

To: City of Ottawa
From: Nik Nanos, Nanos Research
Date: November 5, 2009
Re: Open House Summary - Lansdowne Feedback

Methodology

The City of Ottawa has undertaken a public consultation process to gather input from local residents on the proposed Lansdowne Partnership Plan. Part of a multi-channel community outreach, local residents had the option of providing their feedback via open house sessions conducted by the City of Ottawa.

Feedback provided by residents to the City of Ottawa was forwarded to Nanos Research to be reviewed, coded and grouped for statistical analysis purposes. Following is a summary of the key findings of the Lansdowne Partnership Plan open house feedback.

The results of these tabulations should not be considered a representative depiction of the opinions of Ottawa residents but only of the individuals that completed the open house comment forms. Readers should note the following when reviewing the attached tabulations.

- A total of 844 comment sheets were provided by the City of Ottawa to Nanos Research.
- Each comment sheet included eight sections where citizens could provide feedback:
 - The Vision for Lansdowne
 - Heritage
 - Green Space and Sustainability
 - Stadium and Arena Revitalization
 - Retail and Commerce Approach
 - Governance
 - Transportation
 - Business Model
- Respondents did not necessarily provide feedback in all eight sections.
- Since many of these individuals provided more than one comment for each section related to the LPP, each comment made was coded separately and attributed to one individual.

How to read the tables

- Proportion of all individual comments - For example, 772 of the 844 sheets had input related to the vision (see page 1 of tab). From all the comments made in this section (including multiple comments within a section), 39.3% were opposed to the proposal and 27% were in favour of the proposal.
- Proportion of all submissions - In the same section factoring the number of comment sheets 57% of the sheets submitted opposed the proposal while 39.2% supported the proposal.

Differentiating between the proportion of all comments and the proportion of submissions will allow the reader to understand not just how many submissions supported or opposed a particular element but the overall mentions in the submission as a whole.

Analysis of Open House Sessions

To follow are the key findings of the Lansdowne Partnership Plan open house feedback.

Comments in the Vision for Lansdowne Section

- **Overall perceptions of LPP vision mixed** - Our analysis of the open house participant feedback shows that close to six in ten (57%) forms registered opposition to the Vision for Lansdowne as currently presented. This compares to four in ten (39%) which included a comment in favour of the proposal vision.
- **LPP is too commercial** - Further, one in five (21%) open house forms submitted noted that the LPP, as currently configured, was too commercial in scope/did not include sufficient green space.
- **Costing concerns** - Eight percent of the open house forms noted a concern that the financial scope of the project was too large and that taxpayers, ultimately, would bear the risk if the development failed/ran into difficulties.
- **Other issue mentions** - Overall, five percent of the open house forms noted that the development will create traffic/congestion/pollution problems for the neighbourhood while a comparable number noted that the additional retail which would be built would benefit the community.

Comments in the Heritage Section

- **Divided on heritage proposals** - Feedback provided on this topic points to a division of opinion on the heritage preservation proposals. While 48% of open house forms noted their support for the proposal an equal number (46%) were opposed to the recommendations put forth in the LPP.
- **Heritage preservation important** - One in five (19%) open house forms cited that any proposed changes must ensure that the architectural heritage of the Horticulture Building and the Aberdeen Pavilion be preserved, making it the third ranked comment registered in this section.
- **Commercialism trumps green space** - Ten percent of comment forms cited the belief that the project was too commercialized and not enough green space was set aside for public use.

Comments in the Green Space and Sustainability Section

- **More green space** - By a nearly two-to-one margin feedback in this section were more likely to cite that there was insufficient green space included in the Lansdowne Partnership Plan (63%).

Comments in the Stadium and Arena Revitalization Section

- **Opposed to stadium revitalization plan** – Of the open house forms submitted 56% were opposed to the plan to construct a multi-use facility for sporting and entertainment events, seventeen points higher than the number of forms that noted support for the revitalization plan (39%).
- **Financial concerns** – One in six (17%) open house submissions in this section noted that the revitalization project was too expensive (this was the third most cited comment). As a corollary to this concern, the fear that taxpayers would bear the cost of any future financial difficulties also emerged.
- **Traffic/noise problems** – One in seven (13%) of the feedback in this section asserted that the LPP development would create significant traffic/congestion and noise problems for the community.
- **Other issues** – Other opinions expressed included the belief that the multi-use facility would need to be used by a number of professional sports teams if it was to be financially viable (11%). Five percent of the feedback in this section thought professional sports teams would not be viable in Ottawa.

Comments in the Retail and Commerce Approach Section

- **Significant opposition to plan** – Analysis of the comments submitted through the open house sessions indicate that two thirds (65%) of the feedback submitted opposed the retail and commercial plan proposed in the Lansdowne Partnership Plan. This compares to only one in four (25%) which supported of the planned approach.
- **Retail mix unpopular** – Nearly four in ten (38%) of the comments in this section were concerned the proposed retail development will include too much retail square footage, including too many big box format stores.
- **Local retailers will be hurt** – One in four (26%) thought the retail development at Lansdowne would hurt existing businesses in the area.

Comments in the Governance Section

- **Governance structure opposed** – More than six in ten (62%) were opposed to the proposed governance structure of the Lansdowne Partnership Plan, more than twice the number who supported it (29%).
- **Lack of open competition cited** – One in five (21%) objected to the lack of an open design competition for the redevelopment of Lansdowne and thought it undermined the credibility of the entire process.

Transportation

- **Lack of parking/transit infrastructure a concern** – Overall six in ten (59%) noted there was insufficient parking/transit and road infrastructure in the LPP to accommodate post

construction needs, three times (20%) the number who commented sufficient transit/parking had been allocated in the development plan.

- **Traffic/congestion a problem** – In a similar vein, slightly more than half (54%) of the comment forms noted that the LPP development would cause significant traffic/congestion problems in the area.

Comments in the Business Model Section

- **Viability of business model in doubt** – A significant number (59%) of comment forms for the open house sessions noted their opposition to the business model which would steer the LPP process. This compares to only one in four (26%) which noted support for the proposed business model.
- **Taxpayer liability** – One third (33%) of participants were concerned that taxpayers would, ultimately, have to foot the bill for any future cost over-runs/difficulties the development encountered.
- **Private sector the only winner** – One in four (24%) open house forms noted the belief that the private sector as the only winner in the Lansdowne Partnership Plan process and that the city/taxpayers would not reap any benefits from this plan.



STAT SHEET –CITY OF OTTAWA – LANSDOWNE PARTNERSHIP PLAN – OPEN HOUSE COMMENT SHEETS

Vision

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
In favour of proposal	303	27.00%	39.20%
Opposed to proposal	440	39.30%	57.00%
Too expensive/costly/taxpayer risk	64	5.70%	8.30%
Too commercial/not enough green space	161	14.40%	20.90%
Added retail good for area/community	35	3.10%	4.50%
Traffic/congestion/pollution concerns	40	3.60%	5.20%
Concerns over lack of open competition	78	7.00%	10.10%
Total	1121	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Vision represents the percentage of comments made by 772 individuals)

Heritage

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
In favour of heritage changes/proposals	282	39.60%	48.10%
Opposed to heritage changes/recommendation	268	37.60%	45.70%
Must preserve architectural heritage of buildings	109	15.30%	18.60%
Too commercialized/not enough green space	53	7.40%	9.00%
Total	712	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Heritage represents the percentage of comments made by 586 individuals)

STAT SHEET –CITY OF OTTAWA – LANSDOWNE PARTNERSHIP PLAN – OPEN HOUSE COMMENT SHEETS

Green Space and Sustainability

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
No enough green space in plan	401	62.70%	63.70%
Sufficient green space in plan	222	34.70%	35.20%
Must use state-of-art construction materials	8	1.30%	1.30%
Too much retail in development	9	1.40%	1.40%
Total	640	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Green Space and Sustainability represents the percentage of comments made by 630 individuals)

Stadium and Arena

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
In favour of proposal for stadium/arena	245	26.40%	39.10%
Opposed to proposal for stadium/arena	353	38.00%	56.30%
Too costly/expense/taxpayer liability	108	11.60%	17.20%
Too commercialized/outweighing citizen needs	21	2.30%	3.30%
Need to ensure more pro sports teams use	67	7.20%	10.70%
Congestion/traffic/noise concerns	83	8.90%	13.20%
Pro sports teams are not viable	30	3.20%	4.80%
Area needs to be redeveloped	21	2.30%	3.30%
Total	928	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Stadium and Arena represents the percentage of comments made by 627 individuals)

STAT SHEET –CITY OF OTTAWA – LANSDOWNE PARTNERSHIP PLAN – OPEN HOUSE COMMENT SHEETS

Retail and Commerce

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
In favour of proposed plan	155	14.20%	24.70%
Opposed to proposed plan	406	37.10%	64.80%
Too much retail/big box stores in plan	240	21.90%	38.30%
Too expensive to build	43	3.90%	6.90%
Deal good for business/bad for citizens	21	1.90%	3.30%
Parking/congestion/traffic concerns	31	2.80%	4.90%
Development will be bad for existing local businesses	165	15.10%	26.30%
Development will be good for local businesses	31	2.80%	4.90%
Will provide additional tax revenues for the city	3	0.30%	0.50%
Total	1095	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Retail and Commerce represents the percentage of comments made by 627 individuals)

Governance

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
In favour of proposed approach	141	21.60%	28.80%
Opposed to proposed approach	305	46.80%	62.40%
Expensive/costly/taxpayer liability	65	10.00%	13.30%
Transparency/lack of open competition	104	16.00%	21.30%
Include local representation on governance	37	5.70%	7.60%
Total	652	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Governance represents the percentage of comments made by 489 individuals)

STAT SHEET –CITY OF OTTAWA – LANSDOWNE PARTNERSHIP PLAN – OPEN HOUSE COMMENT SHEETS

Transportation

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
Insufficient parking/transit/road infrastructure	361	41.00%	59.30%
Sufficient transit included in plan	121	13.80%	19.90%
Traffic/congestion concerns	328	37.30%	53.90%
Need alternatives - walking bridge/etc	49	5.60%	8.00%
Too expensive/taxpayer liability	21	2.40%	3.40%
Total	880	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Transportation represents the percentage of comments made by 608 individuals)

Business Model

	Responses		Percent of mentions
	N	Percent	
Expensive/taxpayer liability	177	20.70%	32.80%
Only helps large businesses	128	15.00%	23.70%
Not enough parking for planned development	14	1.60%	2.60%
Opposed to proposed plan	319	37.30%	59.20%
In favour of proposed plan	141	16.50%	26.20%
Need a competitive design process	76	8.90%	14.10%
Total	855	100.00%	

(Percent of mentions for Business Model represents the percentage of comments made by 539 individuals)