

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

25 APRIL 2000

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

Members: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, J. Legendre, A. Munter,
W. Stewart and R. van den Ham

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 11 April 2000.

CARRIED

DEFERRED ITEM

1. SUMMARY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS: ANNEX VII:
OMB APPEAL SUMMARY REPORT RE: COMPREHENSIVE
ZONING BY-LAW #40-99, TOWNSHIP OF GOULBOURN
- *Deferred from Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 11 Apr 2000*
- Co-ordinator, Planning and Environment Committee report dated 13 Apr 2000

At the outset, Committee Chair Hunter indicated that Councillor Hill would be putting forward a motion to resolve the Region's appeal of this zoning by-law.

Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law and Don Herweyer, Senior Project Manager, Development Approvals appeared before the Committee on this item.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 10 May in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 56.

Mr. Marc advised that he, Mr. Herweyer and Barry Edgington, Director, Development Approvals had met with staff from Goulbourn on two occasions to discuss the appeal. He noted, in view of the approaching amalgamation, staff are acutely aware of the need to avoid expending time and resources at the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). Mr. Marc stated that while he understood the official position of the Township of Goulbourn to be that the Region withdraw its appeal, he felt the compromise position proposed by Councillor Hill's motion, was one that Regional staff can agree with and is the second best position for the Township. He said that while certain portions of the appeal will remain outstanding, he was hopeful these could be dealt with by way of affidavit evidence and would likely be resolved at a pre-hearing.

Mr. Marc went on to highlight the six aspects of the appeal and the resolution proposed by Councillor Hill in her motion. With respect to the first appeal dealing with the Jock River Flood Plain in Richmond, he said the Region would support an amendment to the zoning by-law whereby existing uses would be recognized and dwellings would be allowed within the Jock River Flood Plain on lots of record. On the second appeal regarding Organic Soils, Mr. Marc stated the appeal would be withdrawn. He noted on the third aspect, Commercial Zones, a couple of sentences would be inserted in the zoning by-law which would recognize the Regional Official Plan policies that a shopping centre of more than 35,000 square metres would not be allowed in Stittsville and no more than 10,000 square metres in the Village of Richmond. Item 4, Wetlands - Adjacent Lands would be withdrawn. On item 5, the Region would provide the necessary mapping to incorporate all of the wetlands within Goulbourn in the zoning by-law. Finally, Item 6, the site specific appeal, Mr. Marc stated he understood the landowner was content with what the Region proposes and once a letter is received from him confirming this, item 6 would go forward as presented.

Councillor Hill noted as a matter of course, it is her usual practice to meet with Goulbourn and Regional staff on matters such as this, before an appeal is filed, however, this did not happen in this instance. She said she was hoping Regional staff could have withdrawn the appeal completely, however, Mr. Marc has advised this cannot be done. The Councillor said she met with planning staff, and Mr. Marc and discussed what could be done to alleviate their concerns about these sections of the comprehensive zoning by-law and as a result, Mr. Marc drafted this motion.

Councillor Legendre sought clarification with respect the first appeal concerning the Flood Plain in Richmond. Mr. Herweyer explained the Region's position would be to recognize existing uses and permit the building of a single dwelling on lots of record. He said the alternative would be to have zoned the area as Environmental Protection Area, which would have made all of the uses non-conforming. He said this caused a lot of difficulty with the residents of Richmond.

The Councillor questioned why staff had changed from their original position. Mr. Herweyer stated the new position recognizes the existing residential development within the Village. He said it was acknowledged that the mapping should be updated and some of the tributaries off of the Jock River extend quite far (several blocks) into the Village, through a number of homes. Staff agreed it was not reasonable to implement the Environmental Protection Area zoning, with respect to the tributaries of the Jock River.

Councillor Legendre felt existing residential areas were one thing but lots of record where there is no construction now, he felt this would essentially be “allowing a situation that is not good, to get worse”. Again he asked why this would be allowed. Mr. Herweyer advised that staff relied on the Conservation Authority’s comments on this and they indicated they were prepared to accept a compromise solution whereby single dwellings would be permitted on lots of record, but their advise and input would be sought in terms of clearances.

Councillor Legendre noted in the staff report, the Conservation Authority indicated they supported the Region’s appeal of this and would provide expert testimony. Mr. Herweyer replied the compromise solution initially proposed by the Conservation Authority was not included in the Goulbourn zoning by-law, so there was no recognition of the Flood Plain whatsoever in the by-law passed by Goulbourn Council. He stated the compromise before the Committee, is very similar to the one the Conservation Authority submitted to Goulbourn Council.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Herweyer explained on a technical basis, staff relied on the Conservation Authority’s comments that they were satisfied this would not be a health and safety issue. They felt this was a reasonable compromise given the existing development and the very limited number of lots of record that are not built on. On that basis, staff were prepared to recommend it.

Lesley Patterson, Acting Director, Development Approvals pointed out the Regional Official Plan permits the two zone development approach in flood plains. She said where the flow is slow or low, the Conservation Authority will permit a building on a lot of record. In this circumstance, if the flow were really rapid and very deep during a flood, the Conservation Authority would make that comment at the time an application came forward.

Councillor Legendre commented that he was of the opinion the Region was the planning body and the Conservation Authority were the advise givers. Mr. Marc advised that in the context of a zoning by-law, both the Region and the Conservation Authority are commenting bodies.

Councillor Legendre then had questions concerning the second appeal on Organic Soils. Mr. Herweyer stated the recommendation before the Committee is that the Region withdraw from

this appeal. He explained the Regional Official Plan does not state that it is necessary to reflect organic soils in the zoning by-law. He noted that Goulbourn currently implements it through their existing Official Plan. He said staff looked at the land uses that were affected and it is not an issue in terms of development pressures. Mr. Herweyer pointed out this has never been required in any of the other comprehensive zoning by-laws and staff feel it would be best to look at this Region-wide or City-wide next year and deal with it on a comprehensive basis. Mr. Marc added the language in the Regional Official Plan does not make this mandatory. At an OMB hearing, Goulbourn would be able to point to this fact and as well, they would also be able to point to the fact the Region has not appealed on this basis elsewhere. These would be two pretty significant factors that would favour Goulbourn's success.

With respect to Appeal 4, Councillor Legendre commented it appeared to him staff were recommending this appeal be withdrawn at this time but the implication is that it could come up again in the future. He asked for staff comment. Mr. Marc advised it would be possible to come back and look at this again in the future, when an OMB order is issued with respect to adjacent lands. However, he pointed out the Provincial Policy Statement only requires that the issue of setbacks be looked at when a planning application is before the body in question. He noted Goulbourn's position is that there is no need to actually put the setbacks in the zoning by-law but rather allow it to be addressed when a planning application is made and a wetland impact statement can be submitted at that time.

Councillor Legendre could not understand why the municipality would not want to include the setback in their zoning by-law. Mr. Herweyer reiterated the Provincial Policy Statement does not require the setbacks to be set out in the comprehensive zoning by-law, rather it is a condition of development (e.g. subdivision, site plan, etc). He stated the Region would be on tenuous ground appealing this. Further, Mr. Herweyer pointed out the setback is not fixed (e.g. the impact study could determine that a 50 metre setback is needed instead of 120 metres) and this would be difficult to deal with in a zoning by-law.

Councillor Stewart, referring to appeal number 1 (Jock River Flood Plain - Richmond) asked if this took into account the newest flood plain mapping that has just been completed and adopted by the Conservation Authority. Mr. Herweyer advised the mapping dated back to 1979 but there was an update in 1996 (not a complete study but a review of the hydrology) and that indicated only negligible changes through Richmond.

Councillor Stewart advised this was not the new mapping and noted the new mapping that was recently carried out and adopted by the Conservation Authority did show some changes in this area. The Councillor indicated she would require more information before she could make a decision on this.

Councillor Stewart went on to say that as far as she knew, the Conservation Authority Board was not in agreement with building on lots of records in the flood plain. She explained as well, the extent of new building that could occur was also very important as there is a cumulative effect. When fill is added and construction takes place, the waterway is altered and it can have a profound effect downstream. She said where you once did not have a problem and people were able to build very safely away from flood water, a new subdivision in the flood plain upstream will displace the storage capacity for the flood water and will cause the formerly safe area to flood.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Danny Page, Planner, Township of Goulbourn, advised there are approximately 12 lots of record. He said more importantly, the subject area is in the upper reaches of the tributaries, that tend to coincide with the flood fringe. These are the areas that are least susceptible to flooding and might only see flooding once every one hundred years. Mr. Page explained the actual portion of the flood plain along the Jock River would be zoned Environmental Protection Area. Mr. Page also pointed out that Conservation Authority approval would still be required to secure a building permit within these areas.

Councillor Stewart stated she was somewhat assured by this information, however, she noted in the last 30 years, we have learned “it is far more cost effective to keep people away from water, than to keep water away from people”. She said as well the beginnings of climate change within our watersheds were starting to be seen and although, this may sound safe she did not want to make any big decisions on the eve of what may be some serious change in water quantity levels in this Region.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Herweyer confirmed in this area of the flood plain, the possibility of flooding is once in 100 years. The Councillor felt too much was being made of the danger when the probability was only once in 100 years. He also pointed out that the Conservation Authority would have to approve any building permits.

Councillor Munter stated he was quite skeptical about the one in 100 year parameter, as it is known those parameters are changing and the previous 100 years are not a reliable basis to go on. The Councillor felt it was very unwise for people to build houses in flood plains but he asked if wording could be included in the zoning by-law which would in effect allow property owners who decide to build in flood plains to assume liability and render the municipality (and ultimately the taxpayer) harmless. Mr. Marc replied this would not be possible.

Referring to a response given by Mr. Herweyer to a question posed by Councillor Legendre, with respect to the appeal on the Wetlands - Adjacent Lands, Councillor Munter stated he did not understand the argument that because the buffer varies, there is no point in putting a

reference to the buffer in the zoning by-law. He questioned why wording such as “the greater of 30 metres or whatever is determined by the impact study” could not be included. Mr. Marc advised that a zoning by-law, is significantly different than an Official Plan. An Official Plan can speak to generalities and can contain this type of provision. Whereas, a zoning by-law is much more a document, where you “dot your i’s and cross your t’s”; it has to be precise so that the building official can answer a question with certainty. One must be able, on reading the zoning by-law, with just that document in front of them, to come to a conclusive decision as to whether or not a building permit shall be issued.

In response to further questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Herweyer advised he was not aware of any other area municipality zoning by-laws that contained a reference to the wetland buffer. Mr. Marc added that given that the Adjacent Lands policy has yet to be approved in the Regional Official Plan, it is highly unlikely that it would be in any of the area municipality zoning by-laws.

The Committee then heard from the following delegations.

Nicholas Patterson relayed his opinion that the manner in which the report was written, was incomprehensible to him and most likely, to the average lay person. As well, he felt it was evident from the questions asked that some members of the Committee were having difficulty comprehending it. He felt there was a need for staff to receive instruction to improve their writing skills. Mr. Patterson referred as well to another item on the Agenda dealing with City of Ottawa LOPA 37 and felt this was another example of poor writing.

Chair Hunter explained the report on the appeal of Goulbourn’s zoning by-law had been part of a larger report and was intended to only be a brief summary. He suggested if there were anything the speaker would like clarified, staff would be happy to oblige.

Mr. Patterson then referred to the issue of the flood plains and offered his opinion that there was no need to put this land out of circulation and deprive the community of some of the best and most attractive land. He suggested that owners in such areas could be advised on a yearly basis, through a mailing, that they would not be entitled to compensation, should they suffer damage as a result of a flood.

Danny Page, Planner, Township of Goulbourn, indicated he concurred with Mr. Marc’s comments that staff of the Region and Goulbourn have been working very earnestly on this matter and have had a number of meetings to try and sort out the issues of the appeals. He thanked staff for the opportunity to have had that dialogue.

Mr. Page went on to note he was appearing before the Committee on behalf of Goulbourn Council and Mayor Stavinga. He stated that Goulbourn Council's position is that they would like to see the entire appeal withdrawn. He said he understood the appeals were initiated on the basis of a principle, however, in terms of the substance of the appeal, Goulbourn Council believes there really is not a substantive issue involved in any of these appeals.

The speaker then went on to review the issues surrounding the appeals. He said with respect to the Richmond Flood Plain, the area referred to is the upper reaches of the tributaries; the principal flood way will be zoned Environmental Protection Area. Mr. Page explained part of the reason the upper reaches were not reflected by Council in its consideration of the by-law was because of the anxiety this was causing many of the residents. Many of these properties have had residences on them for one hundred and fifty years and the residents have never seen flooding and have therefore questioned the validity of the flood plain mapping. He said Council elected not to zone those areas flood plain but to leave them within the residential zoning and this was done after a great deal of thought and input from the Conservation Authority.

With respect to the appeal concerning the Organic Soils, Mr. Page stated this is not a requirement of either the Goulbourn Official Plan or the Regional Official Plan and is not reflected in most zoning by-laws.

Mr. Page advised the appeal submitted on the Commercial Zones, places limits on the size of commercial centres that may occur in Richmond and Stittsville. He said limits precluding centres in excess of 35,000 square metres feet from occurring in Stittsville and 10,000 square metres in Richmond, were not included because it is highly improbable facilities of this size could occur in either Richmond or Stittsville. The reasons being the primary market does not exist for these kinds of centres and there are no sites within Richmond or Stittsville to accommodate shopping centres of this magnitude. Mr. Page explained Goulbourn staff, in designing this by-law were specifically attempting to streamline it and not have "regulations for the sake of regulation".

On the issue of Provincially significant Wetlands, (item 5) Mr. Page stated Goulbourn has zoned all of the Provincially Significant Wetlands and Goulbourn Council is committed to (when the OMB approves the rest of the Provincially Significant Wetlands) showing those wetlands on the zoning schedule.

With respect to the last issue, the site specific appeal, the speaker stated Goulbourn is of the view that the zoning simply reflects an existing use. He said the existing use, a shooting range has been in place for quite some time and he noted there had been discussions with the landowner as to whether they wished to have any additional uses. Mr. Page said it was his understanding the owner was to confirm in writing that they are prepared to go along with the exception zone that staff have indicated.

Councillor Stewart noted Mr. Page was representing Goulbourn Council's position. She asked what the Goulbourn staff's position was that was brought forward to Council on the first appeal regarding the Flood Plain. Mr. Page stated the initial staff position was to have the EPA zone extend all the way up the tributaries to the upper reaches. However, after the public consultation, where in excess of 100 individuals spoke on this issue, staff developed a revised by-law that was in effect the compromise solution presently before Committee. He noted this solution was developed in consultation with the Conservation Authority (i.e. the residential zoning would remain in place, with a Flood Plain overlay) and this was recommended to Goulbourn Council. The residents, however, were concerned with the implications of this and felt it would place a "black mark" on title to their properties that would prevent them from selling their homes at some point in the future or obstruct their ability to obtain a minor variance for an addition to their house. Mr. Page advised that Council elected not to go along with that compromise solution.

Having heard from all delegations, the matter returned to Committee.

Councillor Hill stated she could appreciate the concerns some of the members of the Committee had with respect to the flood plain, however, she noted the situation would be different if the Committee were dealing with a new development or a new subdivision. In this instance it is a village that has existed since 1818 and has a population in excess of 3000 people and the Councillor felt that common sense should prevail. She pointed out building permits require the approval of the Conservation Authority and they have been allowing houses to be built, since the flood mapping was done in 1979.

In concluding her remarks, the Councillor noted she had lived in the Village of Richmond for 35 years and it had not experienced flooding per se, during that time. She urged the Committee to support her motion.

Councillor Legendre offered his opinion that it was not a very good signal, when the professionals from both the local municipality and the Region are essentially saying, "we do not have to tell people who wish to buy property in this area that they are buying into a flood plain". He said these people would have to find this out when it floods and the municipality does not want to assist because the residents do not want to put a "black mark" against their property. Councillor Legendre noted the Region is there to serve the people and provide information; hiding information is not useful and this is what this motion amounts to.

Councillor Hill pointed out the River runs right through the middle of the Village of Richmond, so there would be no way that people could not know there is a possibility of flooding.

The Committee then considered Councillor Hill's motion. Councillor Legendre asked that the motion be separated.

Moved by B. Hill

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve:

- 1. That the position of the Region with respect to Item 1 (Jock River Flood Plain - Richmond) of the Region's appeal of the Goulbourn Comprehensive zoning by-law be to support an amendment which would recognize existing uses and permit a single dwelling on lots of record;**

CARRIED

YEAS: M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, R. van den Ham and G. Hunter...5

NAYS: J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart....3

- 2. That staff be directed to withdraw Items 2 (Organic Soils) and 4 (Wetlands - Adjacent Lands) of the appeal; and,**

CARRIED

(J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart dissented)

- 3. That Items 3 (Commercial Zones), 5 (Wetlands) and 6 (Lot 15, Concession 10 - Specific Open Space Zone) be sustained.**

CARRIED

The Committee then approved Councillor Hill's motion in its entirety.

Moved by B. Hill

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve:

- 1. That the position of the Region with respect to Item 1 (Jock River Flood Plain - Richmond) of the Region's appeal of the Goulbourn Comprehensive**

- zoning by-law be to support an amendment which would recognize existing uses and permit a single dwelling on lots of record;**
2. **That staff be directed to withdraw Items 2 (Organic Soils) and 4 (Wetlands - Adjacent Lands) of the appeal; and,**
 3. **That Items 3 (Commercial Zones), 5 (Wetlands) and 6 (Lot 15, Concession 10 - Specific Open Space Zone) be sustained.**

CARRIED

(J. Legendre, A. Munter and
W. Stewart dissented)

PLANNING ITEMS

2. NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION PRESENTATION:
CAPITAL CORE AREA CONCEPT PLAN

- Co-ordinator, Planning and Environment Committee report dated 18 Apr 2000

Nick Tunnacliffe introduced the item and noted staff would be coming back to Committee in the very near future with a report on this matter, for its consideration.

Mr. Tunnacliffe then introduced François Lapointe, Director, Planning, National Capital Commission and Daniel Miron, Senior Planner - Urban Area, National Capital Commission. Copies of three separate documents on the Core Area Concept of Canada's Capital, prepared by Du Toit Allsopp Hillier and Delcan for the National Capital Commission, were provided to members of the Committee and are held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Mr. Lapointe provided a brief history of the concept plan, noting he appeared before the Planning and Environment Committee in the summer of 1998 to present the NCC's Vision document. At the same time, the NCC was going through the public consultation for the Plan for Canada's Capital. That was the first phase of a three phase process. The Concept Plan is the second phase and Sector Plan (the third phase) will be undertaken sometime in 2001.

Mr. Lapointe noted in the Vision document, the NCC was introducing a number of key ideas and these are further developed in the Concept Plan. Two of the key ideas were the notion of better linking the core area with the River and enhancing the linkage and relationship between Federal lands and land coming under municipal jurisdiction. He said in February 1999 the NCC released a report on the public consultation and that led to some of the changes incorporated into the Concept Plan, such as a refocus on Sparks Street revitalization.

Mr. Lapointe felt it very important to remind the Committee that the NCC is working on both sides of the River and also at this stage of the planning process, they are considering not only Federal land but all of the land in the core area. He said this Concept Plan is really a long term proposal for the core and he acknowledged there would be a need for additional studies along the way. He also noted that input was obtained from municipal staff on both sides of the River. Mr. Lapointe also stressed that the Concept Plan was a discussion document and not for approval; the Sector Plan (anticipated in 2001), will be formally approved by the NCC. He noted the consultation period for the Concept Plan, provides opportunity for comment until June 2.

Mr. Miron then provided Committee with an overview of the Concept Plan. Some of the highlights of Mr. Miron's presentation follow:

- core area is 10 square kilometres;
- Strategic Environmental Assessment was integrated into the planning process;
- NCC looking at this in global context - Ottawa is the Capital of Canada and the core area is one of the most important areas in the whole National Capital Region;
- some adjustments were made from the Vision document, more effort into revitalization of Sparks Street;
- for Concept Plan, attention is on land between Brewer Creek and Ottawa River;
- scenic entries to the core are very important and should be looked at;
- Federal nodes are to be looked at and redesigned;
- number of areas NCC would like to see used on an 18 hour basis, emphasis on animation, mixed use development, infill and adaptive reuse of buildings;
- proposal to bring light rail to Bank Street on Sparks Street and across the River to Hull on Portage Bridge;
- possible creation of a transit loop that would circle the Confederation Blvd. - looking at ways to reduce traffic (including public transit and tour buses) on Wellington Street;
- possible locations for civic buildings e.g. Victoria Island, Scott Paper site, Parliament Hill;
- two elements of Concept Plan - Civic realm and Capital realm;
- looking at possibility of what could happen on the river, such as water taxis or shuttle boats to the islands. Also better link between Ottawa and Hull. Opening up the Ottawa River to Temiskaming or Georgian Bay for pleasure boating;
- development of west side of the core to balance the activities and attract more events;
- Six major core area initiatives - Lebreton Flats, Chaudieres and Victoria Islands, Sparks Street Area, Connecting with Gatineau Park, Bank Street Axis and Industrial Land Scott Paper;

- Lebreton Flats - change existing alignment of the Parkway to a boulevard connecting more directly with Wellington Street, there would be mixed use development on the south side, north of the Flats a large park would be created and a national institution.
- Chaudieres and Victoria Islands - within next two years could be negotiations with Domtar with respect to west portion of Victoria Island, pedestrian bridges, docking facilities, national institution buildings, infill between existing buildings to house restaurants, boutiques, cafes, there would be a common area with stage;
- Sparks Street - between Metcalfe Street and O'Connor Street; want to consolidate ownership of buildings in this area, two twelve story buildings - one for residential, one for offices. Along Sparks Street the buildings would be three stories to retain heritage character;
- series of courtyards, plaza from Sparks Street to Queen Street, construction of underground parking to accommodate buses on the first level;
- proposal would involve demolition of three buildings and relocation of two others;
- believe Sparks Street has great potential, looking to private sector to carry out but NCC believes can kick start project;
- Connecting Gatineau Park -improved access to Gatineau Park for visitors to the Capital, proposed landscaping between St. Joseph Boulevard and the Gatineau Parkway;
- Bank Street Access - better direct access down to the River and installation of docking facilities. Study being done by Public Works and they are trying to incorporate the NCC plans into their proposal
- Industrial Land Scott Paper - believe Government would be interested in acquiring Scott Paper land and converting to a park and perhaps attract some national institutions. The industrial uses could be moved to another site.

Councillor Munter had questions concerning the Sector Plan. Mr. Miron advised the Sector Plan is part of the NCC's hierarchy of Plans. The top one is the Plan for Canada's Capital and there are a series of Master Plans: one for Gatineau Park, one for the Greenbelt and one for the Urban lands. With respect to the Master Plan for the urban lands, the NCC decided it was too big of an undertaking to do in bulk and instead they would undertake it in parts, with the core area being first. Mr. Lapointe pointed out, in terms of the Greenbelt Master Plan, the NCC worked very closely with Regional staff and the Regional Official Plan is almost an exact duplicate of the NCC's Master Plan, in terms of policy and orientation. He said in terms of the core area Sector Plan, the NCC would attempt to convey to the future City of Ottawa their interests in the core and try to harmonize as much as possible the NCC policies with the new City's policies.

Councillor Munter questioned which aspects of the concept plan, the NCC would be moving forward with first. Mr. Lapointe stated the Sparks Street initiative is one area the NCC will be

actively pursuing over the next few years. As well, LeBreton Flats is also a priority for the NCC, in terms of dealing with the contamination so that some development can begin. Councillor Munter offered his opinion that the development of LeBreton Flats was much more important than knocking down buildings on Sparks Street and moving things around. He asked how the NCC could be convinced to use the money intended to be spent on Sparks Street, on LeBreton Flats instead. Mr. Lapointe stated obviously he was not the one to make such a decision. He also pointed out that in terms of Sparks Street, from the NCC's point of view, it is only two blocks away from Parliament Hill and that relationship is very important to the NCC.

Councillor Stewart had questions concerning where the funding for the proposed plans would come from and whether it would be from the off-loading of other NCC lands that they have declared surplus. Mr. Lapointe replied the NCC has carried out divestiture of land in the past and will likely continue to do so in the future. He noted there is land that the NCC does not need and often, particularly over the last seven years, the NCC has transferred such land to the municipalities rather than putting it on the market. In terms of funding, Mr. Lapointe stated it is obvious that what is proposed is costly and the NCC does not have the money to carry it out. He pointed out this is a long term plan and additional funding will be sought for LeBreton Flats and Sparks Street. However, if the work the NCC is doing right now (i.e. the concept plans) is not carried out, there is no rationale or basis for obtaining the necessary money.

Councillor Stewart noted that some of the most significant parcels of land, (e.g. Vincent Massey Park and Mooney's Bay) are not nationally significant but they certainly are locally significant. She felt it important for the NCC to know the public has certainly made a connection between their valuable local areas and green spaces and the generation of the funds to realize the NCC's dream. Mr. Lapointe pointed out the money from land that is sold by the NCC is reinvested in the property that it continues to own. He said the lifecycle investment in NCC land is approximately \$18 to \$20 million annually. He said the NCC's aim has been to get most of that funding from the Federal Government.

Councillor Holmes stated it was good news to see the Federal Government interested in the National Capital and taking an interest in the downtown because there certainly has not been an interest there for quite a long time. The Councillor then had questions concerning Sparks Street and whether the proposed underground parking lot was being driven by the need to remove cars from Parliament Hill. Mr. Lapointe replied there is an issue on the Hill, in terms of security, landscaping, etc. and there may be a tie but it is not driven by that.

Councillor Holmes asked if the NCC would consider building the Bank Street axis, before the parking lot is removed at the base of the Hill. Mr. Lapointe advised this would be part of the long range plan that Public Works is involved in right now, looking at the accommodation issue on the Hill. He said this could mean some additional construction on the Hill over the next five

to ten years and obviously parking would be part of that. Mr. Lapointe explained it is not a question of removing all parking from the Hill, but rather it is recognizing there is too much surface parking right now and this needs to be rationalized in the context of street scaping of the Hill and future accommodation. Mr. Miron added the study would determine if the parking will have to be relocated somewhere else or not. Councillor Holmes noted when the Region helped build the underground parking garage under the World Exchange building, Council was convinced the reason to do that was to support Sparks Street with more short term parking but in fact the vast majority is commuter parking with very little short term parking.

Councillor Holmes noted that to bring on LeBreton Flats, step one is that the Region move the Transitway, later the NCC will move the parkway. She asked, since the first step is not in the Region's next five year funding plan, if the NCC intended to move faster than that. Mr. Lapointe replied the first step for the NCC will be to deal with the contamination problem. Relocating the parkway will be part of this, because fill under the parkway can be used to replace what is taken off with the contamination. Councillor Holmes asked if the NCC would look at some of the early residential parcels, before moving the parkway. Mr. Lapointe said the NCC's aim is to look at the contamination and at the same time looking at the parkway. He explained the existing parkway will have to be decommissioned and relocated on its new access, LeBreton Boulevard. Councillor Holmes asked if the NCC had any commitment from the Federal Government for funding to move the parkway. Mr. Lapointe advised they were working on this.

The Committee then heard from the following delegation.

Lois K. Smith advised she had not had an opportunity to attend the consultation sessions held by the NCC but said she intended to obtain more information on these.. Mr. Lapointe advised he would speak with Miss Smith after the meeting.

Miss Smith indicated she was very interested in certain aspects of LeBreton Flats, as well as the Bank Street Axis, the Islands and the transit end of things. She noted several years ago, when the Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan was being developed, she provided a proposed route to replace the alternatives suggested by staff. She said her suggestions would preserve existing heritage building, would give an enhanced view of the falls without destroying the falls themselves and would be done in such a way as to be a tourist attraction. She encouraged the NCC to look at these plans.

As the Committee lost quorum, the report could not be received formally.

3. CITY OF OTTAWA OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 37 -
TEMPORARY SURFACE PARKING IN THE CENTRAL AREA
AND INNER CITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 27 Mar 2000

Councillor Hume indicated he would be putting forward a motion to defer this item to the next meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee. He noted he had received several calls from members of the public who were interested in this item but were unable to attend today's meeting.

Councillor Legendre stated he had no objection to the deferral but asked that staff be prepared to make a presentation to the Committee at that time, to expand on the report. Committee Chair Hunter confirmed staff would be making a presentation and suggested the Councillor might also want to discuss the report with the author, Nigel Brereton, in the interim.

Moved by P. Hume

That consideration of this item be deferred to the next Planning and Environment Committee meeting.

CARRIED

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve Amendment No. 37 to the City of Ottawa Official Plan as per the Approval Page attached as Annex I.

DEFERRED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR