



July 29, 2021

Laurel McCreight MCIP, RPP

Planner II

Planning Services

Planning, Infrastructure & Economic Development Department

110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th Floor

Ottawa ON K1P 1J1

sent by email: Kanatalakes@ottawa.ca

Dear Ms. McCreight

RE: Rezoning File #D02-02-19-0123; Subdivision Application #D07-16-19-0026
7000 Campeau Drive – Planning Opinion – Third Submission

I continue to be retained in my capacity as a professional land use planner by the Kanata Greenspace Protection Coalition (KGPC) to provide the Coalition with a land use opinion on the development applications filed to permit the redevelopment of 7000 Campeau Drive (the subject property).

On June 23, 2021, I was advised that ClubLink had made further revisions to their applications as a follow up to the City's comments on the technical and public circulation of these applications. The purpose of this letter is to provide an overview of my opinions on the revised submission for your consideration in the review of the subject applications. However, the KGPC reserves the right to submit additional comments on this and other aspects of these applications should they deem it necessary.

Revised Development Proposal

The development proposal has been revised to a limited degree as a further response to the City's technical and planning review along with community input. From my review of the second resubmission I would summarize the changes as follows:

- Increasing the single detached unit count.
- Reducing the number of times townhouse blocks back onto existing singles.
- Increasing the green buffer between rear yards where new development abuts existing development.
- Widening the local road rights-of-way from 16.5 metres to 18 metres.
- Adding to the greenspace areas generally but not necessarily as parks or usable space.

Planning and Communications
Planification urbaine et communications

1165 Greenlawn Crescent, Ottawa ON K2C 1Z4 | 613-729-3773
momentumplancom.ca

The following table was provided by the proponent in a second Addendum dated June 23, 2021 to the Planning Rationale which summarizes the land use and unit count changes as compared to the original and the first revised submission:

Table 1 – Statistical Comparison

	Original Submission (October 2019)	First Resubmission (July 2020)	Second Resubmission (April 2021)
Dwelling Units	1,502	1,544	1,480
Detached	545 (22.76 ha)	630 (24.63 ha)	654 (23.26 ha)
Front Drive Townhouses	498 (11.05 ha)	332 (7.79 ha)	247 (5.44 ha)
Back-to-Back Townhouses	88 (1.02 ha)	70 (0.79 ha)	68 (0.76 ha)
Stacked Townhouses	0 (0 ha)	76 (0.80 ha)	74 (0.78 ha)
Medium Density	371 (2.97 ha)	436 (2.91 ha)	437 (2.92 ha)
Subtotal (Residential land)	37.80 ha	36.92 ha	33.16 ha
Parks	3 (4.36 ha)	4 (5.91 ha)	4 (6.24 ha)
Stormwater Mgt. Ponds	5 (8.02 ha)	4 (7.31 ha)	4 (7.31 ha)
Additional Open Space	5.36 ha	5.19 ha	7.19 ha
Landscaped Buffers	1.70 ha	1.65 ha	2.40 ha
Subtotal (Open Space land)	19.44 ha	20.06 ha	23.14 ha
Roads	13.65 ha	13.91 ha	14.59 ha
Total Site Area	70.89 ha	70.89 ha	70.89 ha

In my opinion what remains missing from the most recent revision is a response to the following important policy considerations:

- The role that the golf course lands and the related 40% agreement regarding open space dedication played in the overall master planning of this community. In my opinion, this is a central issue which has failed to be addressed in assessing the compatibility of this extensive infill redevelopment. The Kanata Lakes community would not have developed the way it is today if the golf course lands had not been a vital and integral part of the original community design.
- It continues to be my opinion that any redevelopment of these lands would require an official plan amendment to Section 4.10 Greenspace Requirements regardless of the status of the 40% agreement.
- It continues to be my opinion that the length of the cul-de-sacs on Streets 9 and 17 are too long and extend beyond usual municipal norms to ensure safe access by emergency vehicles in the event of a blockage of a portion of the street. The length of the streets also makes the provision of efficient public transit service challenging.
- The continued reliance on the policies relating to distance from, and access to, a planned or existing rapid transit station cannot be supported as a rationale for increased density and height for the subject property. All areas of the subject property exceed the 600 and 800



metre planning standards for targeted intensification, increased density and height used in the Official Plan, Zoning By-law 2008-250, the Transportation Master Plan and in the design guidelines approved under the Official Plan for residential development of all forms.

- Starting at the bottom of page 4 of the Addendum, it is noted that *“the more intensive land uses (i.e. medium density apartments, stacked townhouses, back-to-back townhouses and the majority of the traditional townhouses) will be located closest to Campeau Drive, and therefore closest to Terry Fox Station, which is just over 800 metres away from Campeau Drive. In this regard, the Campeau Drive frontage is already characterized by taller buildings, including heights up to 15 storeys (7303, 7305 and 7307 Campeau Drive), and is where the General Urban Area designation generally targets heights taller than 4 storeys”*. This rationale fails to note that the Kanata Town Centre Secondary Plan, a plan for an urbanized town centre which applies to the lands on the south side of Campeau Drive, permits the high rise buildings located there. The Town Centre Plan in Policy 5.7.5.8.2 a. ii. specifically limits the height of buildings within 25 metres of Campeau Drive to three storeys directly across from the subject property. Given that the balance of the existing development on the north side of Campeau Drive to the east of the subject property is low-rise building forms, it is my opinion that building forms taller than three storeys cannot be supported as compatible development in this area.
- The Addendum also points to a recent development application for 6301 and 6475 Campeau Drive located in the Town Centre as providing support for buildings between 4 and 6 storeys along Campeau Drive. With respect to those applications, the proposed height of the stacked dwelling units fronting on Campeau Drive is 3 storeys with a maximum height of 11 metres as required by the Town Centre Plan. With respect to the proposal for two 10 storey buildings with a height of 35 metres at the back of the site, this is based on a rearrangement of the existing zoning which already permits the proposed buildings as allowed for in Policy 5.7.5.8.1. Thus in my opinion, the reference to these applications as support for the redevelopment of 7000 Campeau Drive with increased height and density in the Addendum is flawed and without merit.
- With respect to the proposed density in general terms, the resubmission continues to assert that the site should be compared to density requirements in new greenfield, suburban communities notwithstanding it is an infill context where compatibility with the existing development is an important policy direction of the Official Plan. This issue of context was covered in considerable detail in my previous opinion dated August 31, 2020.

Overall Opinion on Revised Submission

Having reviewed the materials which make up the second resubmission, my overall opinion remains unchanged. I reiterate that the subject applications to redevelop 7000 Campeau Drive should be refused as they do not conform to the policies of the Official Plan, in particular **Section 2.2.2 Managing Intensification Within the Urban Area; 2.3.3 Drainage and Stormwater Management Services; Section 2.5.1 Designing Ottawa; Section 3.6.1 General Urban Area; Section 4.10 Greenspace Requirements and Section 4.11 Urban Design and Compatibility**. Further, it is my opinion that these applications would



permit a scale and intensity of infill development that has never been contemplated by the Official Plan or any predecessor secondary plans for the subject property so it cannot be considered orderly development. It is not in my opinion, good planning or compatible development given the neighbourhood context and creates the potential for causing undue adverse effects on adjacent properties, the overall built community as well as the natural environment.

Planning and Regulatory Framework Review

The review of the planning and regulatory framework for the consideration these development applications have not resulted in any change in the opinions as documented in my letter dated August 31, 2021 so it has not been repeated here.

This concludes my review of the subject applications as revised by the second resubmission. In summation, it is my professional opinion that the subject applications should be refused as they do not conform to the Official Plan of the City of Ottawa or to the various provisions of Section 51 (24) of the *Planning Act R.S.O. 1990*.

Yours truly

Dennis Jacobs

Dennis Jacobs MCIP, RPP
Principal Planner

Cc Kanata Greenspace Protection Coalition

