond the expertise of the community group.** The community would appreciate further information on this analysis in order to be satisfied that traffic increases for the Karen Way development are realistic and not underestimated in any way.

11. **The community is of the view that a comprehensive assessment of the re-zoning application would require further information to fill analysis gaps, identified as important considerations in the City of Ottawa guidelines for conducting transportation impact studies (September 1995).** These guidelines have important elements which would serve to identify proposals for making improvements to traffic demand management in the area by the builder. The CastleGlenn report does not consider:

- (Elements of Section 4) i.e. consider adjacent sites with the potential for development within the same time horizon as the subject site.
- (Elements of Section 5) i.e. impacts on transit and non-motorized modal applications within the context of the proposed development; anticipated adjacent developments (5.1); existing and future transit volumes (5.3); estimate walking and cycling trips; development of traffic/transit volumes for any adjacent sites (5.4).
- (Elements of Section 5.5) i.e. identify remedial measures to address any negative impact on transit operations due to development traffic; non-motorized modal analysis – pedestrian and bicycle movements.
- (Section 5.6) i.e. monitoring programs.
- (Section 5.7 Other Considerations) i.e. on-site and on-street parking considerations, site access and safety, other driveway locations, bus stop locations, sight-lines (to name only a few).
- (Section 5.8) i.e. Traffic Demand Management and system modifications

Privacy and Shadow Effects

All modern urban planning guidelines require that so-called shade studies be conducted to determine the effect that shade can have on an area under development. In this case the use of the word shade is inappropriate as it suggests the soothing benefits associated with prosaic usage. Cast shadow studies are now the term used in most urban planning guidelines, being far more descriptive of the detrimental reality. Additionally, and becoming the European norm, limiting values have been defined in most German states which are used for judging if the shadow cast will cause a substantial strain or not; e.g., the shadow cast at a location (for example a window of a house) is not allowed to last longer than the maximum limit of 30 hours per year in a worst-case scenario (always cloudless sky). Equally, modern urban planning guidelines require, by virtue of the necessity for compatibility with the immediate surroundings, that privacy be respected. These factors are addressed, as follows:

CAST SHADOW – the study submitted by Richcraft with respect to the current re-zoning application is inadequate, consisting of a limited number of carefully crafted renderings presented from the angles and at the timings most complimentary to the Richcraft proposal. There is no written text to quantify or elaborate on the findings and its authenticity is unknown. the study also fails to address the effect of cast shadow occurring after 4.00 p.m. Shadow cast

after 4.00 pm by a 12-storey apartment is significant, particularly in the spring and summer.

In June, at 6 p.m., a tree 15 metres high, located 88 metres East of the proposed apartment casts a shadow fully two times its height. The effect of the cast shadow on the many 2-storey residences 40 metres to the South and East of the proposed 12-storey apartment will be dramatic.

The study indicates that the shadow at 4:00 pm on June 21 would be beginning to reach into the yards of the adjacent semi-detached houses on Apple Tree. Given that the sun sets after 9:00 pm on this day, the loss of light is significant. Similarly, the study indicates that the shadow at 2:00 pm on December 21 cuts a substantial swath across properties on Peach Tree and Apple Tree, eliminating approximately 2 hours of direct light.

Cast shadow and the effects of it, as generated by the Richcraft proposal, will have significant effects on the well-being of the community. These effects include deprivation of light to the detriment of humans and vegetation, disruption of the normally open and luminous esthetic presently available in the area and an increasing the sense of length of night associated with long winter months.

The wholly negative results of cast shadow caused by the Richcraft proposal now before the city planning commission are contrary to both the intent and spirit of the City of Ottawa urban planning guidance.

PRIVACY – the community, by virtue of living in a long established area of single homes and duplexes and being surrounded by mature vegetation, is accustomed to the right of privacy. This privacy is a fundamental aspect of the community, creating in no small way the total ambience and character of the area. Thrusting a monolithic 12-storey structure into such an area would subject it to the constant surveillance of the high-rise apartment dwellers, totally disrupting this beneficial attribute to the detriment of the community. Privacy is a fundamental right that members of the community expect to be protected. The Richcraft proposal places this right in jeopardy, flies in the face of the conventional understanding of civic rights and is therefore not in keeping with the intent and spirit of the City of Ottawa's urban planning guidance.

Effect on Municipal Services

Various provisions of the 2003 Official Plan require consideration of the effect developments will have on municipal services. Richcraft has provided little information to the community on the impact of the development on the following services:

- sewer and water services (Official Plan 4.4 Water and waste-water servicing)
- electricity
- transit services, such as the number 7 bus (Official Plan 2.3.1 Transportation)
- parks/green space/recreational facilities, such as Hemlock Park (Official Plan 2.4.5 Greenspaces; 2.5.4 Parks and Leisure Areas)

- schools, such as Manor Park School, Queen Elizabeth and Rideau High (Official Plan 2.5.3 Schools and Community Facilities)

It is also not clear who will pay for required upgrades to these services (particularly sewer, water and electricity). These should not be off-loaded onto the tax base.

Construction Effects

Although the Community Association recognizes that these effects do not directly affect zoning decisions, it believes that community concerns about them should be noted. Construction of a major high-rise apartment will undoubtedly produce noise and inconvenience for neighbouring residents. These constitute yet another reason not to allow a level of zoning that would permit large-scale construction.

Conclusion

The sensitive, collaborative development of the Karen Way site is very important to the residents of Manor Park, particularly as we are at the doorstep of the great changes to the North-East corner of Ottawa with the impending development of the Rockcliffe Airbase. Planning decisions must be comprehensive and visionary, rather than looking at each site in isolation. We would urge the Planning Committee to make its decision about the Karen Way proposal taking into account the development potential of adjacent areas as well as the certain greater density that will come with the Rockcliffe Base development. We urge the Committee to apply the following planning principles:

1. Maintaining a residential mix of low rise, medium rise and high rise development.
2. The creation of arterial roadways that are efficient and friendly for pedestrians and bicycles as well as for motorized vehicles.
3. The promotion of reasonable intensification where new and existing residents enjoy the benefits of human-scale buildings and the cohesive interactions that compatible developments promote.
4. The promotion of safe neighbourhoods where traffic and land-use are carefully considered to ensure the safety of all residents especially children and the elderly.
5. The promotion of public spaces that are attractive and welcoming to both residents and visitors, respecting both natural beauty and the appeal of older neighbourhoods and cultural sites.

Finally, we would restate the position overwhelmingly supported by a motion at the second community meeting that development on the Karen Way site be limited to ground-oriented development of no more than 3 stories.