



GCA Board Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, November 22th, 7:00 p.m. at the Glebe Community Centre
 Chair: Christine McAllister
 Secretary and Timekeeper: Sylvie Legros

Administrative	Speaker / Lead	Time	
Approval of the agenda and October minutes	Christine McAllister	5 minutes	7:00-7:05
President's Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter ref: hate graffiti in the Glebe • New Central Library location (Bookmark the Core) 	Christine McAllister Hunter McGill	20 minutes	7:05-7:25
Comments/Issues from the community	All	10 minutes	7:25-7:35
Councillor's Update	David Chernushenko	20 minutes	7:35-7:55
Committees with motions/seeking approval	4 motions to pass	30 minutes	7:55-8:25

Motion 1 – Planning Committee (Carolyn Mackenzie)

Please refer to the letter at the end of agenda

Whereas the Provincial Government has initiated a Review of the Ontario Municipal Board and is seeking feedback on issues as outlined in a Discussion Document posted in October 2016;

Whereas the GCA's Planning Committee is strongly in favour of this review and applauds the provincial government for undertaking this review;

The GCA Planning Committee seeks the GCA's Board of Directors support in providing comments along the lines of the Draft Comments/letter provided as part of this motion. It is anticipated that some further wordsmithing/fine-tuning of comments will be made by the GCA Planning Committee prior to submission by the deadline of December 19th that would not alter the nature of comments made.

Motion 2 – Health and Social Services Committee (Sarah Viehbeck)

Whereas the Community Police Centre (CPC) mission is:

- To provide an opportunity for the public to learn about the role of the OPS (Ottawa Police Services) in their local communities.
- To provide an important and direct link between the community and the OPS, creating an opportunity for ongoing communications between community members and police.
- To provide opportunities for police officers to increase their involvement with the communities they serve.
- To create mechanisms through which the OPS can consult with communities in an effort to create or adapt its services to meet the needs of the communities it serves.

Whereas Community Policing, including the role of the Community Policing Officer, is a valued aspect of crime prevention, community protection, and outreach.

Whereas a single point of contact, through Community Policing Officers, within OPS is an asset for the Glebe Community Association.

Whereas the OPS's "Service Initiative" creates uncertainty around community policing resources within the Glebe and other Ottawa neighbourhoods due to the planned reduction in Community Policing Officers from 15 to 10 and an ongoing prioritization exercise is being undertaken for those Officers.

Whereas the Community Policing Officer assigned to Centretown, including the Glebe, will no longer be in his role as of December 22, 2016 and a replacement has yet to be named for the Officer's area.

Be it resolved that the GCA advocate to the OPS, its Board, and City Council to:

- a) Express the value of Community Policing approaches and communicate concerns regarding the impact of the proposed changes on the Glebe and other Ottawa neighborhoods.
- b) Closely monitor, at the neighbourhood level, changes in crime statistics, call volume, and other relevant data throughout the transitions proposed under the Service Initiative.
- c) Consider geography, alongside other criteria, when developing the prioritization of neighbourhoods so that all neighbourhoods in Ottawa can maintain a single point of contact through a Community Policing Officer.
- d) Express the importance of community association engagement through the Advisory Group and other mechanisms in the prioritization exercise.

Motion 3- Environment Committee (Angela Keller-Herzog)

Re-purposing the \$2,416 segregated environment funds

Whereas the funds in the amount of \$3,025.00 provided by the City of Ottawa Community Environment Project Grant Program (CEPGP) for a 2007 project “Re-Tree Our Glebe” were not fully utilized for the intended purpose due to a number of technical obstacles which caused delay, and then the initiative made redundant due to the City’s larger tree mapping undertaking,

Whereas \$2,416 have been segregated in the GCA budget for almost 10 years,

Whereas the City of Ottawa, CEPGP Coordinator Jen Brown has been contacted regarding the disposition of these funds, and has indicated in an email dated 14 Nov 2016 to Angela Keller-Herzog, co-chair of the Environment Committee that

- she has spoken to the City’s Finance Department, has traced the project, and has found that there is no indication in the file that there is any outstanding balance owing to the City on this project.
- she is giving the Environment Committee of the GCA the go-ahead to dedicate the funding towards community environmental activities and suggests that they help to meet the City’s CEPGP goals of improving stormwater management, enhancing and protecting natural systems and reducing environmental impact.

Be it resolved that

The \$2,416 in segregated funds will be utilized, and fully accounted for through spending on receipted operational expenditures of the Environment Committee, in pursuit of its mandate and programming of community environmental activities, in particular those that serve to improve stormwater management, enhance and protect natural systems and reduce environmental impact.

Motion 4 – Parks Committee (Sam Harris)

Whereas people use our urban greenspaces throughout the year including November- April, and,

Whereas CPE and CPW are 2 of the larger parks in the Glebe and are used by many people, and,

Whereas the city of Ottawa has already chained off the entrances to CPE and CPW,

Therefore be it resolved that GCA write a letter to the city requesting that CPE and CPW entrances not be closed to pedestrians during the winter and that the city maintain (snow removal, sanding etc) the entrance stairs.

Committee notices, issues for input and Q&A		20 minutes	8:25-8:45
Other business		10 minutes	8:45 – 8:55
Board of Directors Manual	Sharon Chartier		
Adjournment	All		9:00

COMMITTEE REPORTS (1 report)

GCA Environment Committee - Report and Motions – 2016 11 17

Over the past month the following issues were pursued by members of the GCA Environment Cttee

Trees & Greenspace

- 150 **Trees in the Glebe** campaign is ongoing. Collaboration with Ecology Ottawa/Tree Ottawa is going well. Inquiries are trickling in. We were extremely pleased that the Glebe Report featured the Trees in the Glebe push on the front page of the November 2016 edition.
- 2016 11 08 Carol MacLeod attended the **Urban Forest Management Strategy** External Stakeholder Consultation on Criteria and Indicators on behalf of the Urban Core CAs tree group.
- The Urban CA Tree group (including Centretown, OOE, Dalhousie, OOS, soon Sandy Hill, Lower Town) met on 2016-11-01 and will meet again 2016-11-19, preparing our input to the External Stakeholder UFMS consultations on 2016 11 22.

Climate Change & Energy

- 2016 11 08 the organizing team for an **Energy Retrofit for Older Homes** event in spring 2017 had its first meeting. (led by William Nuttle)
 - o It was decided that to help us with the programming, format and scope for the event we would like to do a survey of Glebe residents to find out what kind of workshop topics and content they would find most interesting.
- Mark your calendars: we have booked Scoton Hall for April 22 2017 – Earth Day!

OTHER DOCUMENTS OF INTEREST (3 items)

1- Racist vandalism in the Glebe

Letter by the President regarding racist vandalism in the Glebe

Good morning David,

Here is the statement from the GCA:

The Glebe Community Association advocates for a liveable, sustainable, diverse urban neighbourhood and believes in a safe community which welcomes, and is enriched by, diversity, broadly defined. We were all shocked and greatly offended by the racist, hate-crime committed against one of our neighbours. We express our support to Rabbi Maranta and ask that the City of Ottawa Police Service and the RCMP do all that is possible to immediately bring the criminals to justice. We also request anyone with information about the perpetrator report to Crimestoppers.

Please let me know if you hear of anything Rabbi Maranta needs (I will be dropping off a card later today) or if there is anything else we can do to demonstrate support.

regards,
Christine

2- Request regarding the new library location - Bookmark the Core

Dear Glebe Community Association,

On behalf of BookMark the Core (BMC) I'm writing to thank you for your support to date for the citizens campaign to place the new Central Library in the true core of the city. The process to select a site for the new library is at a critical phase and I am now writing to ask for a further expression of interest and concern by your group.

As you are aware, early this year the Ottawa Public Library Board identified 12 possible sites for the new library, and it is believed that this list has now been shortened to 3-6 sites. The announcement of the designated site is to be made in December. But the process has been cloaked in secrecy, despite multiple calls for transparency and disclosure. BMC is concerned that the site selection process is being manipulated in favour of a site on LeBreton Flats rather than in the heart of downtown Ottawa, where thousands of library users now live and work.

BMC would appreciate it if your association could send a letter of concern, along the lines of the attached model, to Mayor Watson, copied to concerned members of Council and to Catherine McKenna, our MP, and Yasir Naqvi, our MPP.

Thank you for supporting our request. Time is of the essence. Please send the letter soon. For additional information please visit BMC's website and contact me at huntermcgill1@gmail.com or [613 233 3472](tel:6132333472).

Yours sincerely,

Hunter McGill for BookMark the Core.

DRAFT LETTER TO MAYOR WATSON RE NEW CENTRAL LIBRARY

Mayor Jim Watson
Mayor
City of Ottawa

Via email: jim.watson@ottawa.ca

November 22, 2016

Dear Mayor Watson,

Our community association finds it completely inappropriate that the potential sites for the new central library are being kept secret from the citizens of Ottawa. It is untenable that a single recommended site will be announced on December 15 without any information being made public before then. This process does not

serve the public interest. Just as we would not accept such a secret process if it were the National Capital Commission, so too we cannot accept such secrecy on the part of the Ottawa Public Library and the City of Ottawa.

Our community association is equally troubled by and opposed to consideration to locate the new central library outside Centretown. We are concerned that you stated, before the site assessment process was initiated, that the new central library should be on LeBreton Flats. The population of the downtown core of the City, east of Bronson Avenue, continues to grow and even 20 years from now will far exceed that of LeBreton Flats. In order to serve its public mandate and to be accessible and inclusive, for the large number of users who live and work in and visit the core, the new central library must be in Centretown.

There is no more public institution than a central library in the life of a city. A central library plays a vital social and community role and must remain in the densely-populated downtown core, where over 25,000 people live and 115,000 work. To remove this crucial social infrastructure – with its vital services for youth, newcomers, unemployed, the elderly and others – would be misguided and risks being a wasted public investment.

Thanks to investments in new footbridges, the downtown core is increasingly accessible to cyclists and pedestrians coming from Sandy Hill and the University of Ottawa campus. The newly-opened O'Connor Street bicycle lanes and the proposed bridge connecting Fifth Avenue and Clegg Street will facilitate access to the downtown core from the Glebe and the growing population of Old Ottawa East.

We urge you, as Mayor, to keep an open mind regarding site selection, bearing in consideration where the users of a new central library now live and work.

Yours sincerely,

Glebe Community Association

cc Hon. Catherine McKenna, MP

2nd letter

November 22, 2016

Hon. Catherine McKenna

Member of Parliament – Ottawa Centre

Minister of the Environment and Climate Change

107 Catherine St, Ottawa, ON

K2P 0P4

Via email: Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca

Dear Minister McKenna,

Re: New location for Ottawa's Central Library

Our community association is deeply troubled and opposed to the plan to locate the new central library outside Centretown, which is the downtown core. The Mayor has long indicated his preference for a new central library to be on LeBreton Flats. This is the wrong decision for our City and for the downtown community that is the heart of Ottawa. Assuming the City is seeking federal funding for this major public project, we urge you to

consider the impact of relocating a major piece of social infrastructure away from the densely populated downtown core. In short, if the central library is not in the right place, it risks being a wasted public investment. This major decision is being made by the City without the kind of open and transparent process that is required to serve the public interest. The Ottawa Public Library and City's closed-door approach is not consistent with the priority your federal government places on transparency and consultation. Among other processes, we have noted your leadership on the process to identify a new site for the Ottawa Civic Hospital. Contrast that process to the central library process where the public has been denied access to the short-list of sites under review and will only learn of a final recommended site in December.

The process of site selection has not been in the public interest. It has not been conducted with attention to the demographic data which should drive the decision of where to locate the central library for it to successfully meet its mandate to be accessible and inclusive.

A central library plays a vital social and community role and must remain in the downtown core, where 25, 600 or more residents live and 115,000 employees work (according to the 2011 census). To remove a crucial public institution -- with all its valuable services for youth, newcomers, unemployed, the elderly and others -- would be misguided and a risk to the social and economic prospects for Ottawa.

To date there has been no justification of why LeBreton Flats would be appropriate for a central library -- except that it is slated for redevelopment. LeBreton Flats does not compare at all on the basis of population catchment today or in the future with the downtown core. It does not offer walkability in the way that comes close to the heart of the city. To locate a central library at LeBreton's Pimisi station ignores the fact there will be two LRT stations in the downtown core. Currently, 81% of main branch users walk to the library and if it is relocated to LeBreton Flats, walkability will be severely reduced.

There is no more welcoming and egalitarian public building than a central library. In major cities across North America, central libraries have been built and rebuilt right in the downtown cores where people visit, work and live. Thanks to public investments in the new footbridges, the heart of Ottawa's downtown is increasingly accessible by cycling and walking from Sandy Hill, the University of Ottawa campus, as well as from the growing community of Old Ottawa East via the proposed bridge connecting Fifth Avenue with Clegg Street.

On December 15, the Ottawa Public Library will release the staff recommendation for a single site and other aspects of the project. On January 31, 2017, the OPL Board will meet, discuss and make their decisions. Then on February 8, the City Council will discuss and approve final decisions.

During your campaign, you pledged to support a request for federal funds for Ottawa's new central library. We urge you to consider the vital issue of the location of this public institution. As a major piece of social infrastructure, the central library is crucial for the health and well-being of our broader community. Even if the project is not supported by federal funding, we ask you as our Member of Parliament to ensure that Ottawa's new central library is located where it is most needed and will succeed in the public interest -- namely, in the true heart of downtown.

Yours truly,

Glebe Community Association

3- Supporting document for motion 1

November 30, 2016

Attorney General Naqvi
Minister of Municipal Affairs Mauro

Ministers Naqvi and Mauro,

Re: Review of the Ontario Municipal Board

The Glebe Community Association (Ottawa) would like to thank you both for initiating this important review. We are very pleased to have the opportunity to engage in this process and to offer our input for consideration. Fundamentally, we agree with earlier comments made by the City of Toronto that, "It is manifestly undemocratic for an appointed board such as the OMB to substitute its opinions for the considered judgment of elected councillors and professional city staff on matters affecting municipalities in which the councillor and city staff will continue to live and in which the OMB has no ongoing presence."

We believe strongly that the time has come for serious reform of the OMB that will result in greater respect for the public interest as expressed through our local councils. That being said, we recognise that a review panel of some sort is required to intervene in local planning decisions when decisions are made which appear to contradict municipal plans and regulations or which cater simply to local, unreasonable opposition despite supporting the intent of the local plan(s). This can create a situation in which a development is not approved due to localised opposition, in spite of a strong planning rationale, and despite a wider community support for a development, with the proponent having no effective recourse to appeal a Council or Committee of Adjustment decision.

Jurisdiction and powers

We believe that the OMB should be required to review municipal/authority decisions on a standard of reasonableness rather than de novo, which results in the OMB second-guessing democratically elected representatives and professional planning staff. De novo hearings also create more lengthy and expensive hearings which effectively create barriers to communities who participate on a volunteer basis with limited resources.

Using a standard of reasonableness, the OMB would look at both the ultimate decision, and the process by which the municipality went about making that decision. If the process/procedures followed at the municipal level were unreasonable, the board could send the matter under appeal back to the municipality with instructions on improving procedure. If on the other hand proper procedure was followed and the decision fell within the range of reasonableness, the appeal should be disallowed.

We recognise that adopting reasonableness requires more clearly enunciating the standards themselves. This has implications for the level of rigour in analysis by applicants/City staff/decision-makers.

Currently, our observation is that staff reports are not sufficiently transparent and rigorous in presenting analysis of competing priorities among development objectives. Part of this is because they suffer from the absence of standards. For example, quantifiable, high level intensification goals at both the provincial and municipal level are commonly pointed to in support of development applications, while concerns regarding impacts on residents/communities that are contained in supporting policies may be mentioned without any attempt at applying objective standards, the result being that they are discounted or easily dismissed. In many cases, staff reports read like more of a one-sided "sales document" to gain approval of a development application, and insufficiently clear in their evaluation and weighing of concerns regarding negative impacts of a development.

One brief example of this is presented below, relating to sun shadowing concerns raised by residents regarding a proposed lot being considered for minor rezoning of a property to allow a 4 storey rather than a three storey residential building:

The shadows that the proposed buildings are projected to throw are shown in Document 2. Three-storey buildings constructed to the zoning limits under the existing zoning would also have the potential to create shadow. The shadow impacts of the fourth floor are lessened by the step back.

The clear implication is that sun shadowing impacts are not significant - but staff do not provide any metrics, nor objective basis for comparing the impact of what is proposed versus the impact of what could be built as of right. Impacts “are lessened by the step back”, but does this necessarily make them reasonable/acceptable? By what measure? How was this actually evaluated by staff? For any option proposed, there are always pros and cons. Informed decision-making by our elected representatives (or appointed as in the Committee of Adjustment) should demand that these are clear, predictable, and transparent.

This may require additional leadership in terms of specifying standards of analysis for municipal decision-making. Additional training and provision of report templates to be used by applicants, as well as those for staff, may be useful as guidance to meeting such standards. Ensuring that such standards are adhered to so that reasonable decisions are made would then be the primary review role of the OMB to ensure that appropriate or reasonable exercise of discretion in making planning decisions has been carried out.

Meaningful citizen participation and local perspective

Citizen participation will be greatly enhanced with a renewed approach to the OMB’s jurisdiction and greater emphasis on strengthened decision making at the local level.

Currently, communities are often left feeling obligated to defend the public interest, without any reasonable resources to do so. Without inviting frivolous appeals, strong consideration should be given to funding of registered Community Associations, perhaps on a matching fund basis, to better level the playing field.

The Citizen Liaison Office (CLC) should be expanded to assist residents/communities in navigating the OMB.

Given lack of awareness by stakeholders of the CLC itself, additional effort should be placed in outreach activities.

Clear/predictable decision making

Similarly, greater clarity of decisions at the local/municipal level should be achievable once a standard of reasonableness is adopted and more transparent and objective methods of demonstrating such reasonableness are articulated.

Hearing procedures and practices

There is strong consensus within the community that the OMB is a confrontational, overly formal process that is dismissive of community/resident perspective. Complete reliance upon expert witnesses results in hearings that are prohibitively expensive to unfunded resident/community groups. This review is encouraged to pursue measures that will assist in leveling the playing field so that community members can more legitimately participate.

Alternative dispute resolution

Mediation should be obligatory before a matter is referred to a hearing to reduce costs for all parties and to provide for better solutions/outcomes.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to provide comments as part of this review process and we look forward to future aspects of this consultation process.

Sincerely,

Glebe Community Association