

DOCUMENT 5: Consultation Detail and Response to Comments:

Contents

5.0 Introduction..... 2

5.1 Approach to Consultation for all Villages 3

5.1.1 Dates of the Public Consultation Meetings..... 4

 Spring 2011 – Initial Consultation Meeting Dates 4

 Fall 2011 – Consultation on Proposed Plan Amendments or Policy Direction Meeting Dates . 5

5.2 Summary of Issues Raised regarding the Proposed Amendments to the Consolidated Village Policies in Volume 2C of the Official Plan 6

 5.2.1 Summary of Issues Raised Regarding Individual Village Visions, Goals, Objectives and Schedules..... 7

5.3: Summary of Issues Raised regarding the Proposed Amendments to the Carp Community Design Plan 12

 5.3.1 Summary of Issues Raised by the Carp Community Association, Carp Business Improvement Association, Carp Corridor Business Improvement Association or Friends of the Carp River regarding proposed Amendments to the Carp Community Design Plan 12

5.4 Constance Bay – Response to ‘As We Heard it’ Comments 14

5.5 Greely – Response to ‘As We Heard it’ Comments 42

5.6 Manotick – Response to ‘As We Heard it’ Comments..... 95

5.0 Introduction

Document 5 provides detail on the scope, methods and dates of public consultation, what was documented during this consultation and how staff has sought to resolve any issues brought to their attention.

Section 5.1 describes the consultation approach and dates of public workshops for all villages.

Section 5.2 deals with issues noted during consultation on the proposed amendments to Volume 2C of the Official Plan. These amendments affect 20 villages in the City and are discussed by individual village.

Section 5.3 summarizes issues noted during the consultation on proposed amendments to the Carp Community Design Plan.

Section 5.4 provides an aggregated response to comments received during the Constance Bay consultations.

Section 5.5 provides an aggregated response to comments received during the Greely Village consultations.

Section 5.6 provides an aggregated response to comments received during the Manotick Village consultations.

5.1 Approach to Consultation for all Villages

A collaborative community process was used to develop amendments to the Village Plans in Volume 2C of the Official Plan. The approach required several methods of communication and consultation.

Website:

- The website was organized by individual village and functioned to provide all the information residents needed to understand the project.
- The website included village background information, results of meetings, draft reports, information, links to other sites and reports, a link to make comments or ask questions and contact information to provide a general feedback.
- The Rural Affairs Office led by Adam Brown helped to connect residents to the website and other activities with their monthly e-newsletter and through direct emailing of residents from each village prior to each meeting.

Public Meetings:

- 14 Public meetings in the spring of 2011:
 - Meeting format for secondary plan villages included a presentation by staff to explain what the project is about, give existing conditions, facilitate a SWOT analysis and vision future development plans.
 - Meeting format for Carp, Constance Bay, Cumberland, Greely, Manotick and Vars included a presentation by staff and a facilitated table topic session on specific areas of interest.
 - All meetings had a series of boards and maps for perusal by the public.
- 14 Public meetings in the fall of 2011
 - Meeting format included a presentation by staff of proposed changes to the plans, a question and answer section and a facilitated discussion on proposed amendments and other issues. Residents were provided a copy of the draft policies for their village.
 - Constance Bay, Greely and Manotick included a presentation by staff of a response to their spring comments, presentation of potential amendments to the plans and a question and answer session.
- **Councillor Engagement**
 - Discussions were held with each councillor and a number of councillor assistants prior to significant milestones in the plan review process.
- **Print Information**
 - Spring 2011
 - Handouts were prepared for each meeting describing the village review process, and goals for the meeting. Additional handouts giving information on other rural review projects were also given out.
 - Fall 2011
 - Handouts were circulated to Community Association representatives of the respective villages prior to the meeting and at the meetings residents were given an information sheet detailing the village review process and the amendments that were proposed.
- **Key Informant Interviews**
 - Where response to the first public meeting was sparse, direct interviews were held with community leaders to collect and consult on issues pertaining to planning in the village
 - When specific site issues arose or supplementary meetings were deemed necessary staff conducted additional direct interviews with Community Associations or land owners.

5.1.1 Dates of the Public Consultation Meetings

Spring 2011 – Initial Consultation Meeting Dates

	<p>Constance Bay <u>Saturday March 26th, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> Constance and Buckham's Bay Community Centre 262 Len Purcell Drive, Constance Bay</p>		<p>Sarsfield <u>Friday, March 25, 2011 - 6pm-9pm</u> Sarsfield Community Centre 3585 Sarsfield Road, Sarsfield</p>
Ward 5	<p>Dunrobin, Fitzroy Harbour, Kinburn, and Galetta <u>Saturday April 2, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> West Carleton Community Complex 670 Carp Road, Kinburn</p>		<p>Navan, Carlsbad, Notre Dame Des Champs <u>Saturday March 26th, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> Navan Curling Club 1305 Fairgreen Avenue, Navan</p>
	<p>Carp <u>Tuesday April 12, 2011 - 6pm-9pm</u> Carp Fairgrounds 3790 Carp Road, Carp</p>		<p>Cumberland <u>Monday April 4, 2011 - 6pm-9pm</u> Maple hall- Lions Club 2552 Old Montreal Rd, Cumberland</p>
	<p>Greely <u>Wednesday March 30th, 2011 - 6pm-9pm</u> Greely Community Centre 1448 Meadow Drive, Greely</p>		<p>Vars <u>Saturday April 9, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> Bearbrook Community Centre 8720 Russell Rd, Cumberland</p>
	<p>Osgoode <u>Tuesday April 5, 2011 - 6pm-9pm</u> Osgoode Community Centre 5660 Osgoode Main, Osgoode</p>		<p>Ashton, Munster and Fallowfield <u>Saturday April 2, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> Goulbourn Municipal Building 2135 Huntley Road, Stittsville</p>
Ward 20	<p>Vernon, Kenmore and Marionville <u>Saturday April 16, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> Vernon Community Centre 7950 Lawrence, Vernon</p>		<p>Kars and Burritts Rapids <u>Saturday April 16, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> Malbrough Community Centre 3048 Pierce Rd RR 2, Pierce's Corners</p>
	<p>Metcalfe <u>Saturday April 9, 2011 - 1pm-4pm</u> Metcalfe Client Service Centre 8243 Victoria Street, Metcalfe</p>		<p>Manotick <u>Tuesday April 19, 2011 - 6pm-9pm</u> Manotick Community Centre 5572 Doctor Leach Drive, Manotick</p>
		Ward 19	
		Ward 21	

Fall 2011 – Consultation on Proposed Plan Amendments or Policy Direction Meeting Dates

Ward 5	<p>Fitzroy Harbour and Galetta <u>Saturday November 19, 2011 - 9am-12pm</u> West Carleton Community Complex 5670 Carp Road, Kinburn</p>	<p>Vars <u>Wednesday September 28, 2011 – 6pm-9pm</u> Bearbrook Community Centre 8720 Russell Rd, Cumberland</p>
	<p>Dunrobin and Kinburn <u>Saturday November 19, 2011 – 1 pm – 4 pm</u> West Carleton Community Complex 5670 Carp Road, Kinburn</p>	<p>Cumberland <u>Wednesday December 7, 2011 - 7pm-9pm</u> St. Andrews United Church 2557 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland</p>
	<p>Carp <u>December 14, 2011 - 7pm-9pm</u> Carp Fairgrounds 3790 Carp Road, Carp</p>	<p>Navan, Carlsbad, Notre Dame Des Champs <u>Saturday December 3, 2011 – 9am-12pm</u> Navan Memorial Community Centre 1295 Colonial Road, Navan</p>
	<p>Constance Bay <u>Saturday November 26, 2011 - 10am- 12pm</u> Constance Bay Community Centre 262 Len Purcell Drive, Constance Bay</p>	<p>Sarsfield <u>Saturday December 3, 2011 – 1pm-4pm</u> Sarsfield Community Centre 3585 Sarsfield Road, Sarsfield</p>
Ward 20	<p>Metcalfe, Vernon, Kenmore and Marionville <u>Monday November 21, 2011 – 7pm-9pm</u> Osgoode Township High School 2800 Albert Street, Metcalfe</p>	<p>Ashton, Munster and Fallowfield <u>Thursday December 1, 2011 – 7pm-9pm</u> Goulbourn Municipal Building 2135 Huntley Road, Stittsville</p>
	<p>Greely <u>Thursday December 15, 2011 - 7pm-9pm</u> Greely Community Centre 1448 Meadow Drive, Greely</p>	<p>Kars and Burritt's Rapids <u>Monday December 5, 2011 – 7pm-9pm</u> North Gower Client Service Centre 2155 Roger Stevens Drive, North Gower</p>
	<p>Osgoode <u>Thursday December 8, 2011 - 7pm-9pm</u> Osgoode Community Centre 5660 Osgoode Main, Osgoode</p>	<p>Manotick <u>Tuesday December 6, 2011 - 7pm-9pm</u> Manotick Community Centre 5572 Doctor Leach Drive, Manotick</p>
Ward 19		
Ward 21		

5.2 Summary of Issues Raised regarding the Proposed Amendments to the Consolidated Village Policies in Volume 2C of the Official Plan

Most comments received by the City relating to the consolidated policies were generally very positive. Staff heard particularly supportive comment on providing a unique vision for individual villages in the plan, the updated schedules, and the concept of expanded home-based businesses to foster village economic activity and, in applicable villages, the coordination with adjacent municipalities.

The name of the land use designation for residential lands with expanded home-based business provisions was changed as a result of the consultation. The original title, Village General caused some confusion because it did not reflect that the designation is a residential one. The name was changed then to Village Residential – Enterprise which was felt to more closely reflect the intention of the use to foster starting businesses, small scale services and entrepreneurial activity.

Several comments received expressed an interest in expansion of village boundaries to provide for additional development lands. The plans however were not amended to expand the boundaries to form additional developable lands. The reason for this is that the village review is not a comprehensive review under the Planning Act. It was stated at the meetings that council may, during a future comprehensive review, contemplate village boundary expansion but expansion would not occur as a result of this study.

Staff received productive input from the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority with regard to definition of natural hazards and policy language in the proposed plan. As a result of their input the plan was modified to match the Official Plan language and the name of a land use designation was changed from Greenland and Natural Hazards to just Greenlands. The reason for the name change is that the schedules could be misinterpreted because not all statutory natural hazards have been included on the plans. The reason that not all hazards are shown in the plans is illustrated in the village of Kars. Within Kars there are large areas of land within the floodplain that have existing homes. Were the residential lands redesignated to Greenlands the uses on these lands could become legal non-conforming following updates to the Zoning By-law. Given that the community of Kars is long established and the exact boundaries of hazards have not been mapped such a restriction on the lands was determined to be not to be compulsory considering that a permit from the Conservation Authority would still be required for development.

Some residents, particularly in the villages of Munster and Metcalfe expressed a concern about height or density beyond what is current in the community. In particular there was concern about row-housing and heights above 2.5 or 3 storeys. Where there was concern objectives were amended in the village vision, goals and objectives to address the need to ensure that future housing would be compatible with existing housing forms and density. These statements will be carried forward and implemented in the Zoning By-law where possible to control heights and density in villages, particularly in the village core.

The City received one lengthy submission from a resident. The submission objected to consideration of the Official Plan amendment without also revising the City's development review, infrastructure and intensification policies, land use policies, design guidelines and

comprehensive zoning by-law. Unfortunately the submission confused the comprehensive plan process with the current review process and misunderstood the relationship between land use designations in the Official Plan and those in the zoning by-law. This current planning project is not an comprehensive Official Plan review under the Planning Act and it is only after the completion of the current planning process that the comprehensive zoning by-law will be updated. Staff reviewed the submission thoroughly but did not make any changes to the draft plans as a result of the review.

5.2.1 Summary of Issues Raised Regarding Individual Village Visions, Goals, Objectives and Schedules

Ashton

Comments from residents at the meeting were positive. Residents were very supportive of the need to coordinate with Beckwith Township and made mention of the need for greater road safety measures in the community.

Burritt's Rapids

Comments from residents and the Community Association were generally positive.

The draft policies were changed based on Community Association and residents requests for language to reflect the vision of the community as a whole and to clarify words relating to sustainable development and home based businesses. The interest in a whole community and coordinated planning with the adjacent township was echoed in a follow-up meeting with a councillor and a senior staff member of North Grenville.

Parks Canada asked for changes to the vision statement to describe the importance of the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site. The plan was changed to reflect this importance.

Carlsbad Springs

Comments from residents were positive.

Based on the consultation changes were made to the vision to include reference to the village's role with nearby communities of Ramsayville and Piperville. Changes to the vision were also made to define the role of the community as greater than the village boundaries.

Cumberland

Comments from residents and the Community Association were generally positive.

The draft policies were changed based on comments that there needed to be a recognition that the community services a broader area than just the village and villagers.

Dunrobin

Staff received an objection to the proposed plan because it did not consider the boundaries or the radius clause restricting development in the proximity of Dunrobin Village. The objection stated that it (the draft vision, goals and objectives) was too restrictive.

Staff did not amend the proposed policies based on the objection because this policy study was not a comprehensive plan review of the Official Plan as defined in the Planning Act.

Fallowfield

Comments from residents were positive.

Residents asked for consideration of some additional lands as village core. Staff reviewed the lands and opted to add a small area along Richmond Road but did not add the lands that were suggested on Steeple Hill Crescent because this is a well established residential area.

Fitzroy Harbour

Staff did not receive any comments on the proposed plan from residents of Fitzroy Harbour residents.

Galetta

Comments from residents were positive.

Kars

Comments from residents and the Community Association were generally positive. Based on comments received the policies were amended to below ground services versus above ground services. Also, the land use schedule was amended to add the community centre to the village core.

Changes to the vision statement to describe the importance of the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site were raised by Parks Canada and a resident. The plan was changed to reflect this importance.

Kenmore

Comments from residents and the Community Association were generally positive. Based on input the vision was revised to reflect the community's desire for growth that matched the existing housing form and density.

Some landowners wanted land added to the village on the north side. They suggested that the township had proposed expansion prior to amalgamation but did not justify this boundary expansion at the time. The land was never added to the Official Plan. Staff are not recommending adding lands to the village at this time.

Kinburn

Comments on the proposed vision were generally positive.

Some landowners expressed desire to expand the village because of encumbrances to development from the quality of ground water resources. Staff is not recommending adding lands to the village at this time.

Marionville

Comments from residents and the Community Association were positive.

At the fall meeting residents were particularly supportive of better coordination with Russell Township. It is notable that a planner from Russell Township participated in the fall consultation meeting and contributed to the facilitated discussion.

Metcalf

Comments from residents and the Community Association were positive.

Residents contributed to amendments to the proposed landuse schedule - expanding the lands in Village Residential - Enterprise where expanded home-based business provisions will be implemented.

Munster

Comments from residents and the Community Association were generally negative.

The fall consultation meeting for the village was well attended and a spirited discussion occurred about the potential for change to the village context. Residents strongly objected to any additional housing, additional housing forms aside from single detached dwellings, height over 2.5 stories or additional businesses. The proposed plan as presented at the meeting actually had fewer lands designated for residential use than the old township plan and no additions to the boundary of the village were proposed or even contemplated.

Following the meeting staff met with the Community Association and formulated revisions to the vision, goals and objectives to ensure that additional housing, were it to occur on already designated residential lands would be slow in pace of development. Statements in the vision supporting a multi-generational community were removed as were any objectives dealing with variety in housing form. The land use schedule was revised to remove and Village Residential -

Enterprise lands and the village core was reduced in size to the existing core plus the library. The school site was also changed back to residential rather than village core.

Staff expressed strong reservations about some of the changes made to the vision, goals and objectives especially as they relate to providing for a complete community but feel that residents of the village are best in tune with the long term vision for the community and that their strongly felt collective desire for minimal or no change to the village should be carried forward.

Navan

Comments from residents and the Community Association were positive.

Changes were made to the plan based on comments received to expand the Village Residential Enterprise designation further west of the village core. Changes were also made to add statements supporting increased connectivity and expanded sidewalks in the village.

Notre Dame des Champs

Comments from residents at the fall meeting were positive. Staff did not receive any written submissions for this village.

Osgoode

Comments from residents and the Community Association representatives were positive.

Staff returned for a question and answer session during the Community Association annual general meeting. Based on the consultation a change was made to the vision to clarify that accessibility across the village was with regard to pedestrian and cycling connectivity.

Sarsfield

Comments from residents and the Community Association representatives were positive.

Residents of the village spoke strongly of the providing for the ongoing growth to maintain the vitality and culture of the historic village. Changes were made to the plan to clearly identify the village as one of rural francophone cultural heritage. In addition, the mention of connectivity of new neighbourhoods to the rest of the village neighbourhoods was made.

Vars

Comments from residents and the Community Association were positive.

Staff received comments requesting expansion of the village (onto lands north and onto lands southward). The village review is not a comprehensive review however and thus expansion of the village boundary is not being proposed at this time.

Based on the comments received and discussion at the Community Association meeting changes were made to the proposed land use schedule to maintain residential designations on land at the northern edge of the village on Rockdale Road. In addition some properties fronting on Devine Road were included within the village core.

Vernon

Comments on the proposed plan were generally positive.

Residents expressed a desire to protect groundwater resources and improve transportation connections to the city. As a result appropriate changes to the draft plan were made.

A landowner of commercial lands requested recognition of a commercial landuse over their entire property. Changes were made to the land use schedule to include this entire property. Also some changes were made to include all the museum lands in the village core and to include the churches and library in the village core.

5.3: Summary of Issues Raised regarding the Proposed Amendments to the Carp Community Design Plan

Comments on the proposed revised CDP have been uniformly positive. Residents expressed satisfaction with the CDP and with the review process and were optimistic about the future of the village in the long term.

Another landowner requested that lands changed to greenspace west of Carp Road and north of Dave's Autoparts be returned to residential land use. Staff completed a site visit and concurred to change the land use on Schedule A back to the existing land use category of Residential. It should be noted that the lands remain within the natural heritage system and an Environmental Impact Statement will be required prior to development.

Several residents pointed out the importance of showing whether roadways were single or double loaded (with sidewalks). Staff subsequently completed a survey of the village sidewalks and updated the pedestrian system map to show existing and proposed sidewalks and their orientation on either side of the road. As a result some proposed sidewalks were added in some locations to double load Donald B Munro and some other streets connecting to the village core.

A resident pointed out that the original CDP decision to categorize lands on Rivington Street as Ground – Oriented Multi-unit was never fully implemented. Schedule A was amended to reflect this previous decision and it is now illustrated correctly in the CDP.

The landowner of the Karson Lands requested adjustment of the greenspace boundary to the floodline in recognition of a recent rezoning decision. Additionally, the landowner requested adjustment of the pedestrian pathway away from an existing truck crossing and onto the sidewalk. In consultation, with the landowner staff made the appropriate amendments to the CDP to be consistent with the recent decision to rezone the lands and with the conservation authority decision to adjust the floodplain on these lands. With the owners consent the greenspace boundary on schedule A has been widened above the floodplain to allow for a future pathway along the river.

5.3.1 Summary of Issues Raised by the Carp Community Association, Carp Business Improvement Association, Carp Corridor Business Improvement Association or Friends of the Carp River regarding proposed Amendments to the Carp Community Design Plan

Staff met on several occasions with all the groups and worked collaboratively with them on the various policy directions and amendments to the CDP. The discussions with each group overlapped to a great degree which suggests that they have similar interests and concerns. As a result, the groups feature as mutual partners in the implementation of several actions under the plan. Staff were very thankful for the interest and input of these groups and would like to ensure the recognition of these groups during preparation of the workplan for the next review

The Community Association completed a line by line review of the proposed plan. The plan benefited greatly from their intimate knowledge of the community and of the planning and

development process particularly in the review of the land use schedules in the plan. One of the issues of the Community Association that could not be resolved was the status of the Carp CDP without an associated secondary plan. The group felt that there was greater strength in having a secondary plan and a CDP rather than just a CDP on its own. While this may or may not be the case staff felt that this was perhaps a general issue relating to all CDPs that would best be addressed through a comprehensive update to the Official Plan. The Community Association also highlighted the need for better pedestrian movement in the village, particularly as it links with the village core and whether a pathway could follow the railway tracks. The community association also expressed concern with sections relating to the village boundary and parking. The boundary issue has largely been deferred because adequate supply exists in the village currently. The parking issue has been added as an action item under the plan.

The Carp BIA contributed strongly to the discussion of the village core and growth of the village. Growth in population of the village will correlate with viability of the village core in the long term. The BIA has interests as well in tourism and employment. Their comments on these topics helped to shape the final language of the plan.

The Carp Corridor BIA, which coordinates itself with the village BIA to some degree, requested better recognition of the role of these two CDP areas. As a result staff have included a subsection in the CDP better defining the relationship of the village CDP to the corridor CDP. Going forward the corridor CDP will require an update and it is recommended then that corridor CDP relate back to the village CDP.

The Friends of the Carp River group requested changes in the pedestrian plan to include the preferred alternative under the Carp River Mediation Project. In response, the plan was altered to include the preferred alternative.

5.4 Constance Bay – Response to ‘As We Heard it’ Comments

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	
CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)	
Comments	Departmental responses
LAND USE	
<p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents are opposed to new development and felt that Constance Bay should not undergo any further growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development may proceed in accordance with zoning regulations provided that it satisfies all the technical servicing requirements. No changes to the village boundary are being proposed at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no focal point except for a linear strip of commercial development near the waterfront. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Constance Bay Community Plan (Community Plan) provides a plan for the future. It identifies future areas for a “Village Mainstreet” at Constance Bay Road and Bayview Drive and a “Village Shopping Area” near Constance Bay Road and the area identified for new residential development. However, the private sector will be responsible for this future development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a feeling that the public lanes accessing the beach from Bayview Drive need to be restored as soon as possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City is working with the Constance and Buckham’s Bay Community Association (Community Association) to establish the locations of the public rights-of-way and access points to the beach areas. The majority of the rights-of-way have been clearly marked, cleared and brought to their end state through the efforts of the Community Association.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a concern that the water accesses will encourage use of private, non-City-owned land. In addition there is concern that provision of parking and toilets “promotes” the beaches as a tourist destination. The Beach Protocols do not work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These issues were dealt with during preparation of the first Community Plan. There was support to undertake the current efforts to clearly identify the public accesses and for the provision of amenities at certain locations. If there are concerns about beach protocol, the Councillor’s Office and the Community Association should be contacted for further

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
		discussions about these matters.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When will there be sign off from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MCA) and a copy of the Environmental Assessment which were needed for cleaning the public accesses to the beach. Further there is a grant between the City and community association to operate both the community centre and sports field, which is the limit of their letters patent for incorporation. There is a \$1000 fine for those who cut down trees on City property without a permit and the Constance and Buckham Bay Community Association (BBCA) is a private company and subject to this fine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council approved the Constance Bay Community Plan in 2006. One of its key recommendations related to water access and management of road allowances. Some of this work involved identification of public accesses and notification of adjacent land owners who may be encroaching on City property. City staff has been working with the Constance and Buckham Bay's Community Association to identify locations of these accesses so that the CBBCA can assist with clearing the overgrown areas and installing signage. This work is being undertaken for the benefit of the residents of Constance Bay. In instances where trees were located in the public access, it is understood that City staff removed the trees and not the community association members. Staff has checked with MCA and MNR staff. The MCA does not regulate the general maintenance of areas such as public accesses and their staff states that an environmental assessment, would not be required for this type of work. MNR staff indicate that they typically would not get involved in clearing vegetation from a municipal access.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to motorized vehicles (eg. ATVs/snowmobiles) using water accesses and road allowances/private property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These matters can be brought to the attention of Police Services who have a drop-in Tuesday evenings at the community centre in the Village.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constance Bay has always been a tourist attraction. This is in contradiction to suggestions that residents do not want to become a tourist attraction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the historical facts found in the Constance Bay Community Plan are incorrect. It states that development started in 1927, however, this individual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisions have been made to Community Plan.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<p>is aware of family cottages he community started quite a while before 1927.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City and police have not been enforcing existing laws, by-laws, regulations relating to public alcohol consumption, trespassing and speeding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any concerns relating to these matters can be brought to the attention of the police. Police Services has a “drop-in” at the Constance Bay community centre on Tuesday evenings. Constable Peter Jeon is available to respond to questions about these types of issues.
	<p>Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents feel that the Village does not have sufficient residential density to support the Constance Bay Community Plan. Others feel that Constance Bay has reached its limit since septic systems and wells are already strained and there are nitrates in the water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will ultimately fall to the private sector to determine whether there is a sufficient population base to implement the areas designated as Village Shopping Area and Village Mainstreet. <p>The Community Plan’s Section 7.1, policy 1 specifically addresses the issue of nitrate build up. It says that hydrological studies to support new development will be required to take into account the observed built-up nitrates in the overburden sand aquifer and will provide measures to minimize additional nitrate loading.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is concern about road salt being found in wells. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A groundwater characterization study (2006) was undertaken for Constance Bay. Road salt was not a significant issue. It states: “Potential road salt effects in groundwater may be identified by elevated sodium and chloride concentrations in the vicinity of major roads and intersections. Such a correlation was not observed; elevated levels of sodium and chloride were primarily detected in deep wells located away from major roads. Therefore, no obvious road salt impacts to groundwater were detected within the Study Area.”
	Natural Environment Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry of Natural Resources has identified the sand

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)**

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents support retaining the forested area “as is” while there were others who support developing a portion of land along Len Purcell within the ANSI so that the community centre and adjacent park would not feel so isolated making it a safer place for children to play e.g. more eyes on the street creating a disincentive to criminals. 	<p>dunes and associated natural vegetation in the Village as the provincially significant Constance Bay Sand Hills Area of Natural Scientific Interest (ANSI) and these lands have been designated as a Natural Environment Area (NEA) in the City’s Official Plan and in the Community Plan. The ANSI includes the City-owned Torbolton Forest and other privately-owned lands. The NEA identifies environmentally sensitive areas that the City intends to preserve for conservation and passive recreational uses. Development is generally not permitted in these types of areas. The lands along Len Purcell were acquired by the City in accordance with the NEA policies and are being managed according to the Forest Management Plan for the Township of West Carleton Torbolton Forest completed for the period 1992-2012.</p> <p>The City’s Forest Planning and Protection Unit, which is responsible for the Torbolton Forest management plan, will be preparing a new management plan once the current one expires. At the Spring 2011 workshop it was clear that better connectivity was important to residents so all comments gathered through this process related to the Torbolton Forest have been forwarded to the forestry group for their future consideration.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the Torbolton Forest is protected, the pines within the forest are not considered significant enough since some of the trees were cut by a logger. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest Services staff responded to this comment by stating that the Torbolton Forest Management Plan sets out succession goals for the forest. One of the goals is to transition this forest from one consisting of planted pine to a natural forest type. This involves periodic thinning of the pine stands to create space and conditions for native species to re-establish. The

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
		<p>existing pines play a significant role in stabilizing the soils through this gradual process.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A logger cut down trees in the Torbolton Forest and spilled 150 litres of hydraulic oil. This impacts the watershed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry Services staff have looked into this matter and report that a broken hose on one of the machines did result in a spill of hydraulic fluid on an access road several years ago. The logging contractor and forestry services staff onsite ensured that the spilled fluid was contained on the road and hired equipment to fully remove both the liquid and frozen fluid, before the watershed could be contaminated. This in combination with the frozen conditions onsite at the time minimized the risk of water contamination resulting from this spill.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a question as to whether or not it was feasible to expand the boundary of the existing community park. The community would like to see a toboggan hill in their park as per a plan that was prepared in the past. This would require minimal disturbance to protect the environment yet provide a huge amenity for the children in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After approval of the Community Plan, an environmental consultant was hired by the City to identify the precise boundary between the community park and ANSI. Sensitive ANSI features were identified on all sides of the community park, such that it cannot be expanded without affecting the ANSI. The park boundary was subsequently implemented through a Zoning By-law amendment. • The plan prepared for the former Township did include a toboggan hill in the woods to the west of the current community park. Creation of a safe hill for tobogganing would require significant tree clearing in this area, which is one of the few areas of natural (non-planted) woods in the Torbolton Forest. This would not be consistent with the goal of conserving the natural features and functions of this area.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the status of the lands to the north of the Torbolton Forest? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lands to the north of the Torbolton Forest are part of the provincially significant ANSI and have been designated as Natural Environment Area, which generally prohibits

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
		development except for an existing lot fronting on a public road.
	<p>Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was some opposition to designating waterfront areas as Open Space. Some residents do not want the Village to become a tourist destination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lands are not designated Open Space in the Community Plan nor are there any plans to do so. The City is working closely with the Constance and Buckham's Bay Community Association in resolving access issues to the waterfront. Lands are in the process of being surveyed and signage will be used to indicate where public access will be permitted.
	<p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future commercial development at the edge of the Village will not encourage a better community feel since everyone must use their cars to get there. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During preparation of the Community Plan, residents felt that Constance Bay should be a more complete community that offered more community and commercial services. Various locations were reviewed and it was concluded that the site located on Constance Bay Drive at Willand Lane, at the entrance to the Village, was the best location for a new village shopping area. This area was intended to provide space for community facilities such as a medical centre and day care, in addition to commercial uses. These uses would be also be easily accessible to non-residents and would improve the viability of the uses.
	<p>New Residential Development Area land use designation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were some concerns expressed about the potential impact of development on environmentally sensitive lands and floodplain areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Constance Bay Environmental Management Plan prepared for the New Residential Development Area identifies the location of the sensitive areas and minimum setback requirements. When an application for subdivision is received, there will be a detailed review of the Plan, including the exact location of the new collector road in relation to sensitive environmental areas. At that time, an environmental impact statement will also have to be prepared by the developer. <p>It should be noted that there is floodplain mapping identifying</p>

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
		<p>both the floodway and flood fringe areas in Constance Bay. The extent of flood hazard should be determined in consultation with flood plain maps prepared by Mississippi Valley Conservation. Development is not permitted in the floodway, but limited development is permitted in the flood fringe areas. Ultimately approval from Mississippi Valley Conservation is required.</p>
	<p>Future Community Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new park should be located closer to the existing residences and not just at the edge of the Village. Children in the community need to be able to bike to their park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of the Future Community Park is shown conceptually on Schedule A – Land Use. Its final location will be refined through the subdivision review process and will be subject to further discussions with City staff and residents through a formal public consultation process. The future park is generally meant to serve residents in the New Residential Development Area.
	<p>Lot size and coverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a concern that the Comprehensive Zoning By-law did not take into consideration the existing lot sizes since most of the lots are non-complying. Mississippi Valley Conservation (MVC) indicates that the lot coverage provisions for properties located within the 1:100 year flood plain, in particular the flood fringe, be re-assessed since excessive building sizes can pose difficulties with respect to flood proofing, drainage, servicing and meeting setbacks from water. The MVC encourages that the Community Plan address minimum lot sizes recommended in the Village of Constance Bay Ground Water Study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City’s Zoning Team agrees that the majority of existing lot sizes are non-complying and this needs to be addressed as part of a future review. During this review staff also identified some inconsistencies between land use and zoning, which need to be addressed. In addition to this planning work, it is recommended that the MVC’s concerns about minimum lot sizes and lot coverage also be reviewed.
	<p>Flood plain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 100 year floodplain is a joke. People have been 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards have been established for technical studies and floodplain mapping. This is the basis for delineating

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<p>here for over 100 years and no flooding to the flood line has been seen. In 1932 a dam was built at Fitzroy so there is not one hundred years of data.</p>	<p>floodplains.</p>
	<p>Floodplain - Section 3.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mississippi Valley Conservation suggests that the word “new” be added to the following: “The Mississippi Valley Conservation (MVC) has defined the flood plain in Constance Bay as two distinct zones, the “floodway” and the “flood fringe”. The “floodway” is defined as the area where new development would not be permitted....” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text revised.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MVC suggest specifying the meaning of “new” development e.g. creation of new lots, or the development of existing lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text revised.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MVC suggested that clarification be provided in the Community Plan: 60.9 metres is the geodetic elevation for the 1:100 year flood plain and 59.9 metres is the geodetic elevation that distinguishes between the floodway and flood fringe. The Constance Bay Flood Damage Reduction Study prepared by Dillon Consulting (June 21, 1990) identifies that the flood fringe can be regarded where the flood depth is normally less than 1.0 metre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text revised.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 4 of Section 3.6 refers to the MVC’s Fill, Construction and Alteration to Waterways regulation. The new name of the regulation is Ontario Regulation 153/06, MVC’s Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text revised.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	Shorelines and Watercourses.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 5 of Section 3.6 – replace the term flood fringe with flood plain since the MVC regulates to within 15 metres of the 1:100 year flood plain of the Ottawa River. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text revised.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MVC adopted new regulations related to development in and around Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW). The MVC’s new regulation limit for Constance Creek PSW is 120 metres from the wetland boundary. The intent of the Regulation is to evaluate hydrologic impacts from any new development on the wetland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	TRANSPORTATION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents were opposed to the closing of unopened road allowances that extend to the water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City and Community Association are jointly working on clarifying the location of the unopened road allowances through surveys and signage. Unopened road allowances will not be closed.
	<p>Road improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend Allbirch Road to Len Purcell Drive - there is sufficient road allowance and this would divert some of the traffic off Bayview Drive providing travellers with an optional route. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There must be a demonstrated need for the road since turning the existing forest track into a paved road would further fragment and divide the forest, possibly leading to salt spray on regionally rare species of vegetation and increased risk to wildlife. <p>This area of Constance Bay is included in the provincially significant Constance Bay Sand Hills Area of Natural and Scientific Interest and has been designated as a Natural Environment Area. Development is generally not allowed in such areas, which are intended for conservation and passive recreational uses.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the community is part of the Constance Bay Sand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforcement has been an issue in the Forest, which is why

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)**

	Comments	Departmental responses
	Hills ANSI, why are horses, sulkies, 4 wheelers, motorcycles and snowmobilers permitted in the Torbolton Forest?	people assume they can use the Forest in any way they wish. Work on the new Torbolton Forest management plan will assist in addressing the issues mentioned.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install a light at Kinburn Side Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A warrant analysis for the installation of a traffic control signal (TCS) was undertaken for this intersection based on a turning movement count conducted on Thursday, August 18 2011. Review of the traffic count shows that the intersection meets 64% of the required warrant. Since the warrant conditions are not achieved (100% required), staff cannot recommend the installation of a TCS at this location at this time. Consistent with their general policy, when the TCS warrant meets less than 75% of the minimum warrant conditions, they generally do not review the same location during the following three years.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bayview Drive is not properly graded and there are no ditches resulting in erosion. There is a need for more run-off control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bayview Drive has not been identified for any road works. This comment has been forwarded to City staff dealing with road needs.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The shoulders should be paved on Bayview Drive to Allbirch Road, Constance Bay Road to Dunrobin Road for cyclists and pedestrians. One person thought that paving shoulders will ruin the “country feel” of Constance Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently the Community Plan identifies the need for paved shoulders on Bayview Drive and Constance Bay Road for use by pedestrians and cyclists. This recommendation will stay in the Community Plan.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2012 Kilmaurs Side Road is supposed to get new asphalt treatment. Prior to this work, an engineering review needs to be undertaken to deal with the hill on Dunrobin Road and low approach of Kilmaurs Side Road making this a dangerous intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section of Kilamurs Side Road located between Woodkilton Road and Dunrobin Road is scheduled to be rehabilitated in 2014. No works are planned specifically on Dunrobin Road. This comment has been forwarded to road rehabilitation staff and they are reviewing sight lines and safety at the Kilmaurs-Dunrobin intersection, collision experience and related matters.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only road access to the Village is from Constance Bay Road, also a dangerous intersection located on a hill. An engineering review should be to relocate this entrance to the south side of Constance Bay Road somewhere between the existing hill and the creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These comments has been forwarded to Infrastructure Services Department (Asset Management).
	<p>New secondary road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where will the new road(s) for the proposed new residential development area go and could this road go through the floodplain or environmentally sensitive land? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new collector road, which will provide a secondary access for Constance Bay, was discussed and reviewed during preparation of the Community Plan. Lands on which the new road will be located (New Residential Development Area) were included as part of the “village lands”. After approval of the Community Plan in 2006, an environmental management plan was prepared and subsequently approved for the New Residential Development Lands, which identified the development limits and areas where an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) will be required prior to development.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents stated that a secondary access to the Village was important while others stated that a secondary access road should not be a priority and that funds should be directed to other priorities such as maintenance of current roads. Some residents believe that the proposed secondary access is in the wrong location being too close to the existing access and should not be connected with Constance Bay Road. There was also reference to a bridge crossing proposed for the south end of Buckham’s Bay prior to amalgamation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The actual cost and responsibility for building this road will be that of the developer who will be constructing the adjacent subdivision. That is, road construction will take place at the same time the new residential area is built. <p>During the comprehensive review that took place during preparation of the original Community Plan, there were very limited options to create a secondary access road. The proposed new road location was the best choice.</p>

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A submission suggested that an alternative access road to Constance Bay be provided to the south of the Village boundary and that this new road should replace the new road proposed by the current Village Plan. The proponent of this road suggests that the unopened road allowance (that is the extension of Kinburn Side Road east of Dunrobin Road), be re-aligned to the north-east so that it connects up with the southern end of Willand Lane to provide an alternative access into the Village. This new alignment will bisect three rural properties located outside of the current Village. The proponent also suggested a park and ride area near the intersection of this road with Dunrobin Road to encourage car pooling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and transportation staff have reviewed this suggestion, but do not recommend this alternative road access for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The cost to the City for land acquisition and construction of this road. No development is permitted on the land impacted by this road resulting in the City bearing the cost of purchasing land for the road and cost of construction. The proposed secondary access in the Community Plan is entirely supported through the development of the land added to the Village at that time. 2. It would fall to the City to undertake an environmental assessment to review and determine a preferred road alignment. This is a further cost to the City. 3. This new proposal would inevitably lead to a village expansion request for the lands adjacent to this new road. No additional lands are needed at this time since there is close to a twenty year land supply already in the Village. 4. The road suggested includes significant environmental features that could be impacted by the proposed road such as a significant valley-land, a significant woodland, fish habitat and natural corridors for wildlife. 5. The new road connects to an existing local street (Willand Lane), which was not designed to accommodate the levels of traffic this new access will accommodate. This would be the first access point for northbound traffic and traffic wishing to avoid using

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
		<p align="center">Constance Bay Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of a park and ride facility would be an additional public cost for similar reasons.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A municipality cannot simply transfer public access requirements to a private sector developer by official plan policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The developer of the New Residential Area lands will be required to build the new secondary access (collector) road as part of the subdivision design because it provides access the development lands. Once the road is built, the City will assume ownership and responsibility for its on-going maintenance.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the costs identified for upgrading Kilmaurs Road and its intersection with Dunrobin Road? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs are dependent on the extent of work required for any future required that may be required at Kilmaurs and Dunrobin Roads. The cost of the work is difficult to assess at this time.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What studies have been done on the level of service and safety factors of the intersection at Constance Bay Road and Dunrobin Road as a result of the new residential lands that were incorporated into the Village? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City undertakes on-going monitoring of intersections on an as-needed basis. The type and extent of a transportation study and impact on the intersection at Constance Bay and Dunrobin Roads will depend on the development submitted.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)**

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the existing un-opened road-right-of way south of the Village not being developed as part of the new infrastructure budget? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no need identified for an un-opened right-of-way located south of the Village; therefore funding is not needed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The annual cost of having/not having a secondary access should be explained and detailed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is difficult to accurately assess costs associated with a “having a secondary road” and “not having a secondary road” scenario. The initial costs depend on whether the road is City- built (as requested by the letter writer) or developer- built. After construction, the City is responsible for on-going maintenance.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the amount of City’s Infrastructure Capital Works budget for 2012 and beyond? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For questions relating to budgets, the budget document can be found at: Ottawa.ca/en/city hall/budget taxes/budget/budget 2012/documents/index.html
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much property tax is collected from residents in Constance Bay in 2011? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amount of property taxes (2011) collected in Constance Bay can be requested from Rene Bisson, Billing & Tax Policy Unit 613-580-2424 ext. 14224.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since amalgamation what transportation infrastructure improvements and costs have been carried out? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since 2003 the City has spent money on road resurfacing and gravel road upgrades throughout Constance Bay totalling \$1,327,000 (Asset Management Branch).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What transportation improvements are planned for construction in Constance Bay and area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements planned for the Constance Bay area include resurfacing of Kilmaurs Side Road from Woodkilton Road to Dunrobin Road (2013-2015); culvert renewal at Kilmaurs/Dunrobin intersection; and a culvert renewal in the vicinity of Buckhams Bay Road in 2012.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What development applications have been received/approved to date and what is the City doing to promote private development of the secondary access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City has promoted private development of the secondary access by bringing in the New Residential Area lands. There are a variety of development applications received by the City

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)**

	Comments	Departmental responses
		<p>according to computerized records to date including plan of subdivision (2), zoning amendments (6), site plan control (5), lifting of 30 cm. Reserves (3), minor variances (26), lifting of holding zone (1), street closure (1), severances (12). Note: figures are approximate.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When will Council lift the ban on rural subdivision applications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council will lift the ban on rural subdivision applications in 2014 when it brings forward its new Official Plan. In the meantime no development applications will be considered within one kilometre of a village boundary.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approved secondary access road is close to sensitive lands and also has significant impacts requiring mitigation. What concerns does the City have about impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City recognized that there could be impacts of the now-approved secondary access on natural areas. An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was undertaken for these lands and its results were approved by City Council in 2007. Results of this EMP have been incorporated into the Constance Bay Community Plan. These include requirement for a tree preservation and protection plan, maintenance of a buffer of mature trees along Constance Bay Road, requirement of a hydrological study to support new development and incorporating large building setbacks from the street to allow a buffer of vegetation between the road and dwellings.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff's concern about costs for a car pooling facility adjacent to the new proposed secondary access is inconsistent with Official Plan and MTO policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City is interested in supporting reduction of car use. If there is community desire for a car pooling facility in Constance Bay, a request can be made to the Ward Councillor to initiate further work. For example, residents could take advantage of the existing community centre parking area, which could potentially be used by individuals participating in the car pool.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be an area north of the unopened Kinburn Side Road set aside for future light 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no need for additional development lands at this time. Evaluation of land supply will be undertaken at the time of

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	industrial growth. Perhaps this area could provide a second access.	comprehensive review of land needs.
	<p>New Secondary Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mississippi Valley Conservation notes that the preferred alternative second access would likely involve a crossing of a regulated flood plain and approved permits would be required from the MVC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<p>Encroachments on municipal land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encroachment on public rights-of-way was identified as an issue, with specific mention made of the west end of Len Purcell and the adjacent owner there who has paved over and assumed use of the lane. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with encroachments should be reported to 3-1-1.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unkempt yards and public laneways, which some residents use as a dumping ground for garbage and leaves are issues in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues with property standards should be reported to 3-1-1 for follow-up by City staff.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several residents stated that there needs to be continued funding for access lane clean-up including those rights-of-way located inland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<p>Traffic and speeding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of concerns were raised about traffic and speeding in the Village e.g. reducing traffic, traffic calming needed on Constance Bay Road, speeding, cars not yielding to pedestrians and cyclists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any area-specific concerns related to traffic should be sent to Traffic@ottawa.ca Speeding motorist is the main traffic complaint received by the City. A Speed Display Board, Educational and Awareness Program has been launched by the City where a speed display board indicates how fast a motorist is travelling. Presence of this board is especially important in residential neighbourhoods. Information is available about the program by e-mailing traff@ottawa.ca or by calling 613-580-2424 ext.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)**

	Comments	Departmental responses
		<i>27777.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At The Point bar – survey needed to reconfigure parking and traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Community Plan includes a recommendation to provide and maintain community facilities at the Point, which includes parking. Parking has already been improved at this particular location.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future development proposed on Dunrobin Road will provide major concerns as more cars will come driving down the hill at Kilmaurs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally the zoning on Dunrobin Road permits a limited range of general rural zones (Agricultural Zone, Rural Countryside Zone) permitting uses such as: animal hospital, home-based business, kennel, and agricultural use. Typically someone wishing to rezone to a more intensive use would be required to provide supporting studies (traffic, hydro-geological) to support their development. At present it does not appear that there are any significant traffic concerns that would impact Kilmaurs Road.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cars are parking on the shoulders of roads and are travelling in opposite directions of one-way street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking is an issue in Constance Bay and efforts will be made to resolve on-going concerns. Residents and efforts have recently been made to improve parking at various locations in the Village: The Point, Auger’s Beach, and Ritchie Street Boat Launch. <p>Residents can call 3-1-1 to identify specific and urgent concerns.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a steep slope leading to the property at 1312 Bayview Drive followed by a sharp turn. Sometimes cars have driven onto the property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic assessment staff investigated the road in this area and nothing further can be implemented to increase safety at this location. Bayview Drive has a 40 km/h speed limit and there is a sharp curve warning sign with an advisory speed of 10 km/h on the approach to the curve as vehicles head down the hill. There are also chevrons installed on the inside portion of the curve and a large checkerboard sign with a right arrow at the

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
		bottom of the hill.
	<p>Cycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The priorities for cycle routes on Dunrobin Road from West Carleton High School to Kanata and on Bishop Davis around Bayview Drive. Making cycling more accessible and safe will contribute to community development by encouraging recreational activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for more cycle lanes has been identified in the Community Plan. It currently recommends that when new road work or resurfacing is undertaken on Bayview Drive and Constance Bay Road, the shoulder of the road be paved to provide space to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. <p>Further, the priorities for cycle routes are recognized in the Ottawa Cycle Plan, which shows existing and proposed new cycle routes. An Existing Paved Shoulder is shown along the length of Constance Bay Road. Future connections are also identified including: a Proposed Paved Shoulder on Dunrobin Road past West Carleton High School, which becomes an Existing Paved Shoulder outside of Kanata; a Proposed Shared Use Lane (Signed Route) on a portion of Bayview, which then turns into a Proposed Off-Road Pathway through the Torbolton Forest and along a portion of Allbirch. Implementation of these routes is typically planned when road work is scheduled in these areas.</p>
	<p>Pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A bike path is also needed because March Road is too dangerous. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ottawa Cycle Plan shows that a bike route is needed. A Proposed Paved Shoulder is planned for March Road/Dunrobin Road.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was concern expressed that new paving/paths/lanes not alter drainage and should not be established through private property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public pathways are not established on private property without consent of the owner. Any pathway construction undertaken by the City would be properly constructed so as to not negatively affect drainage patterns.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a potential for a property acquisition in the south end of the Village (along Shanmarie) to provide a pathway connection down to the creek as the land is too constrained for development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information has been provided to the park planning group in the department. There may be opportunities to secure a pathway through the development review process.
	Environmental protection and parks	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure protection of environmental elements in the floodway south of Buckham's Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area south of Buckham's Bay was included in the study area of the Constance Bay Environmental Management Plan approved in 2007. This plan identified limits of development and locations where an environmental impact statement (EIS) would need to be undertaken to minimize the impact of development. The lowlands south of Buckham's Bay are severely constrained by the regulated floodplain, unstable slopes, organic soils, and aquatic setbacks for the protection of fish habitat. The woodlands associated with this feature have also been identified as significant woodlands in the City's Official Plan (2009).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The red oak trees located along perimeter of Village should be preserved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Community Plan recognizes that Constance Bay is a community built in the forest. Further it states that trees will be preserved wherever possible and where there is no tree cover, trees (preferably oak trees) will be planted as a condition of development approval. There is no intention to remove trees on City property including rights-of-way without good reason.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents agreed with the environmental management plan for the New Residential Area to protect sensitive areas and for the expansion of the ANSI. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the environmental management plan was to precisely identify those areas within the New Residential Development Area which should be protected from development and to establish any associated setbacks from those areas thereby providing clarity to everyone involved in the development process. The plan did not, however,

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
		<p>recommend expansion of the ANSI, which is a provincially identified feature mapped by the Ministry of Natural Resources.</p>
	<p>Torbolton Forest and ANSI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of the Torbolton Forest should move away from pine monoculture towards original savannah landscape to better reflect its historical character. More areas should be part of the ANSI and be covered by the EMP; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is managing the Torbolton Forest according to the “Forest Management Plan for the Township of West Carleton Torbolton Forest”, which expires in 2012 and will have to be updated by forestry staff. In addition to the comments received during the Spring 2011 workshop in Constance Bay, which have been forwarded to forestry staff, there will be a public consultation process on the management plan. <p>The ANSI is a provincially identified feature mapped by the Ministry of Natural Resources. The EMP was undertaken specifically to guide development of the New Residential Development Area.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of the ANSI area into new development areas is acceptable and a good thing to do for the purposes of conserving land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ANSI was identified by the Ministry of Natural Resources based on specific features of interest, and its boundaries cannot be altered without their consent. The City has identified additional features outside of the ANSI that may also warrant protection from development. Any such features that are not already designated for protection will be examined through an Environmental Impact Statement prior to development, and the City will work with the landowners to ensure no negative impacts occur to significant natural features or their ecological functions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational areas should be integrated into the ANSI so that children can play in natural settings instead of manicured lawns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have also been forwarded to the Parks and Forestry Division so that they can be considered during preparation of the new management plan for the Torbolton

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANSI lands should not be transformed into manicured parks. <p>Torbolton Forest - traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the winter, the trails are open to snowmobiles. Are there any plans to open up the trails to ATVs. Why is snowmobile use allowed and not ATVs? • Opposed to the continued use of Torbolton Forest as motorized vehicle park. Unauthorized ATV trails have been established and are maintained all year round. Every barricade to motor vehicle traffic has been by-passed. • In the winter use of trails should be segregated so cross country skiing can return. • Snowmobiles and dog walkers use all the trails. Trails are unusable for skiers. • It was suggested that the Torbolton Forest, which is already used for snowmobile and ski trails could also integrate hiking and cycling in the summer. Should focus on creating activities for kids more related to the kinds of activities they enjoy doing – e.g. wall climbing. • Security is an issue in the “Meadows”, located in the Torbolton Forest. Snowmobiles are not running where they are supposed to. These vehicles interfere with cross country ski trails. Proper enforcement should be provided by the City. • The isolated nature of the park makes it a prime area for criminal activity. 	<p>Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about vehicular use e.g. ATVs in the Forest can be discussed with police at the Tuesday evening “drop-ins” at the Constance Bay community centre.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access point to forest has sign stating no motorized vehicles permitted yet there is a 50 km/h speed limit sign. • Speed limit sign is for snowmobilers – shouldn't allow these uses within the Forest. If it is allowed, then signage should clearly identify what vehicular uses are permitted with associated speed limits. • There is ambiguous signage at one of the main trail entrances. Access by machine is forbidden but there is also a “use at your own risk” and a higher speed limit allowed than vehicles. <p>Torbolton Forest - Littering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is littering/dumping in the north part of the Torbolton Forest and at the Lighthouse Restaurant which is located in the northeast part of the Village. • There should be a clean-out of the junk and garbage in the Torbolton Forest including appliances such as fridges and computers, toxic waste such as tires, shingles, cement and non-biodegradable materials. • People are dumping yard waste and large pieces of garbage in the forest. The community should arrange for an organized large garbage pick-up so that people will not pollute the forest. There should be some signage stating “bring it with you...take it with you” like in provincial parks. Garbage cans should not be provided since people are just throwing out their paints and other toxic items in them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents can call 3-1-1 if there is dumping on City property.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A land owner at the north end of the ANSI lands might be interested in donating 10 acres to the City to be developed as parkland, if he could develop houses on the remaining 50 acres. This land is located closer to existing residences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ANSI lands are designated Natural Environment Area, which generally prohibits development except for a house on an existing lot that fronts a private road. Under current Official Plan policies where a private landowner wishes to sell NEA-designated lands to the City, the municipality is required to acquire the lands. The City would then retain the lands in their natural state for conservation and passive recreational purposes.
	<p>Existing Community Park and Community Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community park is located in a very isolated location. Parents are concerned that they cannot leave their children alone at the park. There is a sense that the needs of the community are second to the needs of protecting the ANSI lands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the recognition of the ANSI as a significant feature by the Province and its subsequent designation as a Natural Environment Area and acquisition by the City on that basis, development is very limited making it difficult to address the isolated location of the community park and community centre. Opportunities to increase pedestrian and cycle access can be discussed during preparation of the Torbolton Forest management plan.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Community Centre should be a focal point in the community but it is not. It does not accommodate small children and youth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since approval of the Community Plan, a variety of efforts have been made with limited success. There is a Sustaining Grant Agreement between the City and the community association to operate maintain both the community centre and sports fields. Residents should approach the community association about their needs. If specialized expertise is required, then City staff are available to assist.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We should move towards a more complex, integrated activity networks that engage youth within the community re: Torbolton Forest. There is a direct correlation between criminal activity and the lack of appropriate and targeted activities for youth – if naturalized recreational areas are made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over the years City staff have worked on a variety of ways targeting and providing programs for youth. “Youth Connexion” was one of these initiatives where youth are involved in planning activities for their peers. City staff are available to assist the Constance and Buckham’s Bay Community Association in developing any specialized

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)**

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<p>available throughout the Village there will be less desire to get into trouble.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How we design parks will influence crime, vandalism - suitable environment will in turn affect human behaviour. • How we design parks will influence crime, vandalism - suitable environment will in turn affect human behaviour. • When people congregate and cause a disturbance this also causes noise and dust pollution. 	<p>programs for the Village's youth.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More funds should be allocated for the security in the Community Centre area. Lighting in areas such as the Community Centre and Legion is too bright – this attracts criminal activity. If the lights were turned down criminals or people causing a disturbance may be disinclined to congregate in that area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City has tried a variety of ways to limit unwanted activities at the Community Centre ranging from lowering to increasing the lighting levels. With both scenarios there was limited success. The approach now is to turn off the lighting in the evening.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light pollution of neighbouring properties across from Legion is an issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This comment has been forwarded to the Legion.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of municipal facilities into the area will reduce its "complexity." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently there is a community centre, park facilities and a library in Constance Bay. However, there are no plans for additional municipal facilities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational areas should be spread out throughout the Bay instead of centralized in one or two parks. This could help reduce the instance of bush parties in Torbolton Forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constance Bay's current community park is currently located in the centre of the Village on Len Purcell. Another community level park will be located to the south in the New Residential Development lands which is in the vicinity of the new secondary road access. These two parks are intended to serve different parts of the community. Opportunities to develop additional recreational facilities in Constance Bay are limited.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A toboggan hill should be created within the ANSI next to the community centre since there are many 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City has already reviewed and determined the most appropriate location of the zoning boundary for the community

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<p>areas where this protected vegetation is found within the Torbolton Forest.</p>	<p>centre lands. The lands west of the baseball diamonds are protected and zoned Environmental Protection (EP3).</p>
	<p>New Residential Area - Proposed community park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed community park should preserve natural features and integrated into the existing landscape. There was a suggestion that it be moved closer to the village shopping centre to allow for a mix of uses to occur in a more integrated fashion. Issues such as traffic would need to be addressed as this would put the park near Constance Bay Road, which is fairly busy and cars travel at high speed. • Moving proposed community park near shopping centre would also save natural resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed new park location is shown at the westerly limits of the Village within the area shown as New Residential Development Area. It is a conceptual location at this point. In the future when a subdivision application is made for the development lands, there will be further detailed discussions regarding road layout, location of the park and connections to the park. The subdivision application will be supported by an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if it includes or is adjacent to any significant natural features. The EIS will demonstrate how negative impacts to those features will be avoided.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will be in the new park? The community wants to have the opportunity to provide input as to what facilities go into the new community park. What age groups will be addressed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When it is time to build the park, location, elements of the park, type of play structures, play fields and landscaping will be discussed with the Community Association. The final plan is affected by factors such as available budget, service levels and consultation with residents.
	<p>Businesses in the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community needs to become more self sufficient and should be better promoted throughout Ottawa as a place to come and visit. • There are a number of home-based businesses that would benefit from wider publicity. • The Bay should be a destination for trades and crafts. • By creating a self-sufficient community with shopping and amenities, people would drive less to the City thus reducing the overall environmental impact • Local home-based businesses, on-line businesses and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the spring workshop, there were a variety of opinions re: future of Constance Bay. However, residents clearly articulated a vision for their Village during the preparation of the Community Plan. Through resident surveys the Constance and Buckham Bay's Community Association determined that there was overwhelming support for the vision, the basis of their Community Plan.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<p>delivery of goods into the Village has produced a local economy where residents do not need to leave the Village. E.g. “In Sync With Pink” Festival 2011, focussing on networking among home-based business, was strongly supported and encouraged.</p>	
	<p>Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater resources already impacted by current levels of development and further development would lead to more erosion of landscapes in Bay. • There is a liability problem - more houses and roads will produce more contaminants which will leach into water supply and Ottawa River. The wells are all surface (shallow) wells. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Community Plan recognizes the importance of protecting groundwater resources since development is on private services. For the New Residential Development Area, new development will be supported by a hydrological study. <p>Section 7.1 of the Community Plan specifically addresses protection of the drinking water supply and reports on a groundwater study that found that nitrate concentrations were elevated within the aquifer. As a result, the Community Plan stated residents were encouraged to have their well water tested for bacteria and nitrates on a regular basis.</p>
	<p>Weeds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nitrification of the River and the Bay has occurred as a result of a variety of factors including fertilizer run-off from the golf course, and pesticide use on poison ivy. This has caused extensive weed growth. As a result, this is ruining fish habitat, the beaches look terrible and boating is problematic. There were no weeds in the area 50 years ago. Water sampling should be done by the golf course. • Some biologists and conservationists indicate that the Ottawa River’s weed problem identified in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City monitored the water quality of the Ottawa River at Constance and Buckham’s Bay during the summer of 2005. Results indicated that from a water quality perspective the area is quite healthy. E. coli results are within recreational water quality objectives and there was no excessive weed growth associated with nutrients. Staff has recommended that water sampling be undertaken on an as-needed basis to determine nutrient levels and to identify problem areas. <p>The Community Plan also suggests that in the case of excessive</p>

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**CONSTANCE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN (rev. March 26, 2012)**

	Comments	Departmental responses
	<p>Community Plan are actually native aquatic plants and not weeds. These plants should not be disturbed. The statement about weeds found in the “village objectives” should be removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The biggest environmental problem is the water quality and the associated weed growth. 	<p>plant growth and algae blooms that “best management practices” should be used by property owners working in consultation with Mississippi Valley Conservation.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are certain older houses along the beach which do not have their septic systems up to code. Some sewage goes directly into the River. The locations are easy to identify in the winter months as the ice doesn’t form in those areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions, concerns or complaints about septic systems can be directed to the Ottawa Septic Systems Office: http://rvca.ca/osso/index.html Phone: 1-800-267-3504 ext. 1129.

5.5 Greely – Response to ‘As We Heard it’ Comments

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greely citizens should be part of the planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the Greely workshop on March 30, 2011 was to involve residents in a workshop format where they could identify their concerns and issues to staff. A whole range of issues was identified and this will assist staff in developing recommendations for next steps forward.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greely has changed, vision for Village Plan has changed, Village is not quiet like it used to be. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted. The vision in the Greely Community Design Plan (CDP) referred to maintaining the village setting, rural feel, links between different areas, developing recreational facilities, open spaces and groundwater sources through sustainable development. Many of these points were identified by residents at the March 30th workshop and are still relevant today.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see some results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greely Community Association has undertaken work on pathways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Greely Community Association (GCA) agrees with most of the parks and transportation comments provided by residents to City staff. One theme in these comments was the segregation of neighbourhoods due to the lack of safe pedestrian and cycling links. In 2005 the GCA took part in the Rural Pathways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff has used this information which has contributed to revisions made to Schedule D – Greenspace Network of the updated Greely CDP.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
Project. At the end of 2011 five Greely residents mapped existing and potential parks and linkages, similar to what was undertaken in 2005. This work has been provided to City staff.	
LAND USE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some believe the public library is in the wrong location and should have been located next to the post office and not in the middle of a field. The City itself needs to comply with Community Design Plan - not put the library outside the core. Others disagree that the library is in the wrong place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the library may not be located next to the post office on Parkway Road, it is located next to the Greely Community Centre located in the Andy Shields Park area where resources can be shared and serve as a meeting place for residents.
<p>Residential land use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain emphasis on low density residential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the village is designated for residential development, which preserves the low-density character of the village. The Greely CDP directs higher density residential buildings such as ground oriented multi-units and apartment dwellings to the Village Core.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some do not want residential uses impacted by commercial development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial uses are to be located in specific areas including the Village Core, industrial area abutting Parkway, west side of Bank Street and east side of Bank Street.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for affordable seniors' housing. The old Ministry of Transportation (MTO) building could be used for not-for-profit seniors' housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff have followed-up with the Committee for Rent Geared to Income Seniors' Apartments in Greely letting them know that the MTO lands are located outside the Village boundary. They were provided with a contact in the Affordable Housing Services Unit in the Community and Social Services Department.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development for seniors need to be accommodated in the CDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Village Core is anticipated to accommodate a wide range of uses including different types of residential uses. Lands designated Village Core may be zoned in separate zoning categories e.g. residential, commercial, open space and institutional.
<p>Intensification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents believe that intensification does not belong in villages, but in the urban area. This is due in part to its impact on roads, services and effect on property values. Still others question its benefit to residents and potential profit made by developers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Official Plan, which guides the overall growth of the City, encourages that the larger villages, such as Greely, provide a variety of housing that are not only geared for families, but also for seniors and young adults. In addition, these villages will also provide residents and the surrounding rural areas with needed community and commercial services.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is enough residential development in Greely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City cannot arbitrarily halt development where lands have already been designated for development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should not be high density housing in Greely. This impacts the rural character of the Village. This could impact septic and well considerations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Official Plan direction is that all future and development in Greely will proceed solely on the basis of private individual water supply and private sewage systems. This corresponds to the community's wish to maintain a low density and rural character. There is only one exception, which will be based on previously-approved communal water supply and sanitary sewer system.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots should be a minimum of ½ acre to allow for property drainage and plentiful well water. Would also protect the water table. • Greely should continue to be serviced with private well and septic systems. 	<p>It should be noted that all development must be in accordance with the Official Plan's Section 4.4.2 and will be reviewed in accordance with the current guidelines for hydrogeological and terrain analyses studies.</p>
<p>Village Core</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the Village Core area defined? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geographic location of the Village Core is shown on Schedule A of the Greely CDP. The Village Core extends along the west side of Bank Street from Remington Way south to Meadow Drive, spanning approximately 20 village lots facing Bank Street. The Core further extends over four blocks east ward into the village along Parkway Road.
<p>Lack of Village Core</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents want to have a mainstreet focus in Greely, however, there was general agreement that there is no village core, like other villages (Metcalf and Osgoode). Greely is seen more as a large residential subdivision. There was also a feeling that the existing lot fabric in the area designated as Village Core is too small and already developed with housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although Greely does not have a physical core that can serve as a focal point for residents, the Greely Community Design Plan designates a location for it to develop over time, which includes the existing grocery store and businesses around it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Village Core needs to be emphasized in planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
Location of Village Core	

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>designation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were a variety of opinions on the appropriateness of the current location of the Village Core. Some felt its location was appropriate and should be the focus of new development. Others felt that the mainstreet should be focussed on Parkway Drive. Yet others felt it was in the wrong spot and should be more centrally located in Greely rather on the eastern edge. This would mean moving it further west closer to the fire station and near the industrial lands. Parkway Drive should have Village Core character and expand west to be in closer proximity to houses on west side of Greely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unusual for the designated Core of a community to be located at the edge of a village, however, there is an existing small cluster of commercial uses on Meadow Drive e.g. grocery store, pizzeria and sports store that provides the nucleus of a Core. This area will serve as one of the building blocks for the Core rather than trying to relocate the Core to a different area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not make sense for the Village Core to be located in the Bank Street area. A commercial shopping area should be located on the “donut hole” lands. This way there would be two shopping areas avoiding traffic and parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shopping centre and adjacent commercial area have been approved by the Ontario Municipal Board to be located east of Bank Street and development is allowed to proceed in that location. In addition, a second shopping centre location is already identified in the Greely CDP at the corner of Bank Street and Mitch Owens Road. In light of this, it does not make sense for yet another location for commercial development to be identified.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the corner of Prescott and Parkway, part of the Quinn Farms development, in the Village Core designation part of the Quinn Farms development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village Core designation applies to the northeastern corner of the Quinn Farm property located at Parkway and Old Prescott Road. These lands, on the north side of Shields Creek abutting Parkway Road, are intended for commercial and mixed-uses and represents the western most limit of the Village Core designation. It should be noted that the draft approved plan of subdivision for the Quinn Farm residential development to the south does not include these Village Core lands.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village Core as shown on Schedule A of the Greely CDP does not exist and only exists in theory. It will never develop as shown and must be changed to reflect/face reality. The “scrap yard” land is an environmental hazard and no longer appropriate. These lands and surrounding area would make for an appropriate Village Core area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. It was noted in the original Greely CDP that the Village was different since there was a lack of an identifiable main street area. The Ontario Association of Architects completed a Community Assist for an Urban Study Effort (CAUSE) which included design suggestions for the Village Core. The CDP includes many of the values expressed and suggestions. Further the land use study that lead to the creation of the original Greely CDP provided the physical form and structure of the Village Core which was based on form and structure of other village cores throughout Ottawa and Ontario. It was recognized that the Village Core would not be transformed overnight and would be based on incremental changes guided by general design direction (Section 5.3 Built Form Guidelines). It is too early to dismiss the direction supported by the community with approval of the original Greely CDP. This designation could be reviewed at a future date.
<p>Extent of Core</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Core is too small and should be expanded to create more opportunities for commercial redevelopment. It should not however, extend east of Bank Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village Core is actually quite extensive and covers about 90 separate properties with the majority of the land currently occupied by residences. The primary issue is that there has not been any development interest in building commercial buildings, with the exception of the proposed shopping centre on the east side of Bank Street. It should be noted that staff have recommended that parking requirements be reduced for uses in the Village Core areas to facilitate creation of a core.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Commercial uses needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents indicated that commercial uses should be focussed in the Core and also identified a variety of uses that should be permitted including: seniors' residence, bank and restaurant. Only those uses compatible with residential uses should be located in the Core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A wide range of non-residential uses are permitted in the Village Core designation. These lands are generally zoned VM3, which permit uses such as retail store, retail food store, restaurant, bank, convenience store, office, and home based business. Residential uses are also permitted including dwelling units (apartments), a detached dwelling, and three-unit dwelling.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway commercial uses should be located on main roads. Is there any reason not to have commercial uses along Stagecoach Road and Parkway Drive? Greely will continue to grow in the coming years and there is still no commercial focal point for the community and few commercial services for new residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is agreed that there seems to be a shortage of commercial uses in the Greely area. Streets that have been zoned for commercial uses include: west side of Bank Street, majority of Meadow Drive, majority of Parkway Road between Bank Street and Old Prescott Road. However, it is up to the private sector to implement these uses. It would not be prudent to expand commercial zoning along Stagecoach Road and Parkway Road when there are already many existing underutilized areas zoned to accommodate commercial uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could a Wal-Mart open up in the core area? Walmart would have a negative impact on local businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village Mixed-Use Zone (VM) generally applies to the Village Core area allowing a range of commercial, residential and institutional uses. One of the permitted uses is a retail store. A maximum gross floor area is not stipulated, which would therefore permit a large format retail store. This is not considered likely, however, since there would be a large number of land acquisitions required to create a large enough site for a business such as a Walmart.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential uses occupy the Village Core and there is no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Greely CDP's land use plan provides a framework for future growth. Although the majority of the Village Core may currently consist of residential

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
room for new commercial uses. How is it possible for those properties to be developed for commercial uses?	uses, it is anticipated that in the future this area will serve as an appropriate location for a mix of uses over time. The existing zoning for the Village Core lands currently permit commercial uses, however it is up to the private sector to implement this direction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a dead end area in the Core where lands have remained undeveloped (street behind Post Office, Ellsworth Lane). This area needs to be cleaned up. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a property standards matter and it should be reported to the City of Ottawa's 3-1-1 line.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there is interest in development around the existing grocery store, a 6 acre (?) parcel is available for sale. Construction of businesses etc would not impact historic homes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
<p>Historic area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meadow Drive is a historic area and was formerly a transportation hub between Ottawa and Prescott. Many of the houses on Meadow Drive should be designated as heritage homes and not torn down. Would like to discuss this further with staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sally Coutts (sally.coutts@ottawa.ca) of the Heritage Services Unit (Planning and Growth Management Department) should be contacted for further information.
<p>Historic homes on Meadow Drive include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1456 Meadow Drive – original home of Andy Shields who once owned the area where the community centre, park and land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information has been provided to the Heritage Services Unit.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>where the Waters Edge Development are located.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1429 Meadow Drive – over 100 years old. Straby’s General Store, a mill and gas station once occupied this site. • 1388 Meadow Drive - home of Bobby Randall, village blacksmith. • 1370 Meadow Drive –former location of the Village Inn. 	
<p>Relocation of existing businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a way to encourage relocation of businesses from further up Bank Street to the Village Core? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning in the Village Core is already in place to accommodate a wide range of uses. Some of the current uses on Bank Street would not be appropriate in the Village Core (e.g. landscaping business, auto salvage and storage). Ultimately it would be up to individual business owners to initiate this effort.
<p>Rapid growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manotick has grown very quickly in the last 10 to 15 years. Is this possible for Greely? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 2001-2009, there were 709 building permits issued for new dwelling units in Greely, an average of about 78 building permits per year, which makes it the fastest growing village in Ottawa. Another 1,685 homes can be built within Greely’s village boundaries.
<p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where can you park in the Core area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several of the existing businesses provide on-site parking for their patrons. On-street parking is permitted for a maximum of 3 hours in the Village Core.
<p>Drive-through facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in favour of drive-through facilities in Greely core 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted and input has been forwarded to staff responsible for preparing policy re: drive-through facilities.
<p>Municipal involvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could the City turn existing City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City has not identified any surplus properties in Greely. City-owned

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
property over to commercial uses?	properties such as Andy Shields Park, with the associated community centre and library, are currently being used to provide services and amenities to residents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could incentives be put in place to bring in commercial uses and what is being done to encourage properties to convert to commercial? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff have identified appropriate land uses and zoning to permit commercial development, and have recommended reduced parking requirements within the Village Core to make it easier to establish a commercial use. The City can only create the planning framework to encourage development, however, it is up to the private sector to implement the Greely CDP.
<p>Shopping Centre area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents believe that the proposed shopping centre is located too far east and not well-linked to the rest of the Village. Safe links need to be created to the rest of the Village so that students, who may work there can safely cycle to work. Others feel that the shopping centre will bring small businesses and professionals to their community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ontario Municipal Board ordered the City to expand the Greely village boundary to include the lands on the east side of Bank Street to accommodate the proposed shopping centre site, commercial area and residential development. The list of permitted uses include: bank, catering establishment, daycare, medical facility, office, retail food store and retail store. <p>Staff understand that there are connectivity issues for pedestrians and cyclists. Future public linkages have been identified in Schedule D – Village Greenspace Network to improve connectivity, which staff will implement through the subdivision/site plan review process.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is too much emphasis on development east of Bank Street and not enough recognition of development along Stagecoach or Old Orchard Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)

Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Scrap yard and industrial area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City needs a strategy for the future use of the car scrap yard located on Parkway Road, which is being squeezed in by development. Generally residents felt that the site is too polluted and should only be used for commercial and industrial purposes. It was suggested that wells be tested on a five year cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scrap yard and adjacent vacant lands are now part of the Official Plan's "Village" designation. It is recommended that a portion of these lands zoned for a scrap yard use (RG3) and located next to the existing industrial area, be designated "Industrial" in the Greely CDP. The remainder of the vacant property will be designated "Residential" on Schedule A – Village Land Use Plan with future road links to Parkway Road and a future park. Any future development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the lands are suitable for the proposed development and need to be re-zoned from the Rural Countryside (RU) zone. Development proposals will need to be accompanied by a record of site conditions and numerous studies to demonstrate that the proposed use of the land is suitable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An appropriate riparian corridor should be secured to extend the pathway network through the scrap yard lands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the time of any future proposal for redevelopment of this property, the proponent will be advised of all the pertinent policies relating to presence of a watercourse, riparian plantings etc. Typically staff will request a pathway just outside the setback requirement to the watercourse.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there some sort of control, such as property standard for industries? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For environmental concerns, contact the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. If there a property standards concerns, residents should call 3-1-1 to report the concern to City staff so that there is appropriate follow-up.
<p>Environmental areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What kind of environmental uses does the City regulate? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City regulates uses through designations in the Official Plan, including various environmental features which have been identified through provincial and municipal studies. These environmental features have been incorporated in the Greely CDP using three land use designations: i) Significant Wetland, ii) Ecological Feature and iii) Ecological Function Overlay.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is an Ecological Feature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ecological Feature in Greely is the interior part of a larger woodland,

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>and Ecological Function?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “Ecological Function” should not permit any development and should be entirely protected. We don’t have many natural areas left and there is a need to protect groundwater recharge areas. 	<p>located at least 100 m inside the edge of the woods, which was recommended for protection in the Shields Creek Subwatershed Study. The entire woodland has since been identified as a significant woodland within the City’s natural heritage system, in part because of this interior habitat. Uses that do not adversely affect the form or function of this area, as determined through an Environmental Impact Statement, are allowed. Areas of Ecological Function were identified in the subwatershed study as providing protection to adjacent features, and have since been identified as significant woodlands in the City’s natural heritage system. As part of this review, the term “overlay” has been added to the term “Ecological Function” to better reflect the land use intent of the lands. The underlying land use for these lands is Residential, which means that residential development may be considered so long as there is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) undertaken to ensure that the woodlands and the adjacent Ecological Feature/Significant Wetland is not negatively impacted.</p>
<p>Farmland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We should consider protecting significant farmland in the Village for use for gardening and food production for residents. The City should consider making the “hole-in-the-donut” a community garden. Other residents expressed concerns about environmental impacts and the risk of contamination in this car storage area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City has designated lands to be used for agricultural purposes, which are located in the rural area, and not within “Village” areas. It is not intended that lands located in a designated “Village”, such as Greely, will be protected for food production. Residents are able to use their own property for gardening if they wish, of course. <p>For any new development of the scrap yard lands in the future, a record of site conditions and numerous studies will be required to demonstrate that the proposed use of the land is suitable.</p>

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be in keeping with the Greely Community Design Plan. Why was Foodland not developed in accordance with CDP policies regarding front yard setback? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Foodland grocery store was built before approval of the Greely CDP and therefore does not reflect the setbacks established for the Village Core area. Any future development within the Village Core must comply with zoning regulations existing at the time.
<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One planner should be assigned to Greely to ensure implementation of the Greely Community Design Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development applications review teams are organized geographically and there is one team of planners responsible for the rural area east of the Rideau River, including Greely. The review team members sit and work closely together to ensure that information/knowledge can be easily shared.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land use map needs to be updated since it does not represent the current lot fabric. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Greely CDP is one of the planning documents that planners must refer to in their review of an application. It was approved in 2005 and reflects the development pattern at that point in time. Ultimately, the land use plan provides direction for future development and is not affected by lotting patterns. <p>Changes to the land use plan including lotting patterns have been updated as part of this review.</p>
<p>Country lot subdivisions located outside the village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is obviously pushing for country lot clustering and the “discussion paper” does not contain firm enough language – too many “may”, “might” and “could” statements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Council directed staff to study issues around country lot subdivisions, in particular “clustering” of these developments. This effort is part of the Rural Review initiative that is now underway. Among issues to be considered: whether “clustering” has the potential to cause groundwater concerns where studies required for one subdivision do not identify concerns; implications of this type of development on the need for communal services and their feasibility; how the presence of clusters on the edge of the urban boundary will

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
	affect any urban expansion particularly efforts to building over prime agricultural land and rural natural features. The purpose of the discussion paper is to form the basis for further discussion before staff reports to Council as to whether any changes are required to the Official Plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At some point, would the village boundary be expanded to include country lot subdivisions located outside Greely? These lots are already there and use the same community services as the residents of the Village. • Country lot subdivisions are great. • Like the bigger lot sizes in country lot subdivisions. • Support country lot subdivisions. • Love country lot subdivisions! • Two acres lots are a good thing. • Country lot subdivisions insulate Greely. • Country estate development - completely appropriate, enhances the community. • These uses should be permitted adjacent to the Village. • Subdivisions are OK, as long as there is an adequately functioning Core area, and there 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been forwarded to staff for consideration in their review of country lot subdivisions.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>are connections/pathways between subdivisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that these subdivisions are connected to the Village through roads, sidewalks and pathways. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country estate development should be allowed in the Village and there should be consideration to expanding the village boundary to include some of the nearby country estate subdivisions as part of this village plan review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City does not typically include already built country lot estate development inside village boundaries. This feedback has been forwarded to staff involved in the policy review of country lot subdivisions.
<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area by the post office has remained vacant and looks abandoned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there are property standards concerns about the property, residents can call 3-1-1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will development occur at the corner of Stagecoach Road and Mitch Owens Road? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The corner of Stagecoach Road and Mitch Owens Road is located outside the village boundary and is not dealt with in the Greely CDP. The south-west corner is zoned Rural Countryside (RU), which can accommodate agricultural, forestry, country residential lots created by severance and other land uses characteristic of Ottawa's countryside. It is likely that rural commercial development will take place at this location.
<p>Village Core – Built Form Guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern about the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Built Form Guidelines were originally developed to apply to the Village Core designation that is located on the west side of Bank Street, generally for

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>applicability of Section 5.3 Built Form Guidelines for the Village Core since there are primarily homes located there now. The existing guidelines do not reflect existing or likely future development. Setbacks and heights should reflect range of existing and future development scenarios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the existing built form guidelines to apply to the Greely Village Centre project, located east of Bank Street, would be harmful and redundant since there are restrictive covenants, including a design review process. 	<p>the area on Meadow Drive and Parkway Drive area, which consists of detached dwellings. These guidelines provide guidance on how development should proceed in the future with respect to height, location of parking or garages, and minimum front yard setback from the sidewalk. It was/is anticipated that change would be incremental e.g. conversions of dwellings to retail store.</p> <p>In situations where Village Core development involves new buildings such as those located east of Bank Street, then guidance will be provided by the Council-approved Design Guidelines for the Development of Rural Villages.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not necessary to apply the guidelines in Section 5.3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.3 Built Form Guidelines are meant to apply to the Village Core located west of Bank Street. For commercial development located west of Bank Street, the Council-approved Design Guidelines for the Development of Rural Villages will apply.
<p>Development charges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial incentives should be available for development in the Village Core for its environmental benefits e.g. reducing transit and transportation demands, reducing road use and car travel by providing good services, employment and recreation locally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In its 2011 decision regarding an appeal of the new Development Charge for the Rural Area, the Ontario Municipal Board found that the City of Ottawa had acted fairly and reasonably in allocating the development charges.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>A temporary reduction in Development Charges (DC) in specific village core development areas could be considered.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of money is collected through development charges on building construction in Greely. This money should be spent expeditiously in Greely on construction/maintenance of parks, arenas, a community pool, tennis courts and soccer fields. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City currently differentiates growth-related capital projects, within certain service categories, by assigning them as having either a broad city-wide community benefit or a narrower, area specific focus based on one of three geographic divisions (Inside the Greenbelt, Outside the Greenbelt and Rural area). The City allocates development charge funds, by benefiting area, based on the forecasted capital works program established using growth projections for each sub-area identified in the Background Study. <p>The area-specific component of the charge is averaged across the entire Rural area and is available to fund a portion of growth-related capital works for such items as parks and recreation facilities. Since there is a limited amount of revenue, funding priorities must be established across the entire Rural area, in consultation with the various community associations.</p> <p>There are no arenas currently identified in the Background Study to be built within the Rural area. Development charges cannot be used to finance maintenance or operational costs.</p>
<p>Lot supply – Compliance with CDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The current CDP requires ongoing review and adjustment to ensure an 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing and revised CDP states: “Review the CDP from time-to-time after adoption to ensure the Plan’s goals are being met. As part of this review, the boundary for the Village of Greely will be evaluated within the framework

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>adequate supply of developable residential land. There must be a reasonable supply of housing mix. Further, it is not reasonable to allow an inadequate supply of the dominant form of housing – single family homes on private services. This non-compliance is required to be addressed and revised urgently.”</p>	<p>of the Official Plan to ensure that there is an adequate supply of developable residential lands.”</p> <p>The Official Plan specifically states that “When preparing a community design plan for any village, Council may consider the need for expansion of...(a) village boundary, but only within the framework of a comprehensive review of all Villages and the need for additional land.”</p>
<p>Support for Greely homebuilding industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding additional land to the village provides some protection for the homebuilding industry in Greely, one of the largest industries in the village economy e.g. surveyors, soil engineer, framers, painters, cleaners, and plumbers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not the role of the CDP to protect the Greely homebuilding industry by bringing in additional land into the Village.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)

Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Supply of lots in Greely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff estimated a development potential of 1,537 dwelling units. There are only about 600 lots available. This does not meet the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the three year requirement or long term requirement for detached homes with private services on ½ acre lots. There is a shortage of developable lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Research & Forecasting Unit (Planning and Growth Management Department) does not agree with the figures, which have been previously disputed by City staff. As part of Official Plan Amendment 76, which brought forward comprehensive changes to the Official Plan as part of the five year review, the potential estimate at the end of 2010 was 1,727 units. The figure of 1,537 dwelling units is outdated. <p>It should also be noted that the PPS does not apply to Greely in isolation from the rest of the City and there is no three year land supply requirement for Greely.</p>
TRANSPORTATION	
<p>Road improvements, traffic and connectivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identified the lack of connectivity in the Village by car, bicycle and foot. This makes it difficult to travel from one part of Greely to another. People want to be able to travel throughout the Village without feeling that they or their children are at risk. There is also a desire to improve connectivity between existing and new communities without creating negative impacts. There should be connections to the multi-use pathways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff heard a wide range of transportation comments from residents at the spring 2011 workshop in Greely. When the Greely CDP was initiated in 2003, there was limited transportation work undertaken. Almost a decade later, Greely has become the fastest growing village in Ottawa and also the most populated. Within Greely there is only one main east-west road connection (Parkway Road) that residents depend on. <p>Since the Greely CDP was approved in 2005, the Village population has grown by about 30% and there have been OMB-approved village boundary expansions. Surrounding the Village are over 1,300 lots that have been created – some developed and others developable.</p> <p>In response to this growth and the wide range of transportation issues identified by residents, it is recommended that a village-wide transportation study be undertaken to identify transportation-related needs and to improve overall</p>

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
	connectivity. All modes of transportation should be considered including car, truck, walking (sidewalks, pathways) and cycling, both in and around Greely.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing developers have established pockets of housing through Greely that are not connected in any way. • Roads have dead ends, no sidewalks or bike paths connect to parks and the larger community. • There are no ways for children to safely cross major roads that have a lot of truck traffic. • A bike path running parallel to Mitch Owens would provide an opportunity for students to bike from one end of Greely to another and to travel to St. Mark High School safely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Road improvements, traffic and connectivity above. During the review of the Greely CDP parks staff worked with the Greely Community Association members to identify greenspaces in their Village. An updated greenspace network map is now included in the revised CDP that shows existing and future City parks and public linkages.
<p>Parkway Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parkway Road was most frequently mentioned as being unsafe. Due to narrow road widths, soft shoulders and deep ditches, residents report that trucks leaving the Parkway fire station cannot drive past cars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response above to Road improvements, traffic and connectivity above.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>travelling in the opposite direction. Drivers must speed ahead and make their turn before encountering the fire truck or must turn into private driveways to avoid an encounter with the fire truck.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Parkway Road is dangerous for cars, pedestrians and cyclists. It is too narrow, no shoulder, needs to be expanded, paved, proper shoulders put in, and possibly a sidewalk or bike path on the south side where the housing developments will be located.” 	
<p>Sidewalks – Village Core</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were several comments about the need for sidewalks to and within the Village Core, including one to the public library. There was also a desire to have streetlights and street trees in the Village Core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Road improvements, traffic, connectivity above. <p>The Greely CDP recognized the need for sidewalks. Section 5.4 Streetscape Guidelines states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Creating a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere is key to making a successful Village Core for Greely. This Plan will ensure that streets in Greely’s Core are safe and allow ease of movement for pedestrians, are linked to surrounding neighbourhoods by a system of pedestrian and cycling routes, and together with the built form creates an intimate and visually appealing public atmosphere.”</p> <p>The CDP further states that Parkway Road and Meadow Drive should be</p>

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
	switched to a “village cross-section” during any reconstruction of those streets, which includes provision of sidewalks.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People do not want pathways retroactively imposed on existing subdivision at the expense of private landowners who might prefer their privacy. There is a desire for pedestrian linkages between parks and development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. Staff try to create linkages through the development review process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety of pedestrians is a concern. More sidewalks, linkages and crosswalks should be built. Meadow Drive (Greely’s mainstreet) is narrow and busy street for cars and trucks. Walking to this area (grocery store or library/community centre) can be hazardous. It can be dangerous for seniors and people with children especially in the winter. • A sidewalk from “Hot Pizza” to the library/community centre is a bare minimum. Another desirable sidewalk along Pig Alley linking to Parkway Road pathways. The lack of sidewalks is unacceptable from pedestrian safety perspective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Road improvements, traffic and connectivity above.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrians need to walk on the road (to reach the library and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This comment has been forwarded to Gill Wilson, Transportation – Strategic Planning Unit in the Planning and Growth Management Department. See

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
	response to Road improvements, traffic and connectivity above.
<p>centre). This is difficult to do in the winter. Area should be given priority since the bridge needs repairs and pedestrian safety is a concern. Even a sidewalk on one side of the street would help.</p>	
<p>Osgood multi-use pathway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents would like to see crossing lights at Manotick Station Road at Mitch Owens Road so that cyclists using the multi-use pathway to the east of the intersection can cross Mitch Owens Road safely. There appears to be a conflict between City traffic and cycling staff as to whether some kind of traffic light. Can this be clarified? • Many dump trucks and 18 – wheeled trucks travel at 80 km/hr along Mitch Owens Road. There is nothing to warn drivers that the Osgood multi-use pathway crosses the road. When the sun sets it is difficult to see. Something must be done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community desire for a crossing is recognized by City staff. Residents' comments have been sent to traffic staff to determine whether the warrant is met for a crossing at Manotick Station Road and Mitch Owens Road. <p>The second comment has been forwarded to the Public Works Department regarding visibility and crossing.</p>
<p>Bicycle lanes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated cycle lanes are needed along Stagecoach Road, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ottawa Cycling Plan (OCP) identifies streets designated for future paved shoulders to accommodate cyclists

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Old Prescott Road, Mitch Owens Road, Bank Street, Parkway Drive and road network through the Village.</p>	<p>http://ottawa.ca/residents/onthemove/cycling/ottawa_cycling_plan_en.html :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Old Prescott Road (Mitch Owens Road to future multi-use pathway approx. 500 m. south of Breanna Cardill Street) ii) Parkway Drive (Stagecoach Road to Old Prescott Road) iii) Apple Orchard Road (Manotick Station Road to Stagecoach Road) iv) Gough Road (Dozois Road to Manotick Station Road) v) Dozois Road (Mitch Owens Road to Gough Road) vi) Stagecoach (Mitch Owens Road to Gold Ash Lane and Lakeshore Drive north to the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry boundary) <p>Multi-use pathways identified in the OCP, can accommodate cyclists, including one to the south that is intended to link to Metcalfe on a special alignment that includes segments of off-road cycling (e.g. multi-use pathways) and on-road cycling (e.g. quieter local streets) with shared lanes but no special bike facilities. Final alignments are not shown, but the intent is to provide connectivity with the use of arrows.</p> <p>Residents generally identified streets where cyclists should be accommodated; however, it would be helpful for City staff to understand the exact segment of roadway where cyclists should be accommodated. It should be noted that the development of such facilities represents a significant capital cost to taxpayers and may impact on-street parking.</p> <p>See response to Road improvements, traffic and connectivity.</p>
<p>Road conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major roads need to be widened - maintaining two lanes, but including bike paths and sidewalks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to “Road improvements, traffic, connectivity”.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the main roads have poor grading and are dangerous. Roads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is aware of the road conditions in Greely and maintains a list of planned road works based on priorities and needs: i) Apple Orchard from

RESPONSES to COMMENTS
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)

	Issues	Departmental Responses
	<p>were not built to withstand the weight and volume of traffic that now exists in Greely. The roads need to be excavated and paved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads are not in good shape. Many of the sides of the roads are gouged out and dangerous, especially for inexperienced drivers.... Particularly at night. There has been some patch work, but not enough to solve the problem. 	<p>Manotick Station to Stagecoach, ii) Parkway from Stagecoach to Old Prescott, iii) Old Prescott Road from Stagecoach to Donwel. These projects fall outside the 2012-2014 planning horizon due to backlog of needs and projected funding levels – this may change with the current budget.</p> <p>Road resurfacing/renewal is being undertaken on Parkway Drive (east of Bank Street to west of John Quinn).</p> <p>An environmental assessment will be undertaken for the proposed widening of Bank Street from Leitrim Road to Rideau Road. There has been rapid growth in this area leading to increased traffic on Bank Street resulting in congestion during peak periods. It is noted that traffic demands from rural area residents will be incorporated into the study process.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a sloped gravel parking lot on Old Prescott Road into the vicinity of the soccer field at Andy Shields Park. Better access is needed because it is very steep and dangerous. Gravel and rocks often get kicked up and damage other cars. Pedestrians are at risk as well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This suggestion has been forwarded to the Recreation Planning & Facility Development Unit (City Operations Portfolio) and it will be added to their list of works and will be prioritized every year against all other requests.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Albion Road from Mitch Owens Road to Lester Road is in poor condition. Albion Road has heavy morning congestion driving into the city. The road is very narrow with soft shoulders and deep ditches on both sides of the roadway. Albion Road needs to be widened and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Infrastructure Services Department (Asset Management Branch) states that Albion Road from Mitch Owens to 200 metres north of Lester Road is planned for resurfacing in 2014. Pre-engineering data collection starts in 2012. Additional watermain work is planned for the section from Del Zotto Avenue to Leitrim Road for 2012.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS		
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)		
	Issues	Departmental Responses
	resurfaced.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank Street needs to be cleaned up both north and south of Greely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call 3-1-1 to address this matter.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The poor condition of Parkway Road is between Old Prescott and Stagecoach Roads is very important and has not be acted on for the past five years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the 2012 Budget identifies upgrades to some of the major roads in Greely, there is no mention of Meadow Drive, which leads to the community centre, library, grocery store, post office and doctor's office. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of concerns re: road conditions identified at the December 15, 2011 public meeting in Greely. Seen as a health and safety issue by residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Old Prescott Road from Mitch Owens to Stagecoach Road - All of Parkway Road - Albion Road from Mitch Owens Road to Lester Road • Roads desperately need to be resurfaced, widened considerably with sidewalks or bike paths for kids to use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns have been forwarded to road needs staff.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is too much traffic on Stagecoach Road. Traffic should be diverted to Manotick Station Road or Stagecoach Road should be widened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stagecoach Road is classified in the Transportation Master Plan as an arterial roadway, whereas Manotick Station Road is a collector. Accordingly, no action should be taken to direct traffic to a lesser tier roadway. The Transportation Master Plan does not identify a need for any future widening of Stagecoach Road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic should be reduced at Bank Street and Parkway Drive because of the proposed shopping centre where youth will be working or shopping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The matter has been reviewed recently by the Traffic, Safety & Mobility Unit (Public Works Department). They confirm the ideal speed limit for this section of Bank Street is 90 km/h with the lowest limit to be posted for safe operation, 80 km/h. An arbitrary reduction in the posted speed limit will not affect the speed of traffic, but may decrease safety as the length of any required turning lanes would be designed based on the lower posted limit, whereas the majority of drivers will still travel at or close to the previous design speed of the roadway (100 km/h). Also, traffic signal clearance intervals are adjusted based on the posted speed limit. A lower speed limit set at an arbitrary level will result in a yellow light that is too short for the actual speed of traffic. Accordingly, this could result in an increase in “red-light running.” <p>No further action is proposed to reduce the posted speed limit on this former Provincial highway at this time. The Public Works Department will, however, review vehicle speeds following completion of all development at this intersection and will give consideration to a different speed limit should one be recommended based on the criteria outlined in the City of Ottawa Speed Zoning Policy for Urban and Rural Roads.</p> <p>Note: The intersection at Bank and Parkway will be modified to include turning lanes and street lights to accommodate traffic generated by the shopping centre.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank Street and Meadow Drive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See note above regarding the speed limit on Bank Street. Traffic staff note that

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>should have a lower speed limits, streetlights, and bike lanes. There was a fatal bike accident with the young boy riding home after working at grocery store in 2010.</p>	<p>the unfortunate fatal collision involving the cyclist was alcohol-related and could not be addressed by changes to signs or the speed limit. The matter of bicycle lanes on City streets is addressed above under Bicycle lanes section of this document.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns about traffic at Parkway Drive and Stagecoach Road. Traffic lights are needed to slow traffic so residents living north of Parkway in west Greely can turn north on Stagecoach Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff are assessing the intersection at Parkway and Stagecoach. Residents will be notified of study results when they are available.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Greely Community Association (GCA) is concerned that the City will build a traffic circle rather than erect a traffic light. This intersection is used by children on bicycles travelling from the western part of the Village to the Meadow Drive area. Traffic circles are not cycle friendly. The GCA is working with the City to ensure that this area is correctly designed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be an eastbound right turn lane off Mitch Owens Road onto Stagecoach Road. It 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For east bound traffic on Mitch Owens, a right turn lane onto Manotick Station is planned as one of the Development Charge projects. This project is recommended to be implemented within a few years.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
is anticipated that there will be an accident because there is no turning lane.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an east bound right-turn lane from Mitch Owens to Old Prescott. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no eastbound right-turn lane proposed at Mitch Owens and Old Prescott. Traffic volumes should be warranted before a right-turn lane is constructed. Staff will monitor the intersection to determine if the traffic volumes warrant a turning lane.
<p>Truck traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a concern about traffic on Old Prescott Road, especially truck traffic travelling at 80 km/hr. The suggestion is to move truck traffic onto Bank Street in light of new residential development and terrible road conditions of Old Prescott Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff are aware of the truck issues in Greely. See response to “Road improvements, traffic, connectivity”.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What can be done about the truck traffic on Mitch Owens Road to and from Orga World? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitch Owens Road is a designated heavy truck route and has functioned this way for the past half century. Any change must be mandated by City Council.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it possible for trucks to use an old right-of-way to the south or is it possible for the road to be widened and resurfaced? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is much to consider in converting or returning an existing un-used right-of-way into a travelled road. In order to consider using an existing road right-of-way (ROW), staff must review the specific site in question. There needs to be an assessment as to how this ROW would fit into the existing road network, the adequacy of the ROW to accommodate trucks. According to the new 2012 budget the City has plans to resurface aging roads, and improve sidewalks and cycling infrastructure.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trucks are driving and speeding through the Village. Old Prescott Road should be a “no truck zone” the way Stagecoach Road is now. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The matter of speeding trucks is a common complaint. Changing truck routes must be addressed by City Council and given the historical usage of the road by trucks, it is doubtful that the Public Works Department would recommend a change. Diverting truck traffic onto an adjacent truck route would simply increase the number of complaints from residents on that roadway.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dump trucks and other trucks driving fast along Stagecoach Road are very loud. The recent change of speed to 70 km/hr should be changed to a lower speed before the south entrance to Lakeland Estates to slow traffic down. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This request has been forwarded to traffic@ottawa.ca for review and follow-up with the letter writer.
<p>Old Prescott Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Old Prescott Road divides the community. There are hundreds of kids who have no effective way to get around the village 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. It is hoped that with future road resurfacing work on Parkway that a paved shoulder will be created, which will accommodate a cycling route along the only continuous east-west roadway in Greely.
<p>Speeding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speeds should be reduced on Stagecoach Road and Old Prescott Road. Vehicles travel at 80-90 km/hr. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The matter of vehicle speeds is addressed by the police. Accordingly, Sgt Mark Gatien has been notified of this concern by the Public Works Department. The Public Works Department notes that reducing speed limits to reduce speeding traffic is problematic. Drivers who choose to travel in an aggressive manner and at high speeds do so regardless of the posted speed limit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been requests by a church and school for a 60 km/hr speed limit on Bank Street. The City responded that they could 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The matter of the speed limit near the church was reviewed and approved by City Council to be maintained at the 80 km/r speed limit recommended by staff. The speed limit in the Village of Vernon was set by the Province of Ontario when this roadway was a Provincial highway and a subsequent speed zone

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>not lower the speed limit from 80 km/hr because it was a major road. It was noted, however, that Vernon has a 60 km/hr speed limit on Bank Street. Why is there this discrepancy?</p>	<p>review has confirmed that a 60 km/h or 70 km/h would be appropriate and safe for this portion of Bank Street. Other sections of Bank Street could be posted at either 90 km/h or 100 km/h in accordance with the roadway design, function and adjacent land development.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parkway Drive should have a 40km/hr speed limit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Public Works Department has provided the following response to the suggested speed limit reduction: <p>“The currently posted 50 km/h speed limit is the lowest limit to be posted based on the City of Ottawa Speed Zoning Policy. As a collector roadway, any reduction in the speed limit would not be adhered to by the majority of safe and prudent drivers regardless of the level of enforcement. Also, any action to reduce the speed limit to reduce the number of speeders would eliminate the effectiveness of the school speed zone. The roadway would simply become a speed trap requiring constant monitoring by staff and the police with no net improvement in safety.</p> <p>Regarding speed limits in general – of note to all interested parties, statistics have proven conclusively that, as arterial or collector roadways, any reduction in a posted speed limit will not be adhered to by the majority of the driving public and the results of the most recent spot speed surveys confirm this fact.</p> <p>Without doubt, safety is paramount in any speed review conducted by this Department. However, it is important to maintain consistent, uniform speed limits on any roadway to provide all users including pedestrians, cyclists, adjacent residents and motorists with a correct representation of the actual speed of traffic on that street. The provision of unreasonable speed limits, especially relating to roadway function, design and development, may result in</p>

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
	<p>enforcement difficulties and increases in traffic hazard as the majority of motorists continue to drive at speeds they find reasonable and prudent, having regard to the prevailing roadway conditions.</p> <p>The resulting greater differences in relative speeds between these and the majority of motorists causes increased and undue risk – undue risk to all those motorists who, by their efforts in upholding an unreasonable speed limit put themselves and others at further risk by those who will seek to pass slower moving vehicles and by their action increase the risk of side-swipe, loss of control and worse, head-on collisions. So, as drivers are forced to expend extra effort in continually adjusting their speeds to comply with unreasonable speed limits, less driver attention is available for competing traffic elements such as other motorists, pedestrians, or cyclists.</p> <p>Contrary to popular opinion, the provision of higher speed limits, when and where appropriate, results in safer traffic operation. It cannot be emphasized often or emphatically enough: there is no safety, inherent or otherwise, in faith being placed on a speed limit that is inconsistent with the speed actually travelled by traffic.”</p>
<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the road network in the “lakes areas” be connected so residents will not have to drive along Parkway Drive? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the development application process, staff will ensure that connections are provided in new subdivisions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the City doing with collector roads in the vicinity of the Quinn farm development so congestion is not created on Old Prescott Road. What is the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quinn Farm development has been designed with an internal collector road exiting east onto Old Prescott Road and north onto Parkway Drive. The developer will be paying 50% of the cost of a pedestrian- activated signal crossing which will connect the new development with Andy Shields Park. As part of the crossing, there will be a section of walkway along Old Prescott Road

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
developer's responsibility?	so that people can walk to the actual crossing – in the vicinity of the vehicle entrance to the park. The City is planning a sidewalk in the parking lot to line up with the crossing to guide pedestrians appropriately.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More east-west roads are needed besides Parkway Drive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted. The City's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) identifies the higher order roads (arterials and collectors) in Greely, but does not identify any new proposed east-west collector roads. Much of the road system in Greely has already been established and it would be very difficult to create any new east-west roads.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult for vehicles to manoeuvre in the vicinity of the grocery store. There have been three minor accidents and delivery trucks are having trouble getting in and out of the parking lot. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern that there is no parking area for users of the private bus that travels north on Bank Street and for those individuals carpooling. There are 15 cars parked on Meadow Drive, near the grocery store. • Is there an option for vehicles to park at the community centre? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents should contact Councillor Doug Thompson to voice their desire for a park and ride facility at the Community Centre. This will assist to initiate discussions with staff.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of residents were concerned about a potential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ontario Municipal Board issued its decision regarding the appeal to the Cadieux residential subdivision application and approved a road link between

RESPONSES to COMMENTS		
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)		
	Issues	Departmental Responses
	future road through Lakeshore Drive which would disrupt life for residents and have a safety impact on children. A street crossing through their crescent street would take away the unique feel of their community.	the proposed subdivision and Lakeshore Drive.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to arterial roads that benefit passersby are not considered benefits to the Village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is critical that the north-south collector road be developed as soon as possible for the Shadow Ridge, Quinn, and Cadieux subdivisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<p>Transit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents would like to have peak hour bus service during the weekday and limited service on weekend for youth. At the same time, other residents do not want this service because they do not want to lose the rural village character of their community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately ten years ago residents in Greely clearly told staff that they did not want bus service. This explains the absence of bus service in the community.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds should be diverted from transit to roads because residents pay for transit, but they do not have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since Greely residents do not have bus service, they do not pay for bus service. However, it should be noted that all residents pay for ParaTranspo through their taxes.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
transit service.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teenagers need something to do e.g. movie, shopping, work. There should be a local bus between Metcalfe and Manotick on Friday night, Saturday and Sunday. The Findlay Creek bus route could be extended to Parkway Road and Bank Street. With weekend bus service teenagers would have reasonable transportation for activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. This input has been forwarded to Transit Services staff for information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is there an OC Transpo stop sign in front of the library? No such request was ever made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a bus stop located in front of the Greely Community Centre. It was added in January and serves Route 204. This route is one of the new Shoppers' Bus Routes that operates every Thursday with one trip in the morning to an urban shopping destination and a return trip in the afternoon.
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND GREENSPACE	
<p>Protected areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was support for plans for protected areas, however, it was noted that development is encroaching and deer no longer exist. There is a desire to protect what is left including the wetlands and woodlot. There was interest in the specific elements of the woodlot and having public access to it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The woodlot located at the north-west corner of the Village will trigger the requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be prepared when development is proposed within it or nearby. Staff aim for maximum tree retention in the case of development in a vegetated area. The wetland in the south-east corner of the Village is designated as a Significant Wetland, meaning no development is permitted within it and an EIS would be required for any development proposed nearby. The Shields Creek Subwatershed Study addressed the potential for public trails in the woodlot and wetlands, depending on the EIS results.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “hole-in-the-donut” should be protected. Lands along the creek(s) should be protected and a pathway could also be created. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development proposal would be required to consider the policies of the Official Plan regarding watercourse setbacks as well as the findings of the Shields Creek Subwatershed Study. This Study identified areas of ecological significance including the creek corridors and provided for associated opportunities for public trails, depending on the results of an Environmental Impact Statement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider keeping natural elements of the former pit located just north of Village Core as there are trees and a watercourse running through it. A trail system through the area would be good too. Keep as many trees as possible when development occurs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area located north of the Village Core to the west of Bank Street is designated for residential use. Official Plan policies will guide future redevelopment of the former pit with respect to watercourses, trees and pathways.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents would like to see development in the village and surrounding areas halted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City cannot arbitrarily halt development where lands have already been designated for development. The designated “Village” areas including Greely have been identified to be the focus for residential growth and commercial/community services in the rural area. There must be extraordinarily compelling reasons for development to be halted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Someone is cutting down trees in the woodlot. Perhaps the City should buy the woodlot feature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City already owns a parcel of the woodlot, but does not have funds budgeted for acquisition of more land in this area. Tree cutting on private property is regulated in the urban area, but not in the rural area e.g. Greely.
<p>Greenspaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents want their existing greenspaces protected. They feel more parks and associated amenities, sports fields (soccer fields, baseball diamonds) and trees are needed in their parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. They have been forwarded to parks planning staff in the Department.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over the cumulative loss of natural features and greenspaces as result of developments approved with no apparent consideration given to the surrounding area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to keep the Village green and continue to maintain the beauty without jeopardizing what already exists. There should be more greenspace (higher parkland ratio) and money should be allocated to this. There is a need for a higher ratio for parks (e.g. more parkland per person). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parkland is dedicated to the City as part of the development process as prescribed under the parkland dedication by-law. It is not possible to require more than is established in this by-law. Development charges are collected during the development process and a specific portion of these funds is apportioned to new park development. As for existing parks, there are limited funds to retrofit and improve existing parks and these requests must be evaluated in the face of other requests throughout the City.
<p>Parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a comment that there should be a parks master plan to look at the entire greenspace network (trails, pathways, parks and open space) holistically. Improvements are needed to make the existing system better before looking too far into the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule D – Greenspace Network in the CDP has been updated to look at the greenspace system on a more holistic basis identifying elements such as existing and future linkages and parks .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a park in the new community east of Bank Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A higher level community park and an adjacent neighbourhood park are planned for the lands east of Bank Street.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports fields are only located in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports fields are typically located in community parks because they require a

RESPONSES to COMMENTS
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)

	Issues	Departmental Responses
	<p>large parks and are often too far from many neighbourhoods. They are also not very well connected to surrounding neighbourhoods. Perhaps these should be located in a variety of locations so people do not have to drive.</p>	<p>large amount of parkland and neighbourhood parks do not always provide sufficient space. There will eventually be three community parks in the Village: i) the existing Andy Shields Park, ii) a community park located west of Old Prescott Road and iii) another community park located east of Bank Street.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for an outdoor hockey rink in each neighbourhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a process for establishing an outdoor rink in both existing and new parks. For existing parks, a volunteer group would make a request to the City and it would have to be evaluated in terms of location of existing rinks and budget availability. To establish a rink in a new park, a winterized water source is also needed and would have to be done as part of the park development process. For further information contact Luc Lavictoire of Arenas and Outdoor Rinks (City of Ottawa).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most city parks don't have many facilities that are usable such as tennis courts, or a BMX park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This comment has been forwarded to Recreation Planning & Facility Development Unit of the Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Department.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks with lighting have less vandalism—more should be lit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted and forwarded to Recreation Planning & Facility Development Unit of the Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Department.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some existing and future subdivisions do not have parks and there is no place for kids to go. More parks should be provided in all areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted. It is difficult to create parks in established subdivisions, however, efforts are being made to ensure parks are established in new subdivisions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks need to be developed at the same time as subdivisions so they are ready when new residents move in. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning and Growth Management Department is changing the way that parks are developed and they are being tracked and developed earlier.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When there is cash-in-lieu of parks for Greely development, some of this money should be allocated to transportation issues in Greely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally the City will take actual parkland instead of cash-in-lieu of parkland. However, where the City does take cash-in-lieu of parkland, the funds can only be used for new park development. The money collected is split between a general “rural” parks fund and a City-wide park fund.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no reference to the park in Emerald Links. Is it called something else or was it omitted for a reason? What are the plans for this space? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Park location is anticipated to change and will be combined with another future park in the Emerald Links, phase three development.
<p>Recreational facilities needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parks, trails, trees, arena, pool, tennis, more soccer fields, existing park dedications need to be developed including the park at Greely Village Centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City currently differentiates growth-related capital projects, within certain service categories, by assigning them as having either a broad City-wide community benefit or a narrower, area specific focus based on one of three geographic divisions (Inside the Greenbelt, Outside the Greenbelt and Rural area). The City allocates development charge funds, by benefiting area, based on the forecasted capital works program established using growth projections for each sub-area identified in the Background Study. <p>The area-specific component of the charge is averaged across the entire Rural area and is available to fund a portion of growth-related capital works for such items as parks and recreation facilities. Since there is a limited amount of revenue, funding priorities must be established across the entire Rural area, in consultation with the various community associations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no arenas currently identified in the Background Study to be built within the Rural area. Development charges cannot be used to finance maintenance or operational costs.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are adult-sized softball diamonds at Andy Shield's Park, but they are not available for use by adults. Diamond #1 is available for use but there is a soccer field beside the right field fence. This is very dangerous since balls hit to the right field come close to soccer players or fans watching the game. Diamond #2 has no lights and is all booked by the Greely Softball Association. Diamond #3 is a youth only diamond due to complaints by a residents who had too many balls going in his backyard. • The Greely 3-Pitch league has moved to Metcalfe. A league that has been around for 30 years should not have to play in another community. A new complex with 4 diamonds and lighting is needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been forwarded to the parks planner responsible for new parks in Greely.
<p>Up-to-date info</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need up-to-date information about parks and parks facilities. The current GIS information is not accurate or complete. The information needs to be verified in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents can access the City's inventory of parks and park facilities through http://apps104.ottawa.ca/emap/. They can zoom into the area of their choice and then search by theme e.g. "Parks and Recreation". It is acknowledged that the City's parks inventory has not been updated for several years. This has resulted in the lack of current information on parks and associated facilities. A technology renewal project is now underway to produce a system that will

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>the field.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area 3 South West is there another park not showing on plan? 	<p>result in more accurate and timely mapping information. In the mean time, residents can alert staff to inconsistencies by calling 3-1-1 with the specific mapping concerns.</p>
<p>Youth and parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some people do not want new parks since there are issues with youth using them. There were others who thought it was important to ask youth about their needs since older residents do not use or need parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parks planning staff involve community associations in their park development consultations. It would be helpful if community associations are able to solicit input from local youth as part of this process.
<p>Resident info/involvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage and notices should be used to denote future park locations so residents know what to expect. Residents want to know and be involved in the process when decisions about parks are made, such as location, and whether cash-in-lieu of parkland is taken. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a condition of the City's standard agreement the Developer is required to post a sign denoting future park space.
<p>Andy Shields Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community centre at Andy Shields should be more like the Greenboro Community Centre which has many facilities and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the Greenboro Community Centre was developed, it was a more basic facility. However, over the years there were additions to the building and programs offered. The Recreation and Cultural Services Department will monitor changes in Greely and will identify when building improvements and additional services to the existing facility are required.
<p>Quinn Farm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quinn Farm area should have a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A higher level community park is planned for the residential development on

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
small park	the Quinn Farm lands.
<p>Private parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private parks are better than public parks—better facilities and better maintenance. • This is exclusionary and does not contribute to community building. This should not be allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. The City is involved in the provision of public parks and this land is required to be provided in accordance with the Parkland Dedication By-law as part of the development application process. The provision of private parks is at the discretion of the developer.
<p>Pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages (sidewalks and pathways) for non-motorized vehicles are needed and vitally important between parks, facilities, commercial areas, and residences within Greely. It must be made easier to cross major streets. These connections need to be shown clearly on plans. • There seems to be a need to better integrate parks and pathways between communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Road improvements, traffic and connectivity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are there no linkages or pathways and a lack of linkages to the larger rural pathway system including connection to the Osgoode pathway and Leitrim pathway systems? • Need to better integrate developers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff have encountered difficulties when new connections are proposed between existing neighbourhoods and new development. This has resulted in the creation of isolated communities. This deficiency is recognized by planning staff assigned to Greely and will be an important consideration in their review of development applications in the future.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS		
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)		
	Issues	Departmental Responses
	<p>into planning for the Village. Currently planning is too fragmented with little to no linkages between communities. Limited ability to travel to parks and pathways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to integrate new development with the existing community. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to add pathway linkage from Thunderbird Cove subdivision (Pegasus Crescent) to South Village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the revised Greenspace Network (Schedule D) in the updated Greely CDP, staff have identified an existing pathway from Thunderbird Cove to South Village via a through block connection. In addition there is a future link identified when Pebble Trail is extended eastward to Thunderbird Cove and another future pathway connection located further north from Sunset Lakes to Thunderbird Cove.
	<p>Village boundary – Cedar Lakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current village boundary is irrational and should be adjusted to include the south-west corner of Greely, which would create logical east/west and north/south boundaries. There is development on three sides of the subject property. Studies have been conducted to demonstrate suitability of land for development. Benefits of the Cedar Lakes development include a four field soccer park and 1.5 kilometres of trails. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review of the Greely CDP is a re-fresh of the planning document and boundary expansions are not being undertaken as part of the overall village plan review to bring in additional development land into the villages. <p>Further an Ontario Municipal Board hearing was held and a decision has not yet been issued regarding the proponent's application to bring the subject lands into the Village designation.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter was received in December 2011 from Greely Sand and Gravel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS		
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)		
	Issues	Departmental Responses
	<p>in support of the proposed application to expand the Village boundary to accommodate the Cedar Lakes development. It was noted that approval of this application will support the local homebuilding industry and provide a well-designed new community for the growing Village of Greely.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In support of village boundary adjustment in the vicinity of Cedar Lakes, which is logical. There is a shortage of residential lots in Greely and including these lands would help. As a septic system company, the village boundary expansion and lots will provide jobs to development consultants and the trades (December 2011 letter) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A village boundary adjustment is supported for the following reasons: economic development, shortage of lots, land to support the homebuilding industry in Greely and would result in an innovative mix of residential and recreational uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
	WATER AND WASTEWATER	
	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns over current water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
	supply or septic systems.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a comment that water and sewage rates are expensive. In addition, sewerage is even charged on water used to water the lawn, which is not fair. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of dwellings and businesses are privately serviced. This means that the majority of landowners in Greely do not pay for public water and wastewater services. The Shadow Ridge development located at the south end of the village is the only location where communal water and communal wastewater systems are provided and it is the responsibility of each landowner to pay for that service.
<p>Concerns about impact of development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern over sustainability of septic systems on ½ acre lots and smaller lots. . • The City should require developers to undertake studies to prove zero impact from development on existing dwellings. • How does the City assess cumulative impact of development on capacity of the aquifer, surface and and groundwater quality and quantity? • There is concern that the understanding of groundwater hydrology may be disconnected from the amount of development happening in and around Greely. Will the City take responsibility if water quality/quantity is affected by new development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For an official plan amendment, zoning amendment, subdivision application, site plan control or condominium application located in an area with private water and private septic systems, developers must demonstrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is sufficient quantity of groundwater on-site to serve the development; - a well can be constructed on the proposed lot(s) without being impacted by identified potential sources of groundwater contamination; - the quality of groundwater meets or exceeds the Ontario Drinking Water Standards, Objectives and Guidelines; - operation of the on-site wastewater system will not adversely impact a well to be constructed on the proposed lot(s) and on wells of adjacent properties.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are communal wells more sustainable? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should not be any other connections to the Shadow Ridge communal water and wastewater systems eg Cadieux lands. These pipes would likely be in close proximity to the Lakeland Estates subdivision and could cause ecological impacts on the lake. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any additional applications for subdivision development, whether on communal or private services will need to demonstrate minimal impacts on groundwater and surface water.
<p>Private well water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the water quality good? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of the groundwater in Greely is generally good.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any concerns with nitrates? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With privately serviced developments there is often the possibility of nitrate impact. There is no immediate concern, as nitrate levels in Greely do not currently exceed the Ontario Drinking Water Standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the City know the extent of the aquifers that supply Greely? What are their capacities? If not development should be slowed until the capacity of the aquifer is understood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through many hydrogeological reports and modeling work the City has a very good understanding of the aquifers in the Village of Greely.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well water within the village should be consistently monitored by the City, and reported back to residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquifers in Greely have good capacity. There is no indication of aquifer mining (e.g. that water levels are decreasing over time). The City performed extensive sampling of private wells in 2002, and will continue to monitor water quality over time, both through monitoring wells and more private well sampling.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned over the impact that the communal system will have on the quality and quantity of water for existing and future private systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only public communal well in the Village is in the Shadow Ridge subdivision, located at the south part of Greely. The communal well is an overburden well, which means that it is not tapping into the bedrock aquifers which are the sources of groundwater for most of the village residents. An engineering report was prepared for the municipal communal well. It should have little impact on the bedrock aquifers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is concern over the depth of the well – should have been deeper. 	<p>The communal well was drilled prior to the Clean Water Act (CWA). Through the Source Water Protection efforts under the CWA the vulnerability of the area within the capture zone of the well has been established. The areas with high vulnerability around the municipal well Shadow Ridge might have been reduced if the well had been completed in the deep bedrock formation(s), but since the well is already in place and meets all the Ministry of the Environment requirements the subdivision was allowed to proceed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was also concern about the potential adverse impact that surrounding golf courses and sod farms may have on the Village's groundwater supplies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been a number of tests performed for herbicides and pesticides in the Greely area, with some locations adjacent to golf courses, and impact from these chemicals have generally not been identified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the impact of the man-made lakes on groundwater/drinking water? Is it being monitored? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been a substantial amount of sampling in Greely, including in the vicinity of manmade lakes, through village-wide sampling and consultant reports, and no concerns with the lakes have been identified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City's water is being provided to Russell. Water service should be provided to Greely also. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The infrastructure that has been brought to Russell was fully paid for by that municipality. Greely is not a Public Service Area (PSA), and in accordance with the Official Plan for non-PSA areas, it must be privately serviced.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the water being piped to Russell also serve Greely? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The water piped to Russell will not serve Greely (see above).
<p>Septic systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communal septic field has never been tested. It only works in theory; what if something goes wrong? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The type of sewage system constructed to serve the Shadow Ridge subdivision has a fairly long track record (peat has been used for sewage treatment for more than 20 years in Ontario). The Certificate of Approval, issued by the Ministry of the Environment, has requirements for on-going monitoring. Should the system not perform as intended, further development will not take place, and remedial actions will be required for the existing system.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the City ensure that old septic systems get checked and upgraded? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Septic systems are under the jurisdiction of the Ottawa Septic System Office (OSSO). OSSO staff state that septic systems are typically checked at the time of a home renovation through plan review or if a homeowner suspects that there are problems. It was noted that there is no inspection system in place to check the condition of existing septic system.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the City notify neighbours when a landowner's septic system causes contamination of ground water? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to Ottawa Septic System Office (OSSO) staff, it is typically neighbours who notice that there is an issue with someone else's septic system. Usually they contact the OSSO, which then follows-up with the owner of the septic system to rectify the situation. The OSSO does not specifically notify abutting neighbours about septic system issues. It should be noted that complaints are usually associated with a commercial operation or a farm.
<p>Artificial lakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New construction should not adversely affect water quality and levels in existing surface water ponds (artificial lakes). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new development is required to manage stormwater so as to minimize impact from runoff.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One resident worried that someday the lakes, which were created by a developer might be developed for more houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the lakes are amenity features. Some of the recent developments incorporate the lakes as stormwater management ponds. It should be noted that many of these lakes do not have road frontage - this factor is critical in land development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We noticed a comment in the draft plan regarding the impact of the man-made lakes and monitoring by the City. <p>Although Lakeland Estates is just outside the Village boundary, they have been using the pesticides Diquat and Copper Sulphate in their privately owned two man-made lakes since 2008, under MoE permits, and plan on continuing to use pesticides. The small lake lies in close proximity to the Shadow Ridge Wellhead Protection Zone. It is worth noting that in 2008 late August and in 2009 there were toxic blue green algal blooms which caused Ottawa Public Health advisories not to use the large lake for all of the 2009 recreational season. The toxin found was the rarer version and was tested to be at a level more than 500 times the serious risk level of 20, i.e. 11,500</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The man-made lakes are located outside the Wellhead Protection Area for the Shadow Ridge municipal well and therefore do not pose a risk to the municipal water supply. <p>Any concerns about use of these specific pesticides should be discussed with the local office of the Ministry of the Environment.</p>

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>ug/l.</p> <p>We would like to know what the City's position is from an environmental, drinking/ground/surface water, and health perspective with regard to the use of these highly regulated pesticides within City boundaries and in such close proximity to the Shadow Ridge Wellhead Protection Zone?"</p>	
<p>Rain barrels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City should partner with the Community Association to sponsor rain barrels so they are accessible to village residents at a reduced price. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This comment has been forwarded to the Greely Community Association for their consideration.
<p>Existing wrecking yard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was concern expressed about the impact of the wrecking yard, on the quality of the ground water supply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This concern has been forwarded to the South Nation Conservation Authority and acknowledged by their staff. They note that the Source Water Protection Committee may consider looking at this site addressing low and moderate threat policies. It is noted that a scrap yard is not a significant drinking water threat, but there could be the storage of fuel oil and perhaps waste. It is also noted that the general concern of the site polluting neighbouring wells would fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Environment (MOE).
<p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City should provide information/ education to new residents on the use, care and maintenance of wells and septic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City hosts an annual Well & Septic Workshop, and also provides some basic information to residents through its web site: Wells: http://ottawa.ca/env_water/water_sewer/water_wells/wells/index_en.html

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
systems.	<p>The Ottawa Septic System Office is responsible for the approval of septic systems in Ottawa. Homeowners with “Tertiary Treatment Units” have specific responsibilities including having :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of service report by a manufacturer trained service provider within last 6 months. <p>Further information is provided on the OSSO web site: http://www.rvca.ca/osso/things_to_know/index.html</p>
<p>Interest in City services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was interest in whether City services are planned for Greely in the next 20 years. Residents want to know so they will not replace their existing private septic system when municipal services are already planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no plans to bring public water and public wastewater systems to Greely.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would cause City water to come to Greely? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greely is not part of the City’s Public Service Area and, as such, it will continue to be privately serviced. Should there be a threat to human health then consideration would be given to alternate servicing, including the possibility of extending the City’s water distribution system into Greely. However, there have been no human health threats identified in Greely.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Shadow Ridge and communal systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the guarantee that the Shadow Ridge development will not have an adverse impact on existing wells? • High density development that this type of system allows is not what people in Greely want. Townhouses do not fit with the existing, quiet and peaceful “suburban” lifestyle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The municipal well servicing the Shadow Ridge subdivision is completed in the overburden sand aquifer; whereas most private wells are completed in the (deeper) bedrock aquifer(s). The engineer’s report for the communal well does not indicate undue impacts to private wells. <p>The Greely CDP anticipates that the majority of residential dwellings will preserve the low density character of the Village e.g. detached dwellings. However, the CDP also states that two-unit (semi-detached dwellings and duplexes) and ground oriented multi-unit dwellings (townhouses) will be considered on a limited basis. In addition, the CDP provides locational criteria for these multi dwellings e.g. not concentrated in one portion of the Village with the exception of Shadow Ridge and not located in the interior of a subdivision unless planned from the outset.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the City change from 2 acre lots to ½ acre lots in Shadow Ridge? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically, residential lots located in the rural area average two acres in size. In villages a smaller lot size is acceptable, provided it can be demonstrated that the impact from the smaller lots is acceptable.
<p>Communal systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are other communal systems planned in the village? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other than the Shadow Ridge development, which may be expanded to accommodate development of the nearby “Cadieux” lands, City staff are not aware of any other communal systems planned in Greely.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can people on the communal system dig their own wells? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents in Greely with an existing communal well system will also have a communal wastewater system, both of which will be operated by the City. The Shadow Ridge subdivision is therefore a Public Service Area and people will not be allowed to drill private drinking wells.

RESPONSES to COMMENTS	
GREELY COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN (rev. April 3, 2011)	
Issues	Departmental Responses
<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City uses significant resources to undertake studies and reviews, but a small amount of money is spent on hard improvements. Greely may be the highest or among the highest tax payers in the rural area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff was directed to undertake a review of village plans and to identify any refreshes necessary to bring them up to date.

5.6 Manotick – Response to ‘As We Heard it’ Comments

Comments - Responses	
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN	
(rev. March 5, 2011)	
COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
LAND USE	
<p>Village core</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Businesses should be focused primarily in the existing core and uses should not be segregated e.g. commercial located at grade with residential use above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manotick Main Street and the Mews are areas that are intended to accommodate commercial uses. Along Manotick Main Street residential uses can be located above commercial uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could the property located at the corner of Manotick Main Street and Clapp Street occupied by a double decker bus be improved? This business is better suited for a better location and the site could be used as a parking lot. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This property currently occupied by a double decker bus serving food is zoned VM (Village Mixed-Use Zone). It permits a wide range of commercial, institutional and residential uses including bank, convenience store, medical facility, library and multiple attached dwellings. The landowner can establish any use permitted in the zoning for this property.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manotick can emulate the type of development in Stittsville since it has both a main street and shopping plaza/big box stores. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manotick has a vibrant main street with unique shops, restaurants and offices. Like Stittsville, Manotick’s main street is located near a shopping centre. Manotick has much to offer to residents and visitors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drive-through facilities in the village core is not supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This information has been conveyed to staff working on the drive-through policies for villages that will be incorporated into the Official Plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 0 metre front yard setbacks don’t work when the main street is so narrow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The VM - Village Mixed-Use zone provisions permit a range of permitted setbacks from the front property line. The provisions for this zone include a minimum front yard setback of 0 metres and a maximum front yard setback of 3 metres. This means that the front of a building may be located anywhere between 0 metres and 3 metres from the front property line.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public park should be established along 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New public parks are typically created through the subdivision process

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	Manotick Main Street.	and may also be created through lands bequeathed to the City.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the right-of-way width along Main Street? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cursory review shows that the right-of-way along Manotick Main Street generally ranges from 15 m to 26 m.
	<p>Village Core’s “Character Areas” identified in secondary plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were a range of opinions as to whether the “Character Area” designations within the Core, identified in the Manotick Secondary Plan, need to be reviewed. Several people felt that the designations were appropriate and recognize Manotick’s unique village character while others thought that these could be refined, and still others thought that the Historic Village character area was the only one that should be kept. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The appropriateness of the character areas and their zoning will be evaluated during the course of the Village Core and connectivity review (recommended below).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan should show Dickinson Square and the mill as a themed character area – it could be called the “civic centre”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. This comment has been forwarded to the City’s Real Estate Partnership & Development Office for their consideration. This group is responsible for developing future plans for the Mill Quarter.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current zoning does not adequately reflect the intent of the “Character Areas” – Bridge Street was specifically identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A further review has identified that there are additional areas where the zoning does not implement the land use designations shown in the Secondary Plan. A City-initiated zoning study should be undertaken to rectify these issues.
	<p>Design guidelines for Village Core</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any other provisions other than zoning that will guide the character and nature of development? The availability of piped water and public wastewater will lead to changes in the Village Core. It is important to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General design principles are provided in the Secondary Plan and the Council-approved “Design Guidelines for the Development of Rural Villages” provides further detailed direction. This document provides guidance to assess, promote and achieve appropriate development in Villages. These guidelines are applied at the development review stage for proposed Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw amendments and Site Plan

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>preserve the village atmosphere and character of Manotick Main Street. The status quo does not contribute to this and the Village Core could be ruined if there is no context.</p>	<p>Control applications. During pre-consultation process, staff encourage the proponents to use these documents during design development. The guidelines are available at: http://ottawa.ca/residents/planning/design_plan_guidelines/completed/rural_village/index_en.html</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gateways on Manotick Main Street at Bankfield/ Bridge Street and the southern end of the Mews do not really exist - there are signs but not much more. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<p>Village Core and connectivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a wide range of opinions regarding the Village Core. Some people felt that it should not be expanded and that the existing lands should be developed before any expansions are contemplated. Others thought that expansion cannot occur because there is no room to expand and others felt that there were opportunities to grow. • There were a range of opinions as to the appropriateness of the “character areas” described in the Manotick Secondary Plan. • Residents would like to have a pedestrian-friendly environment in the Village Core, but heavy traffic makes crossing the street dangerous and difficult to cross. • Sidewalks suddenly end and together with a lack of signalized intersections or crosswalks with pavement markings makes it unsafe for people, especially seniors to cross the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that a Village Core and connectivity study be undertaken to address future growth and many of the issues identified. This study will address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the Village Core expand? If yes, where? - Do the character areas need refining? If yes, how? - Assessment of connectivity in the village including the pedestrian environment and identification of improvements required in the Core e.g. pedestrian crossings including Bridge/Main Street intersection, sidewalk location, traffic calming, and streetscaping upgrades. - Identification of future connections to parks, neighbourhoods and Rideau River for pedestrians and cyclists travelling to the Village Core. - Assessment of parking in the core and, if required, strategies to improve situation. <p>Note: Prior to installation of traffic signals, warrants (criteria) need to be</p>

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>mainstreet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Village Core needs to be more attractive with wider sidewalks and street trees. • Some people mentioned the need for a multi-use pathways and cycling facilities which link the core to the rest of the community. • There need to be pathway connections to the Rideau River. 	<p>met.</p>
<p><u>Traffic speed</u> Vehicular traffic speed was identified as an issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic is too fast and needs to be slowed down. • Can traffic be slowed down? • Speed limit is already 40km/h • Need traffic-calming measures to preserve village character of core area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Village Core and connectivity.
<p><u>Sidewalks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sidewalks are in poor condition so people drive to their destinations instead of walking. • The sidewalk on Manotick Main Street should be extended south to the fire station. • Rideau Valley Drive has no sidewalks or bicycle path. This should be addressed with the imminent development of the Mahogany community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments regarding sidewalk condition have been sent to Asset Management Branch (Infrastructure Services Department). <p>Please see response to Village core development and connectivity.</p> <p>Note that pedestrian/bicycle routes within the Mahogany development have been planned for and are conceptually identified in Schedule B of the Manotick Secondary Plan. These include some pedestrian/cycle routes leading north to the existing village and east-west pedestrian/bicycle connections. Further information will be shown on plans submitted as part of the subdivision process.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Island Road is used by buses and is in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurfacing of Long Island Road is tentatively scheduled for 2014 based

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
poor condition. There are no sidewalks but it is a link to the schools so it should be marked.	on current funding projections according to Asset Management Branch (Infrastructure Services Department).
<u>Cycle lanes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no bike lanes on the bridge. It disappears travelling from the east on the bridge. • An established bike route and multi-use pathway network is needed to attract tourists. These will reduce the need for parking in the core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Village core and connectivity.
<u>Pathways</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pathways are needed to create opportunities for people to walk. A pathway plan has already been produced for Manotick and this document needs to be reviewed and considered. • Concerns were expressed about a potential pathway along the Rideau River and possible conflicts where private property runs down to the water. • A link should be created along Rideau Valley Drive through to Beryl Gaffney Park and to the north. • Linkages are needed to greenspaces outside the village and to the pathway system along the Rideau River. • Establish a pathway linking David Bartlett 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Village core and connectivity. The Rural Pathways Plan, a project initiated by Manotick residents, will be one of the references used during the Village Core and connectivity study.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>Park to Parks Canada lands and eastward of the Long Island locks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future wish to improve “school to pool” connection (from St. Mark’s High School to the pool). • Consider a potential pathway at the far west near First Line and northerly boundary of Mahogany lands – maybe it should be looped back to the highway by First Line near Century Road. 	
<p><u>On-street parking</u> A range of opinions related to parking in the Village Core were voiced by residents.</p> <p>Existing parking supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking is not a problem, but may be in the future. • The parking situation is always changing along Manotick Main as local businesses begin to develop their own small parking lots. <p>Location of existing parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most people want to park in front of their destination. <p>Future supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any additional space for parking in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Village core and connectivity. <p>In 2010 City staff met with Manotick BIA and Councillor’s office to discuss the issue of on-street parking, which covered short term parking issues along Main Street, overall parking issues in the area and traffic circulation in light of the Mahogany development. These issues will be discussed in light of the Village Core and connectivity study.</p>

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>the Village Core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing available on-street parking could help the problems. <p>Solutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps there should be no parking permitted on Manotick Main Street. • Parallel parking could be considered on Manotick Main Street but is a challenge because there is so much traffic. • There is not enough metered parking. • People should be encouraged to walk. • Intensification/new development will cause more problems. • Residents do not want to pay for parking. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking at the top of the hill on Manotick Main should be prohibited because it is dangerous and approaching drivers cannot see the parked vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This concern has been forwarded to Traffic Management & Operational Support Branch, Public Works Department.
<p><u>Off-street parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no parking lots available other than what is available at the Mews shopping centre. • There is only one off-street parking lot and a few shared parking areas, which are full by 8:30 – 9:00 a.m. • A public parking facility is needed, possibly an underground structure in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to Village core and connectivity.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>Dickinson Square area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area behind the Manotick United Church is congested with cars. A municipal parking lot is needed so parked cars will not be focused in the historic area. 	
<p>Village Core expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can the village core be expanded? Will the expansion include rezoning? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An Official Plan Amendment would be required to amend the Manotick Secondary Plan, which is part of the City of Ottawa Official Plan, to expand the Village Core designation. To implement this, a Zoning By-law Amendment would also be required.
<p>Watson's Mill Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the plans for the Mill Quarter"? There needs to be a way to pay for City-owned historic buildings. The Mill lands should be shown as greenspace, as it is a City-owned open space. It should be a pedestrian-only area with theatre and the arts. The War Memorial area has been ignored and more attractive use can be made of lands across from the existing Mill. Structure on the other side of the Rideau River, across from the existing Mill, should be more attractive. Cultural centre should be built on Clapp property. Potential uses include art galleries, theatre, meeting rooms, police station and underground parking, which could ease parking problems. Some of these could be income generators. These uses would complement adjacent heritage properties including the mill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff involved in planning the Mill Quarter have been informed of the public comments. <p>The following information was excerpted from the report, Manotick Mill Quarter Community Development Corporation – 2010 Annual Report, available at, HTTP://OTTAWA.CA/CALENDAR/OTTAWA/CITYCOUNCIL/OCC/2011/08-25/ENGLISHDRAFTAGENDA18.HTM</p> <p>Incorporated in August of 2009, the objectives of the Manotick Mill Quarter Community Development Corporation (MMQCDC) are:</p> <p>a) to formalize and maintain Dickinson Square as an open space, primarily for public use, as designated and approved by its owner and for the purpose of:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. preserving the heritage character of the "Mill Quarter" area in the</p>

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>and former Rideau Valley Conservation Authority buildings. Extend historic designation to include Clapp property; current designation does not permit uses contemplated.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Village of Manotick; and</p> <p>ii. providing for enhanced opportunities for heritage and cultural events;</p> <p>b) to plan, subdivide and develop or redevelop properties within the “Mill Quarter” area in the Village of Manotick, with the consent of their owner(s), for the purposes of preserving and enhancing the character of the Mill Quarter area and the heritage buildings located therein, including:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. providing opportunities for arts and heritage programming, and community activities; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. accommodating commercial tourist and heritage uses including commercial accommodation, boutiques, galleries, craft and other specialty outlets, museums, restaurants and studios;</p> <p>c) to improve, beautify and maintain land buildings and structures owned by the City of Ottawa and located within the “Mill Quarter” area in the Village of Manotick, as designated and approved by the City of Ottawa, beyond the standard provided at the expense of the City of Ottawa generally;</p> <p>d) to promote the “Mill Quarter” area in the Village of Manotick and other areas adjacent thereto, and to undertake community improvement thereof;</p> <p>e) to acquire, hold, sell, lease or dispose of land within or adjacent to the “Mill Quarter” area in the Village of Manotick for the purposes set out in</p>

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
 (rev. March 5, 2011)

	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
		<p>paragraph a), b), c), d) above;</p> <p>f) to clear, grade, service or otherwise prepare the land and properties of the corporation for the purposes set out in paragraphs a), b), c) and d) above;</p> <p>g) for the purposes set out in paragraphs a), b), c) and d) above, to construct, operate, maintain, own and/or provide (including ownership of land related thereto):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. facilities for amusement or for conventions and visitors’ bureaus; ii. culture and heritage systems. <p>The establishment of the MMQCDC was based on the requirement that the Corporation becomes financially self-sustaining by generating revenues through the sale or lease of properties transferred into the Corporation. By acquiring the subject parcels, the City has incurred expenditures totaling \$2,440,000 and the MMQCDC is responsible for repaying the City for those expenditures within two years of the properties being transferred by the City to the Corporation. In that regard, there are certain directives and conditions pertaining to the transfer of the properties to the Corporation that must be met by the Corporation, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • repaying the City for all costs associated with the acquisition and holding of the properties by creating appropriate sales revenues or prepaid long-term property lease; • entering into a heritage easement agreement(s) for the designated heritage buildings and the related public spaces that define Dickinson Square, which will protect these spaces for public events prior to the sale or lease of any of these properties; • pursuing the potential for economic viability for generating electrical power

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	at Watson's Mill.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underground parking in Dickinson Square would be inappropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
<p>Gaps Character Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment opportunities are needed in village and the "Gaps" character area should be focus of employment uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Manotick Secondary Plan identifies the Gaps Character Area as having a strong employment focus.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Gaps Character Area is comprised of houses – the Secondary Plan plan needs to be updated to reflect current realities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the Gaps Character Area consists of houses at this time, the Secondary Plan provides a roadmap for future growth. It is anticipated that this area will accommodate offices, multiple residential development and various public and institutional facilities in the future.
<p>Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is enough land within the village boundary for residential growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2009-2010 Rural Residential Land Survey states that there are 1,851 future potential dwelling units in Manotick. Since 2001, Manotick has grown by about 24 dwelling units per year. This means that there is over a 75 year land supply for residential development. (Note: This does not take into account the potential impact of the Mahogany development on current trends.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where commercial development occurs outside of the core, residential development should be permitted too. How can commercial development sustain itself if there is no residential to support it? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other than Manotick Main Street, there are several areas where residential will be permitted with commercial development including: Bridge Street, the Post Office District, the Mews and the Gaps.
<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where can the Secondary Plan be found? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Manotick Secondary Plan can be found in Volume 2C of the City of Ottawa Official Plan. http://ottawa.ca/city_hall/ottawa2020/official_plan/vol_2c/former_rideau/manotick/index_en.html

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some questions asked by residents: Should Manotick be a tourist destination? Do we want more traffic associated with a successful tourist destination or should growth be devoted to providing services to residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Manotick Business Improvement Area plays a significant role in how these questions are answered. These comments have been forwarded to the BIA for their information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to continuing country estate development in the rural areas. It's a lose-lose situation. The lands at Bankfield Road and Rideau Valley Drive should be developed only on municipal sewer and water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions at December 2011 public meeting were informative. Disappointed in staff presentation, which focussed on "clerical" changes. Learned nothing from the presentation other than boundary changes. I applaud the City for taking trouble to invite citizens to the meeting. There were many well-informed people at the meeting which should lead to constructive input. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<p>Village boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the village boundary be expanded (west, north or south) to permit additional commercial uses? The lands to the south would be a good location for institutional uses, which would buffer the residential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Village expansion – Trinity development below.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	uses in the Mahogany subdivision from agricultural uses to the south.	
	<p>Village – big box</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents feel that the proposed Trinity development located outside of the Village is a threat to the commercial viability of the core, does not fit with the area as proposed and will cause additional traffic problems. There was also some unhappiness about the size of the development and there was the opinion that people moved to Manotick to get away from big box development. • A range of opinions were expressed about big box development. These ranged from those who felt that big boxes in the core – which needs to be respected - would destroy it and that if people need to shop at the box stores, they can drive to other locales. Others thought that people moving to Manotick will want the amenities and conveniences of the City e.g. big boxes. • Core development will result in employment. But it needs to be decent employment – office, high tech, as opposed to big box retail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been directed to planning staff involved in the Trinity development application and associated Ontario Municipal Board appeal(s).
	<p>Village expansion –Trinity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponent of the Trinity development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On April 8, 2009 City Council directed that the Planning and Growth

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>located outside Manotick states that the current village boundary should be expanded to include the lands located at the intersection of Mitch Owens Road and River Road, site of the proposed commercial development. Some of the reasons for this request: i) there has been commercial development between the Rideau River and Rideau Road, including a retail site, a bank and restaurant both with drive-throughs,; ii) City Council has approved 1,400 dwelling units that will add to larger market demand; iii) there is strong market demand; iv) the existing residential uses east of the village boundary are in conflict with Official Plan policies which prohibits residential uses within one kilometre of a village boundary.</p>	<p>Management Department oppose Trinity's Official Plan and Zoning Amendments to permit construction of a shopping centre with retail, service commercial and office uses. This matter is to be considered by the Ontario Municipal Board. Subsequently the proponent also appealed Official Plan Amendment 76 in order to bring the subject lands into the Village designation. This is also before the Ontario Municipal Board.</p> <p>The proponent has requested a village boundary expansion to accommodate a shopping centre development through this Village Review project. This village review process as directed in Motion No. 68/23 by City Council was intended to include an analysis of changes in the last five years, a refresh of the village plans and to consider any needs and challenges and any required policy initiatives.</p> <p>It is beyond the scope of this village plan review of 24 villages to consider this request. The Official Plan states that the most appropriate time to conduct a land supply assessment is during its five year review. When residents were asked about large format development in Manotick - see Village – big box, they were concerned about impact of development on existing businesses in the core and traffic.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the status of the Trinity Ontario Municipal Board appeal regarding expansion of the village boundary into Osgoode Ward? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ontario Municipal Board appeal has been adjourned in light of City staff's work on the village plan review for the Manotick Secondary Plan.
GREENSPACE AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	
<p>Parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A parks master plan should be prepared for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the Village Core and connectivity study, a review should also

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
Manotick. Are parks designed based on demographics and community needs?	<p>be undertaken of the greenspace network and how it can be linked to the commercial core and heart of Manotick. In this way existing and new linkages (pathways, bike routes and sidewalks) can be identified to connect these greenspaces with the Village Core and Rideau River.</p> <p>Parkland dedication is taken at the time of subdivision and site plan application. The size of the park/parks is determined based on the number of dwelling units per hectare or 5% of the total developable area to a maximum of 10%. The park design is based on demographics and community needs. Parks planners consult with community representatives during park design.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks will be better used if public washrooms were available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public washrooms are only constructed in community and district park locations where a building such as a field house, community hall or recreation centre exists. In some cases a washroom is installed as a shared cost with sports groups who also maintain the sports fields.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an off-leash dog area in David Bartlett Park. If the City completes a pathway along the Rideau River, the off-leash area should be maintained. There is a fear that dog owners will lose their off-leash privileges since this is a significant meeting place for some residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be reviewed and considered during the Village Core and connectivity study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are seventy acres of City land located behind the municipal yards on Bankfield. This could be a good location for a new park and new pathways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These City lands will be jointly used for both sports fields and snow disposal. An environmental assessment is required to establish a snow disposal facility, which will be undertaken jointly by Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services and the Infrastructure Services Departments. Work will wait until funding is in place for the former Department.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is green space available at the north- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of City departments include City lands in their inventories.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	east corner of Kelly Marie and Rideau Valley Drive. It would be a suitable for City parkland.	The City may have uses planned for the lands, however, this will be investigated. This will be reviewed and considered during the Village core and connectivity review.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing pathway in George McLean Park should be shown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be reviewed during the Village Core and connectivity review.
	<p>Greenspaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mahogany Forest is important to preserve since it has a unique habitat. Several residents mentioned that it is important to have pathways in the forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mahogany Forest is designated as a Natural Environment Area in the Manotick Secondary Plan. Any development within 30 metres of the boundary of this designation will require that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared and submitted with the development application.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to preserve both sides of waterway on the Mahogany lands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Manotick Secondary Plan includes broad setbacks along both sides of the various watercourses crossing the Mahogany lands, which are intended to protect the riparian corridors and also provide opportunities for pathway connections. At the time of pre-consultation with City staff, the proponent will be advised of all the pertinent policies relating to presence of a watercourse, riparian plantings etc.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village Plan shows lands on the east side of Rideau Valley Drive and north of Bankfield Road are located within Manotick's village boundary. These lands are not located in the Official Plan's village boundary. The Official Plan boundary should be changed so that it can serve as a pathway linkage from the Village to Beryl Gaffney Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Manotick Culture Parks and Recreation Association (MCPRA) would like to ensure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This comment has been forwarded to staff involved in application review of the Mahogany development.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	that there is a continuous path on the west side of Mud Creek on the Special Design Area lands. This pathway should connect to the existing pathway in Manotick Estates.	
	<p>Access to Rideau River</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no visibility or access to the nearby Rideau River a nearby natural amenity. Signage should be installed to indicate where the public can access the river's edge and the boat launch. Another idea is a temporary dock to allow access to the village core from the water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be considered in the Village Core and connectivity study.
	<p>Village Open Space and Recreational Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives of Section 3.7.3.8 are weak and do not state the benefits of open space and parkland amenities. • Schedule A shows a conceptual pedestrian plan, but this is dated and should be replaced by a rural routes plan. City support with mapping, aeriels to update the walking and cycling routes would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Village Core and connectivity response.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3.7.2.8 should be updated to reflect the purchase of property connecting David Bartlett Park to Long Island Locks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3.7.2.8 needs to be updated to reflect the City's purchase of the boat launch property and that any redevelopment requires further public consultation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. Any redevelopment would typically involve public consultation.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
TRANSPORTATION	
<p>Bridge Street traffic – trucks The following comments were received relating to truck traffic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Street is currently a “drive-through” for truck traffic making it unsafe. • Trucks making turns at Bridge Street /Manotick Main Street mount the curbs which is unsafe for pedestrians. Trucks will ruin bridge with weight. • A ring road or bypass should be considered to address the truck traffic so it avoids the Village core along Bridge Street with nearby elementary school, soccer park, Long Island Aquatic Pool, library, medical centre and church. There should be a ban on heavy truck traffic on Bridge Street. A ring road that includes Roger Stevens and Snake Island is the only safe alternative. • There should be restrictions on truck traffic after Strandherd-Armstrong Bridge opens e.g. only local deliveries. Is there a plan to ban trucks on the Bridge? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction is now underway of the Strandherd-Armstrong Bridge, which will be completed and operational by 2012. We anticipate that some of the traffic travelling through Manotick will be diverted to the new Bridge. It is only when the Bridge is operational that the City can evaluate it’s impact on traffic and what, if any other traffic improvements must be undertaken.
<p>Bridge Street Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be reduced traffic when the Strandherd Bridge is opened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can a northbound “right turn only” lane be painted on Manotick Main Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This comment is being reviewed by the transportation department.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
approaching Bridge Street?	
Dickinson Avenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a left hand turn that needs to be taken out at Dickinson Avenue and Bridge Street in order to stop people from bypassing Manotick Main Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is part of the Mill Quarter initiative and will be addressed as part of the planning work currently being undertaken by the City's Real Estate Partnership & Development Office.
Bridge Street – pedestrians <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridge Street at Manotick Main Street is not pedestrian-friendly and safety is an issue. Even with a traffic light it is still hard for pedestrians to cross the road. There is a lot of congestion not only a peak hour, but also in both directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff is aware of the issues at this intersection and this will be addressed as part of the Village Core and connectivity study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A pedestrian light only activated when needed should be installed on Bridge Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above.
North - south traffic improvements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new Strandherd-Armstrong Bridge will help east-west traffic issues but what about north-south traffic, which is tied to traffic volume? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manotick residents will benefit from the future widening of Prince of Wales from Strandherd Drive, at the new bridge, north to Fisher Avenue. This is a large project that will likely occur in two phases starting with Strandherd Drive to Merivale Road and then later Merivale Road to Fisher Avenue. The widening is a road infrastructure project identified in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP - Phase 2 – 2015-2022). <p>Another road project is scheduled to the north of Manotick, the widening of Jockvale Road from Prince of Wales Drive to Cambrian Road. This is another Phase 2 (2015-2022) project identified in the Transportation Master Plan.</p>

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>Mahogany development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a traffic impact study for the Mahogany lands? Can the current roads accommodate increased traffic in the Village Core? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic studies were submitted as part of the planning process for the Mahogany lands to demonstrate the impact of development on the community. The Ontario Municipal Board's 2009 decision, which was incorporated into the Secondary Plan, stipulated that a maximum of 1,400 dwelling units could be built in accordance with specific phasing policies. These dwelling units will be comprised of detached housing at low and moderate densities and mixed residential areas ranging from detached dwellings, street townhouses, semi detached dwellings. <p>Traffic impact studies will be required to support the zoning amendments associated with each phase of development. These studies must show that the roads can accommodate increased traffic throughout the Village including the Village Core.</p> <p>A transportation impact study was submitted for Phase 1 of the development – this phase has been approved by the City.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the transportation planning from Mahogany be carried forward? We should defend the previous planning for this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for the Mahogany lands will proceed in accordance with the Ontario Municipal Board's decision of April 8, 2009, which is has been incorporated into the Manotick Secondary Plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern about the construction of a pathway on the eastern edge of the Mahogany development. There is no room for a pathway at the northern end of the pathway without impacting the existing waterway or affecting existing buildings. A pathway on the western side of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 of the Mahogany development from Century Road to south of Potter Drive has been draft approved. Staff is awaiting a draft landscape plan for Phase 1to be submitted by the developer, which will show location of this pathway. It is expected to be submitted this Spring. Development planning staff is now aware of concerns about community concerns regarding pathway location.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
waterway would have fewer design issues.	
<p>Area transportation issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transportation issues related to First Line Road, Bridge Street, and Bankfield Road need to be dealt with first before development proceeds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue was considered in the Manotick Secondary Plan, which states that depending on the timeframe of each phase, <u>it is the responsibility of the developer to fund or wait for City implementation</u> of the following modifications (subject to change depending on the results of the required studies and verifications): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signalization of Bankfield/First Line Road intersection and provision of the required turn lanes. (Note: this intersection is being monitored for signalization and when warrants are met it will be signalized.) - Potential modifications to Bankfield Road/Prince of Wales intersection (if warranted); - Widening of Bankfield Road to four lanes from First Line Road west to Prince of Wales Drive; - Additional turn lane and approach lanes, as identified/required at both the Bankfield/First Line Roads and Bankfield Road/Prince of Wales Drive intersections; - Consideration of the need to connect Mahogany's East-West Collector to First Line Road in order to minimize the site traffic impact on Manotick Main Street; - An east-west Collector Road link to First Line Road, if not provided/required at Phase 3.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should not be a new access onto Manotick Main Street for the new Mahogany development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Manotick Secondary Plan shows that there will be an east-west collector road in the Mahogany development from Manotick Main Street to First Line Road. Phase 1 is anticipated to have access onto Manotick Main Street and Century Road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has happened to the proposal to extend Van Vliet Road so that it can align with the northerly intersection on Bridge Street? There is a light at the north end of island, but it is very difficult for residents at the south end of the island to get off. • Residents of the south end of the Island have no safe access to Bridge Street and the Village Core. In the meantime, the traffic light at the school should cycle on and off without regard to traffic. It's the only way for residents to have a chance to get on to Bridge Street. • A three point planned has been proposed by Long Island residents to deal with the turning issues at Bridge Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The feedback received has been forwarded to staff responsible for an environmental assessment for this area, which will start in the spring 2012.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People use Dickinson Street area north of Main Street to avoid the traffic congestion on Main. Perhaps traffic calming measures would be useful with this problem? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are discussions underway for the future development of the "Mill Quarter", which could change the current traffic patterns in this area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a (proposed) seniors residence and (elementary) school on Bridge Street. It is not currently safe for pedestrians to cross since there is no traffic signal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated above, there are two studies underway (environmental assessment of Van Vliet Road and Mill Quarter planning) that will affect traffic on Bridge Street. Once the outcomes of each are known, the City will be in a better position to determine what is needed to

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	address pedestrian crossings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earl Armstrong Road could be extended east to connect to Highway 417. Earl Armstrong Road should be upgraded to “truck route” standard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earl Armstrong Road between Bridge Street and Spratt Road is being upgraded and widened to four lanes to take higher traffic volumes as a result of the new bridge crossing. <p>There are two roads that provide access to Highway 417 from the Manotick area: Mitch Owens Road and Leitrim Road located further to the north. The Transportation Master Plan shows a future road link of Earl Armstrong Road from Albion Road only to Bank Street.</p>
<p>First Line Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are concerns about increased traffic on First Line road where there are already speeding problems. New development will exacerbate the problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response for Area transportation issues.
<p>Suggested road improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic should be diverted around the core to preserve the Village Core’s character when new development occurs. Traffic calming is not needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See responses for Mahogany development and Area transportation issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a new traffic light at Century Road and Rideau Valley Drive especially once new development occurs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response for Mahogany development and Area transportation issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider closing Eastman at Mews or make it a one-way street to eliminate cut-through traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastman Avenue functions to accommodate traffic from Manotick Main Street and the Mews.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local roads in poor condition – it’s like a washboard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information has been forwarded to Asset Management Staff (Infrastructure Services and Community Sustainability Portfolio).

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

Comments - Responses	
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN	
(rev. March 5, 2011)	
COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divert traffic from Mahogany around village via Rideau Valley South —Century Road—First Line Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response for Mahogany development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new traffic signal should be installed at First Line and Bankfield. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response to Area transportation issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manotick Main Street cannot be widened so how do we deal with increased traffic from Mahogany? Sidewalks are too narrow. Need a redesign of street; need traffic calming on Manotick Main Street and; encourage other routes (bypass) to eliminate impact of Mahogany traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Village core and connectivity study is recommended to address the mainstreet issues. All phases of the Mahogany development require traffic impact studies in support of their zoning applications. These studies will identify the traffic improvements required to address traffic impacts.
<p>Roundabout – First Line/Hwy 16/Bankfield</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City should consider 5-leg roundabout at First Line Road/Highway 16/Bankfield Road for many reasons including: construction cost savings compared to using many signalized intersections, safety, maintenance cost, and more greenspace would be conserved. These modifications should not be considered with a future environmental assessment for Greenbank Road since this study would likely happen after First Line Road warrants are met and are signalized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of work for a future environmental assessment for Greenbank Road south of Cambrian will include the intersection at First Line Road/Highway 16/Bankfield Road. Any modifications at Bankfield will be reviewed during this process.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
 (rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<p>Suggested transit improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use mini-buses to better match demand. • An on-demand shuttle bus should be available to get people around village instead of relying on parking in the core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to an inquiry made by Councillor Wilkinson at the January 31, 2011 Transit Commission meeting, Transit Services staff undertook an evaluation of the potential use of small buses within the OC Transpo conventional fleet. A draft report has been prepared by staff and is currently under review by senior staff.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide “dial-a-bus” service that is only available on demand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OC Transpo’s service design, and in turn service provision, is based upon customer demand. There are currently two routes that operate through Manotick (Routes 186 & 245) and each route only operates hourly during the peak period. Neither of these routes run empty and as such, moving to an on-demand type of service would not reduce the number of buses that operate through Manotick. Presently, both existing routes meet the minimum financial performance standards established by OC Transpo. An on-demand type service would be difficult to provide as the inconsistency/uncertainty of customer demand would create difficulties in scheduling buses for service, and if provided, would be very costly to operate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide buses that go to destinations specified by the bus rider. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This type of service might be best satisfied by the use of private taxi companies. OC Transpo operates on the basis of providing a service that is reliable and predictable to the customer, and also relies upon a certain level of demand. By providing a service that is directed by each individual customer, there would be no benefit to any other customer as there is no predictability in terms of where or when a bus may be passing any given location. As well, there would be no established level of customer demand, and in turn would result in high operating costs.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

Comments - Responses	
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN	
(rev. March 5, 2011)	
COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize a shuttle bus from outer village points or a common parking lot to bring people into the village core—this would reduce parking demand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to the above two suggestions, there would not be a consistent and/or sufficient level of demand to warrant the provision of a shuttle bus service.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern of empty buses in Manotick 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To help address this general concern, it is best to note that it is a standard practice of OC Transpo to interline buses to the most efficient degree possible. Interlining is a process by which routes are matched, or strung together to form one run, in order to maximize the productive time that a bus is in service. For example, a bus may begin as a Route 95 at Trim Station in the east, travel to Barrhaven Centre Station where the Route 95 ends its route, and then continues on to Manotick as a Route 186. In addition, often times interlining offers an opportunity to provide transfer enhancements for passengers as they're able to travel a further distance without changing buses. Conversely, the amount of deadhead and layover time is reduced. In general, OC Transpo is able to make the highest and best use of its operating resources (buses and personnel) through interlining. <p>As interlining relates to the perception of empty buses in Manotick, it could be the situation that an articulated bus is required to service the Route 95 in the afternoon peak period, due to the high ridership volumes on this route. As this bus continues on to Manotick and passengers continue to exit, by the time this articulated bus reaches Manotick, it appears empty. However, it is more cost effective to continue an articulated bus through to Manotick, rather than schedule a new, smaller bus to enter service and carry passengers to Manotick.</p> <p>In general, depending upon what point one looks at a route and whether the</p>

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

Comments - Responses	
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN	
(rev. March 5, 2011)	
COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	bus is full or empty, it is typically the case that passenger loads are lower toward the end of a route. As previously noted, both existing routes operating into Manotick meet the minimum financial performance standards established by OC Transpo.
WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICING	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is involved in the petition process to obtain public services in a neighbourhood? What is the cost of servicing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order for the City to bring water and wastewater into a neighbourhood, residents need to prepare a local improvement petition with this request. As part of this process, staff can provide the community with the relevant forms and fact sheets. Costs are variable and only approximate costs can be provided at the early stages of the process. More accurate costs are not known until a later date. Further details regarding the local improvement process are available from Gina Gill, Infrastructure Services Department (gina.gill@ottawa.ca)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MCPRA also states that the section dealing with Servicing Options needs to be updated as well as the proposed phased approach to sewer services in the remaining parts of the village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed.
Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why can't you drink from the water fountain at the public library? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tap water is high in salt. Water from a bottle is available to staff and public, if requested.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How often are fire hydrants checked? During a recent fire two hydrants did not work (1136 O'Grady and 5550 Dickinson) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information has been forwarded to Fire Services for follow-up.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents commented on an iron taste to their water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is likely that these residents' drinking water comes from a private well where there may be possibility of iron in the water.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

Comments - Responses	
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN	
(rev. March 5, 2011)	
COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
Wastewater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a concern about ½ acre lot size. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical studies must be carried out to substantiate the feasibility of proposed lot sizes in all new development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happened to the sanitary sewer station in Manotick? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building will be demolished sometime in 2012.
Hydro <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overhead wires should be buried on mainstreet to improve the streetscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro burials are usually considered at the time of road reconstruction and are a costly component of any renewal project.
Stormwater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stormwater management policies seem weak “in the face of growing evidence.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The servicing policies in the Secondary Plan are to be reviewed as a future work item. Any revisions and updates will be undertaken at that time.
GENERAL COMMENTS ON EXISTING PLAN	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MCPRA indicates that the existing Secondary Plan was hastily approved around the time of amalgamation. There could be benefit from more dialogue and discussion than has occurred during this review process. • The MCPRA states that Manotick is on the verge of substantial growth with Mahogany development and availability of servicing in the Village Core and Hillside Gardens. Further consultation in all aspects of the Secondary Plan need to be reviewed. • Further, the MCPRA states that the Secondary Plan does not address growth outside the Village, which is a concern. Infrastructure and services have been impacted by development permitted outside 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Manotick Secondary Plan will be brought to the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee as an information item. Due to the extent of the issues that need to be reviewed work will be undertaken at a future date. Any contemplated changes will require consultation with Manotick residents and other interested individuals, which requirement amendments to the Official Plan.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
the Village.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MCPRA states that the section on the Secondary Plan dealing with the Historic Village needs to be updated to reflect ownership of the Mill Quarter. The Mill Quarter would greatly benefit from a comprehensive landscape design prepared by a qualified landscape architect with input from cross-section of residents since there are multiple visions in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments have been forwarded to the City's real estate staff, who are responsible for dealing with the future of the Mill Quarter lands.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MCPRA strongly supports numerous policies/statements in the Secondary Plan dealing with a walkable/cyclable village in Manotick. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCPRA indicates that "Part A: The Preamble" of the Secondary Plan is no longer applicable and should be updated to reflect amalgamation and have details describing its context e.g. proximity to Riverside South and Stonebridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<p>Other comments from the MCPRA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be re-validation of statements in the Plan, which originate from a document prepared in 1997. E.g. need to change the type of housing built considering the aging population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secondary Plan anticipated potential future uses such as the issue identified. For example, the Gaps character area, which is located on the eastern edge of the Village Core, extending from Bridge Street south to the southern end of the Mews, was identified as a potential area where seniors housing can be located. The Secondary Plan states that "Council shall promote this area for... with particular emphasis as a multiple family district, including seniors housing..." • Staff has reviewed the Secondary Plan and the request to review the

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
(rev. March 5, 2011)

COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	“vision” for Manotick goals and have concluded that there is no need to undertake this review since the vision is still relevant today. In addition, no other requests were made by residents to undertake this work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a significant buffer area around the Village to protect the integrity of the village. Estate lot development is expensive and unsustainable way to develop especially when there is development in the Village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Official Plan currently states that there should not be development within one kilometer of a village boundary, which should provide this buffer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be further discussion on the function and form of potential gateways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Land Use Schedule in the current Secondary Plan shows four gateway locations: Bankfield/Rideau Valley, Bridge/Main, Main/southern end of Mews, and Bridge/eastern end of the island. <i>Design Guidelines for the Development of Rural Villages</i> was approved by City Council and this document provides additional information on entries into villages and its potential form.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mahogany development needs to include pathways and sidewalks to the Mews and Main Street. • It is supportive of a departmental proposal to undertake a village core and connectivity study to connect greenspaces, the village core and the Rideau River. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk and pathway locations are shown on Schedule B – Land Use Plan for Mahogany Community, which was incorporated into the Manotick Secondary Plan as directed by the Ontario Municipal Board. Any additional connections will be discussed during review of subdivision applications as development proceeds.

Comments - Responses
MANOTICK SECONDARY PLAN
 (rev. March 5, 2011)

	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MCPRA is concerned that the strategic planning initiatives undertaken by various groups are being done in isolation and that the Village is missing a collective sense of direction. Work is being/has been undertaken by the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manotick Village and Community Association - Rideau Township Historical Society - Watson's Mill Inc. - Manotick Culture, Parks and Recreation Association - City's village review • The MCPRA would like to City to consider a process to develop a clear vision, goals and objectives for the Village and its different facets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff will review the vision documents and will identify any conflicting issues, if identified and will convey these to the group(s).