



Planning Committee

MINUTES 42

Tuesday, 9 October 2012, 9:30 a.m.

Champlain Room, 110 Laurier Avenue West

Present: Councillor P. Hume (Chair)
Councillor J. Harder (Vice-Chair)
Councillors S. Blais, R. Bloess, R. Chiarelli, K. Hobbs, A. Hubley,
B. Monette, S. Qadri and M. Taylor

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were filed.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes 41 of the Planning Committee meeting of 25 September 2012.

CONFIRMED

Note:

- 1. Except where otherwise indicated, reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 24 October 2012 in Planning Committee Report 38.**
- 2. Copies of all correspondence, presentations and related reference material received and marked with an asterisk (*) are held on file with the City Clerk.**

**STATEMENT REQUIRED FOR *PLANNING ACT*
FOR MATTERS SUBMITTED POST JANUARY 1, 2007**

The Chair read a statement required under the *Planning Act*, which advised anyone intending to appeal the proposed Comprehensive Zoning By-law and Official Plan Amendments listed as Items 4 to 6 on the agenda that they must either voice their objections at the public meeting or submit comments in writing prior to the Amendments being adopted by City Council on 24 October 2012, failing which, the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) might dismiss all or part of the appeals. In addition, it was noted that applicants could appeal these matters to the OMB if Council did not adopt amendments within 120 days for Zoning, or 180 days for an Official Plan Amendment, of receipt of the applications.

**POSTPONEMENTS AND DEFERRALS
REPORTS ET RENVOIS**

**PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE
PLANNING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT**

1. ANNUAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT - 2011
(*Deferred from Planning Committee meeting of 25 September 2012*)
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0220 CITY-WIDE

REPORT RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Committee receive this report for information.

Chair Hume spoke briefly to note that the City's strategy with regard to Smart Growth and Intensification is not only working, but is exceeding its targets. He then introduced Mr. Alain Miguez, Program Manager, Intensification and Zoning Unit, Policy Development and Urban Design, Planning and Growth Management Department (PGM), and Messrs. Ian Cross, Program Manager, and Royce Fu, Planner, both with the Research and Forecasting Unit, Policy Development and Urban Design, PGM. Mr. Fu spoke to a detailed PowerPoint slide presentation overview of the report (held on file with the City Clerk).

Committee discussions touched on:

- intensification issues involving future demand for apartments in suburban areas to accommodate changing demographics;
- additional capacity for the areas of Kanata and Orléans to meet intensification targets;
- anticipating future development pressures, including targeted intensification for identified growth areas, where warranted;

-
- the need to consider the City's Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan and Infrastructure Master Plans in partnership to ensure that infrastructure keeps up with growth, along with the improvement of existing infrastructure;
 - development charges and front-ending options for transit options in addition to Light Rail Transit;
 - urban boundary expansion, and;
 - affordability.

Following Committee discussions, the report recommendation was put before Committee and the report was RECEIVED as presented.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OTTAWA BUILT HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

2. APPLICATION TO ALTER 353 ELMWOOD AVENUE, A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE ROCKCLIFFE PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0219 RIDEAU-ROCKCLIFFE (13)
-

OBHAC RECOMMENDATIONS:

That that Planning Committee recommend that Council:

1. **Approve the application to alter 353 Elmwood Avenue as per drawings submitted by Hierarchy Development and Design on August 20, 2012, included as Documents 3, 4, and 5, subject to the following conditions:**
 - **The proposed stone veneer on the front elevation be removed and replaced with the same composite siding proposed for the upper-storey, sides and rear of the building; and**
 - **The design of the front porch and pediment be reconsidered in consultation with heritage staff.**
2. **Delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning and Growth Management Department; and**
3. **Issue the heritage permit with a two-year expiry date from the date of issuance.**

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on November 19, 2012)

(Note: Approval to Alter this property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* must not be construed to meet the requirements for the issuance of a building permit.)

Correspondence submitted prior to OBHAC consideration is held on file with the City Clerk, and listed in OBHAC Minutes 24 of 20 September 2012.

The Committee heard from the following delegations:

- Mr. Peter Ho requested that the conditions in Recommendation 1 be removed, noting that the preferred cladding for the residence was in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.
- Mr. Jean-Paul Boisvert, Designer, speaking to his revised drawings, noted that the residence's proposed pediment and tabature had been scaled back per recommendations received earlier, as shown in drawings he offered to submit at the current meeting.

Ms. Lesley Collins, Planner, Urban Services Unit, Development Review Branch, PGM, referencing a PowerPoint slide presentation to provide proper context (held on file with the City Clerk), explained the issues from a departmental perspective. Following Committee discussions on the recommendation of conforming with a Georgian architectural style appropriate to the design, versus the applicant's desire to clad the residence in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, the following Motions were introduced:

MOTION NO. PLC 42/1

Moved by Councillor R. Bloess:

That Recommendation 1 be amended by removing the bulleted conditions contained therein.

Yeas (6): Councillors R. Bloess, A. Hubley, B. Monette, S. Qadri, M. Taylor and J. Harder

Nays (3): Councillors R. Chiarelli, K. Hobbs and P. Hume

CARRIED

MOTION NO. PLC 42/2

Moved by Councillor J. Harder:

That Recommendation 1 be amended to incorporate design changes as per drawings submitted by Hierarchy Development and Design, submitted on 9 October 2012.

CARRIED, with Councillor K. Hobbs dissenting.

The report recommendations were then put to Committee and were CARRIED, as amended by Motions Nos. PLC 42/1 and 42/2, with Councillor K. Hobbs dissenting.

That the Planning Committee recommend that Council:

- 1. Approve the application to alter 353 Elmwood Avenue as per drawings submitted by Hierarchy Development and Design submitted on 9 October 2012;**
- 2. Delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning and Growth Management Department; and**
- 3. Issue the heritage permit with a two-year expiry date from the date of issuance.**

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on November 19, 2012)

(Note: Approval to Alter this property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* must not be construed to meet the requirements for the issuance of a building permit.)

CARRIED, with Councillor K. Hobbs dissenting

3. APPLICATION TO ALTER 192 STANLEY AVENUE, A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE NEW EDINBURGH HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0218 RIDEAU-ROCKCLIFFE (13)

OBHAC RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Planning Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Approve the application to alter 192 Stanley Avenue as per drawings submitted by Dennis Kane, ARC Associates Inc. on August 1, 2012 and included as Documents 3, 4, and 5;**
- 2. Delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning and Growth Management Department; and**
- 3. Issue the heritage permit with a two-year expiry from the date of issuance.**

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on November 12, 2012)

(Note: Approval to Alter this property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* must not be construed to meet the requirements for the issuance of a building permit.)

Correspondence submitted prior to OBHAC consideration is held on file with the City Clerk, and listed in OBHAC Minutes 24 of 20 September 2012.

Ms. Lesley Collins, Planner, Urban Services Unit, Development Review Branch, PGM, provided a PowerPoint slide presentation overview of the report, a copy of which is held on file with the City Clerk.

The following delegations spoke in opposition to the report recommendations:

- Mr. Jeffery Smith* spoke to issues of over-development, loss of greenspace, loss of historic value and privacy, and that the mass and form of the proposed reconstruction was incompatible with the form of the existing neighbourhood (also provided written comment Re: OMB precedent with Ms. Maggie Butcher).
- Ms. Gail McEachern, Heritage & Development Sub-Committee, New Edinburgh Alliance, also spoke to over-development, noting that the mass and form of the design was not only excessive, but incompatible with what should be allowed under a Heritage Zoning overlay.

The following delegation spoke in support of the recommendations:

- Mr. Dennis Kane, Project Designer, ARC Associates Inc., explained that much had been done to alter the drawings in an attempt to be more compatible with the neighbourhood and to comply with by-law setback requirements. He also noted that efforts would be made to match original photographs where possible.

Written correspondence was received from the following, as noted.

- Mrs. Beverley and Mr. Paul McConnell*, in opposition to the recommendations, citing that oversized projects and overdevelopment were negatively affecting the New Edinburgh area.

*[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]*

At the conclusion of discussions involving questions pertaining to the Committee of Adjustment and an explanation of possible outcomes, including appeals to the OMB, the recommendations were put before Committee and were CARRIED, as presented.

**PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE
PLANNING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT**

4. ZONING - 2744 INNES ROAD
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0224 INNES (2)
-

REPORT RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Committee recommend Council approve an amendment to the Zoning By-law 2008-250 to change the zoning of 2744 Innes Road from Residential Third Density, Subzone Y, Exception 708 (R3Y [708]) to Residential Fourth Density Subzone M, with Exceptions (R4M [XXXX]) as shown in Document 1 and as detailed in Document 2.

CARRIED

5. ZONING - 50 AND 54 BELL STREET NORTH
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0230 SOMERSET (14)
-

REPORT RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Committee recommend Council approve an amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 to change the zoning of 50 and 54 Bell Street North from Residential Fourth Density, Subzone H (R4H) to Minor Institutional, Subzone A (I1A[xxxx]), as shown in Document 1 and detailed in Document 2.

Ms. Kersten Nitsche, Planner, Intensification and Zoning Unit, Policy Development and Urban Design Branch, PGM, spoke to a brief PowerPoint slide presentation to provide the Committee with an overview of the report. A copy of this presentation is held on file with the City Clerk.

The following delegations spoke in opposition to the report recommendation to address concerns over the mass of the proposed design being out of proportion with the built form of the surrounding neighbourhood; traffic and parking; noise from possible uses of the gymnasium; setbacks from the curb and adjoining properties; excessive height; increased shadows, and a lack of greenspace.

- Ms. Joanne Dickinson*;
- Ms. Connie Brian*, on behalf of the Beccles (Bell/Eccles) Group;
- Mr. Mark Barszczewski*;
- Ms. Des McKay;
- Mr. Jon Svazas* (also provided written comment with Ms. Kate Svazas), and;
- Ms. Wong (given name not provided; did not complete speakers' form).

The following delegations spoke in support of the recommendation, speaking to the Ottawa Chinese Alliance Church's (OCAC) longstanding involvement with the community, and pointing out the benefits of the proposed amendment, which will provide additional multi-function recreational space and educational services for the Church's members. It was also noted that the Church had responded to earlier concerns by scaling back the design, and by redesigning the building with a hip-roof instead of the original flat-roofed design, along with supplemental landscaping, to address concerns over inadequate greenspace.

- Messrs. Gerald Chan and James Wong, on behalf of the OCAC,
- Mr. Miguel Tremblay (FoTenn Consultants), also on behalf of the OCAC, and;
- Ms. Leighann Burns, Harmony House.

The following delegation had registered, in advance, to speak in opposition to the report recommendation, but was not in attendance:

- Ms. Sheri Arnott.

In addition to those marked with an asterisk (*) above, written correspondence was also received from the following, as noted:

- Mr. David Seaborn*, Chair, Planning and Development Committee, Dalhousie Community Association (letter, in opposition);
- Ms. Sarah Burns* (email forwarding letter of support from Mr. Peter Tilley, Executive Director, Ottawa Food Bank), and;
- Mr. David Nguyen, Ottawa Chinese Alliance Church* (in agreement, also forwarding a copy of the above letter from the Ottawa Food Bank and a letter of support from Ms. Susan Garvey, Executive Director, Cornerstone Housing for Women).

*[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]*

Somerset Ward Councillor Diane Holmes acknowledged area residents' concerns that two residential lots would be replaced by an institutional building, and voiced that she hoped additional design elements would be incorporated by the time the project reached the site plan stage, to be more in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, and to address residents' concerns. She submitted the following Motion for Committee's consideration, drafted to address the issue of building height, which Councillor Harder moved on her behalf:

MOTION NO. PLC 42/3

Moved by Councillor J. Harder:

That Document 2 – Proposed Changes to the Comprehensive Zoning By-law be amended by adding:

2. Section 239 – Urban Exceptions
(f) Maximum building height 11.0 metres.

CARRIED

At the conclusion of discussions, the report recommendation was put before Committee and was CARRIED, as amended by Motion No. PLC 42/3:

That the Planning Committee recommend Council approve an amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 to change the zoning of 50 and 54 Bell Street North from Residential Fourth Density, Subzone H (R4H) to Minor Institutional, Subzone A (I1A[xxxx]), as shown in Document 1 and detailed in Document 2 (Proposed Changes to the Comprehensive Zoning By-law), as amended, by adding:

2. Section 239 – Urban Exceptions
(f) Maximum building height 11.0 metres.

CARRIED, as amended

6. OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT - NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM
MAPPING, LESTER ROAD WETLAND COMPLEX, KIZELL DRAIN
WETLANDS AND THE CARDINAL CREEK KARST
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0214 CITY-WIDE
-

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee and Planning Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Approve and adopt an amendment to the Official Plan to amend policies related to the Natural Features and Functions, Environmental Impact Statement and Implementation as detailed in Document 1;**
- 2. Approve and adopt an amendment to the Official Plan to include the Natural Heritage System Overlays, as shown in Schedules 1, 2 and 3**

of Document 1 as Schedules L1, L2 and L3, respectively, of the Official Plan;

That Planning Committee recommend Council:

3. Approve and adopt an amendment to the Official Plan to designate the Lester Road Wetland Complex, as shown in Schedule 1 of Document 2, as 'Significant Wetlands' in Schedule B of the Official Plan;
4. Approve and adopt an amendment to the Official Plan to designate the Kizell Wetland, as shown in Schedule 1 of Document 3, as 'Significant Wetlands' in Schedule B of the Official Plan; and
5. Approve and adopt an amendment to the Official Plan to designate the Cardinal Creek Karst as shown in Schedule 1 of Document 4 as an 'Earth Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI)' in Schedule K of the Official Plan.

Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee - 4 October 2012

At its meeting of Thursday, 4 October 2012, held in Greely, Ontario, the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee (ARAC) considered the first two recommendations outlined above, within its area of oversight. At that time, ARAC had CARRIED the recommendations as presented.

Written correspondence was received from the following, as noted:

- Ms. Ursula Melinz* (Soloway, Wright) on behalf of Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., reserving the right to seek further revisions to Natural Heritage Policies in Section 2.4.2 of the City's Official Plan;
- Ms. Judy Makin*, March Rural Community Association (in agreement);
- Ms. Janet Bradley*, Borden Ladner Gervais, LLP, on behalf of Mr. Bill Cox (opposed);
- Mr. Martin Callsen*, President, South March Highlands / Carp River Conservation Inc. (in agreement);
- Mr. Steve Cunliffe*, Manager, Land Development, Regional Group Inc. (in agreement, noting corrections to the Natural Heritage Feature Overlay);
- Ms. Amy Kempster*, Chair, Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital (in agreement), and;
- Mr. Ken McRae* (in agreement).

Planning Committee - 9 October 2012

At the Planning Committee meeting of 9 October, the Committee received a PowerPoint slide presentation overview of the report (held on file with the City Clerk) from Ms. Wendy Tse, Planner, Land Use and Natural Systems Unit, Policy Development and Urban Design Branch, PGM. Mr. Nick Stow, Planner, and Ms. Marica Clarke, Program Manager (both within the same Unit and Branch as Ms. Tse), were also present to respond to questions.

It was noted that all but the fifth of the above recommendations were a response to directives from the OMB. Committee discussions included: protection for that part of the Cardinal Creek Karst in private ownership; timelines for completion of recommended work; questions regarding mechanisms to adjust mapping boundaries, and; Provincial Policy Statement requirements to incorporate wetland areas deemed *Provincially Significant* within the City's Official Plan.

The Committee heard from the following delegation in opposition to the report recommendations:

- Ms. Ursula Melinz*, Soloway Wright, LLP, on behalf of KNL Developments (and via a letter on behalf of Thomas Cavanaugh Construction, reserving the right to seek further revisions to Natural Heritage Policies in Section 2.4.2 of the Official Plan). Ms. Melinz suggested it was inappropriate to proceed with designation, given that work and discussions were ongoing. She also noted that boundary mapping based on aerial photography was imprecise, and should be 'truthed' at ground level.

Kanata North Ward Councillor Marianne Wilkinson suggested that Committee could approve the recommendations now, with additional work to be undertaken at a later date to adjust boundaries, as necessary. Mr. Stow confirmed that this could be done, but not likely before late Spring or Summer of 2013.

In addition to the above, the following also provided written correspondence, as noted (some submissions were received by both Committees):

- Ms. Judy Makin*, March Rural Community Association (in support)
- Mr. Steve Cunliffe*, Manager, Land Development, Regional Group Inc. (in agreement, noting corrections to the Natural Heritage Feature Overlay);
- Mr. Martin Callsen*, President, South March Highlands / Carp River Conservation Inc. (in agreement);
- Ms. Janet Bradley*, Borden Ladner Gervais, on behalf of Remer Holdings (in opposition, noting the overlay does not apply to the owner's land);
- Ms. Amy Kempster*, Chair, Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital (in agreement);
- Mr. Ken McRae* (in agreement), and;

-
- Ms. Cheryl Doran* (in agreement).

[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]

At the conclusion of discussions, the report recommendations were put before the Planning Committee and were CARRIED, as presented. This item will proceed to Ottawa City Council for its meeting of 24 October 2012 in Planning Committee Report to Council No. 38, with the endorsement of both Committees.

7. BUILDING BY-LAW - BUILDING PERMIT
FEE METHODOLOGY CONVERSION
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0225

CITY-WIDE

REPORT RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Committee recommend that Council amend the Building By-law 2005-303, as outlined in the report, to give effect to the change in methodology in calculating building permit fees and to give effect to the new fee schedule.

Staff noted a discrepancy in the fee structures set out in Document 1 of the report after the report had been distributed, and requested that Committee consider the following amendment (proposing a lower fee). Councillor Harder moved the following Motion:

MOTION NO. PLC 42/4

Moved by Councillor J. Harder:

WHEREAS Report ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0225 titled "Building By-law – Building Permit Fee Methodology Conversion" recommends to the Planning Committee and Council the adoption of a new fee methodology for calculating building permit fees and a new fee schedule for the Building By-law 2005-303 to take effect January 1, 2013;

AND WHEREAS the new fee schedule in the attached Document 1 to the report sets out new rates for new residential construction based on the area of proposed construction;

AND WHEREAS one specific fee rate under the class of buildings of "Group C (Residential Occupancies), specifically of "Footprints for SFR, Semi-Detached, and Rowhouses" should read \$0.92 per square feet rather

than \$0.95 per square feet and \$9.90 per square meters rather than \$10.23 per square meters;

BE IT RESOLEVED THAT the fee schedule be amended accordingly and that the attached Document 1 replace the one in the Report ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0225.

CARRIED

The report recommendation was then put before Committee and was CARRIED, as amended by Motion No. PLC 42/4.

That the Planning Committee recommend that Council amend the Building By-law 2005-303, as outlined in the report, to give effect to the change in methodology in calculating building permit fees and to give effect to the new fee schedule, as amended by the following:

WHEREAS one specific fee rate under the class of buildings of “Group C (Residential Occupancies), specifically of “Footprints for SFR, Semi-Detached, and Rowhouses” should read \$0.92 per square feet rather than \$0.95 per square feet and \$9.90 per square meters rather than \$10.23 per square meters;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the fee schedule be amended accordingly and that the replacement Document 1, as amended by the foregoing, replace the one in Report ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0225.

CARRIED, as amended

8. PROHIBITION, INSPECTION AND REMEDIATION OF BUILDINGS USED FOR MARIJUANA GROW OPERATIONS
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0091 CITY-WIDE
-

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee and Planning Committee recommend Council:

1. Approve the service delivery model and fee structure for the prohibition, inspection and remediation of buildings used for marijuana grow operations, as outlined in this report and summarized in Document 1;
2. Approve the By-law substantially in the form of Document 2, pertaining to the prohibition, inspection and remediation of buildings used for marijuana grow operations; and

-
3. **Direct staff to prepare comments on Health Canada's proposed regulations with respect to the production and distribution of medical marijuana that will reform the Marijuana Medical Access Program, and report back to City Council early in 2013.**

Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee - 4 October 2012

This item was also considered by ARAC at its meeting of Thursday, 4 October 2012, held in Greely, Ontario, at which time, the Committee received a detailed PowerPoint slide presentation overview of the report from Ms. Arlene Grégoire, Director and Chief Building Official, Building Code Services Branch, PGM.

Discussions touched upon whether residences used to grow marijuana for legitimate medicinal purposes would require such information to be listed on title for future owners. Ms. Grégoire pointed out that if carried out legitimately, the City would likely have no knowledge of such an operation, however, she noted that Health Canada was revisiting its guidelines in these areas. She noted that for all other cases, where remediation had occurred, and where a Certificate of Compliance had been issued, such information would be lifted from a title. In response to a question from Councillor Qadri about where debris from grow operations can be taken for disposal, Ms. Grégoire speculated that this waste would be considered hazardous, and would have to go to facilities licensed to handle such waste. Staff offered to provide additional clarity before this matter rises to Council at its meeting of 24 October 2012.

The Committee heard from the following delegation in opposition to the report recommendation:

- Mr. Nick Westwood*, a resident of Blackburn Hamlet, who questioned the need to fence a property determined to be a marijuana grow operation until remediated by the owner, citing the stigma put upon entire neighbourhoods where such operations are discovered.

*[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]*

In response to Mr. Westwood's concerns, it was pointed out that a greater issue was that of community safety, in endeavouring to protect people from contamination by molds and other pathogens often found within such residences.

At the conclusion of discussions, the report recommendation was put before the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee, and was CARRIED as presented.

Planning Committee - 9 October 2012

Ms. Arlene Grégoire, Director and Chief Building Official, Building Code Services Branch, PGM, was present to respond to questions. Discussions included authorities given to the Building Code Services Branch and circumstances under which demolition may be required. Ms. Grégoire pointed out that once notified of a grow operation by the police, the municipality must, under the *Municipal Act*, ensure habitability by requiring *remediation* of the residence. *Demolition* would require proof of immediate danger to the public and neighbouring community.

The following delegation had registered in advance to provide comment, but had left by this point in the meeting:

- Messrs. Tim Lee and Rick Snell, Ottawa Real Estate Board (position not indicated).

Written correspondence was received from the following, as noted:

- Ms. Cheryl Parrott*, Hintonburg Community Association (in support).

[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]

At the conclusion of discussions, the report recommendations were put before the Planning Committee and were CARRIED, as presented. This item will be considered by Ottawa City Council at its meeting of 24 October 2012 in Planning Committee Report to Council No. 38, with the endorsement of both Committees.

9. DEMOLITION CONTROL BY-LAW REVIEW
ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0210

CITY-WIDE

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Planning Committee recommend Council:

1. **Repeal By-law 215-2000, the former City of Ottawa Demolition Control By-law;**
2. **Approve a new Demolition Control By-law, pursuant to Section 33 (2) of the *Planning Act* substantially in the form contained in Document 1, to apply to all residential properties outlined in Document 2;**

-
3. Delegate authority to the General Manager, Planning and Growth Management, to issue a permit on such terms and conditions as the General Manager considers appropriate subject to concurrence from the Ward Councillor and applicant;
 4. Despite Recommendation 3, require staff to submit a report to Committee and Council when a building is designated under Part 4 or Part 5 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and when delegated authority is lifted; and
 5. Approve an amendment to By-law 2011-451, which imposes fees for planning applications, to set out the fees applicable to applications for demolition control permits as detailed in Document 3.

CARRIED

Written correspondence was received as noted below:

- Ms. Cheryl Parrott*, Hintonburg Community Association (in support).

[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE CITY MANAGER

10. QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT TO COUNCIL,
Q2: APRIL 1 – JUNE 30, 2012
ACS2012-CMR-OCM-0017

CITY-WIDE

REPORT RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Committee receive this report for further review and discussion of the service areas' performance results, as outlined in the report.

RECEIVED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

A. 2013 VEHICLE GROWTH - IPD
ACS2012-COS-PWS-0114

CITY-WIDE

RECEIVED

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

*Original signed by
C. Zwierzchowski*

Committee Coordinator

*Original signed by
Councillor P. Hume*

Chair