



**Glebe Community Association
Minutes of the Board Meeting
Tuesday, November 22nd, 2016**

Present:

Board Members: Christine McAllister, Sharon Chartier, Sylvie Legros, Vaughn Guy, Elizabeth Ballard, Scott Blurton, Dan Chook Reid, Sam Harris, Angela Keller-Herzog, Rochelle Handelman, Peter Leyser, Carolyn Mackenzie, Carol MacLeod, Johanna Persohn, Judith Slater, Sarah Viehbeck.

Others: Councillor David Chernushenko, Joshua VanNoppen, Liz McKeen (Glebe Report), Breaden Cain, James Stuewe.

Regrets: Nini Pal

Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted with the addition of a motion by the President on letters regarding the location of the new Ottawa Library.

(Christine McAllister / Sharon Chartier) Carried

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of October 25th, 2016 were approved.

(Sylvie Legros / Sharon Chartier) Carried

PRESIDENT REPORT – Christine McAllister

- 1- Ken Slemko is in rehabilitation at the Bruyere Centre. Information will be distributed regarding possibilities to visit him once we hear more from family.
- 2- Hate graffiti in the Glebe. Sarah Viehbeck stated there are two upcoming events in support of groups that were targeted by racist graffiti. One is held at the Quaker House on Fourth Avenue on Saturday November 25th between 3 and 4:30pm and one is held at City Hall on November 25th where leaders of various communities will speak during the event. Several members of the GCA also attended the multi faith service that was held on Saturday November 19th. Sarah also propose to invite Jeff Turner to speak to the GCA Board in January about the movement BeKind 2017. The Board agreed to invite him to speak.

ISSUES FROM COMMUNITY

None

COUNCILLOR'S REPORT – David Chernushenko

- i) The Advisory Committee on urban tree conservation has issued its report which is available on the website (Councillor's website?). They recommend 29 steps taken over a 20 year period to reverse the loss of urban trees which is deemed too high for long term sustainability. The adding of bike paths, larger sidewalks and other resulted in little space for trees and residents are reluctant to plant trees on their properties. *Note that the GCA Environment Committee, along with other community associations in the core of Ottawa have issued a report responding to the Advisory Group report.*
- ii) No update on the development at Bank / Fifth. No confirmation of tenants, Pizza Hut and McDonald's are still a rumour.
- iii) Hate Graffiti. Efforts were coordinated during the graffiti event to support community people who were targeted by the vandalism and several events took place to bring the community together.
- iv) Budget. The summary of the budget for Capital Ward is on the website. There was a question whether the numbers related to Lansdowne Park are presented in a separated format to better assess the financials of the Park.

MOTIONS

Motion 1 – Review of the Ontario Municipal Board (Planning Committee)

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

(Carolyn Mackenzie / Johanna Persohn)

Carried

Discussion. Carolyn presented and explained in details the letter Planning Committee intends to send to Attorney General Naqvi on the review of the OMB. The Board supported the Committee and the general outline of the letter giving leeway to amend while keeping the spirit of the letter. The letter is attached at the end of the minutes.

Motion 2 – Community Police Center (Health and Social Services Committee)

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.

(Sarah Viehbeck / Johanna Persohn)

Carried

Discussion. Sarah explained that the Community Police Officer assigned to the Glebe area will leave his post at the end of the year and no replacement has been named. The number of CPOs in Ottawa has been cut from 15 to 20 and the presumption is that each CPO will serve a much larger territory. Sarah outlined and elaborated on the four items under which the Social & Health Committee will advocate to keep the presence of Community Police Services in the neighbourhood. Among others, they will send a letter advocating for retaining our CPO and will request that crime statistics be made available during the transition period after the Glebe CPO has left his post.

Motion 3 – Re-purposing of the segregated environment funds (Environment Committee)

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.

(Angela Keller-Herzog / Dan Chook Reid)

Carried

Discussion. Angela presented the motion after she got confirmation in writing by the City that there is no outstanding balance owned to the City on the segregated \$2,416 held in GCA accounts and that she got permission from the City to use these funds as per outlined in the motion. Angela was looking for authority to use these funds to pay for the Environment Committee’s activities.

There was a lengthy discussion on how the funds will be used and should be used, how spending will be accounted and reported for accountability and governance purposes, how spending will be related to the three activities the City listed as a conditions and how the Board will oversee the spending.

It was agreed that the environment Committee will provide a monthly report to the Board that will outline the budget and / or the activities that were funded through the segregated account.

Motion 4 – Maintenance of entrances to Central Park East (CPE) and Central Park West (CPW) during winter (Parks Committee)

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 **and Patterson Creek Park** entrances not be closed to pedestrians during the winter and that the city maintain (snow removal, sanding etc) the entrance stairs.

(Sam Harris / Dan Chook Reid)

Carried

Discussion. The Board supported the motion with the addition of Patterson Creek Park in the motion as well as the entrances to the parks are chained as well. The change is in bold in the motion.

Motion 5 – Location of the new Ottawa Library – request from Bookmark the Core (President)

Whereas

(Christine McAllister / Sharon Chartier)

Carried

Discussion. Christine received a request from Bookmark the Core for support from the GCA regarding the process in designating a new location for the new Ottawa Library. There are concerns about the process as it appears to be very opaque with no public consultation in the process. Bookmark the Core has requested the President to send a letter to both Mayor Jim Watson and Minister Catherine McKenna requesting a more transparent process as there are concerns that some private interests may be at play and that the new location will be located outside the core of the City.

Christine asked the Board to support the letters although she stated that the letters will be amended to better reflect the GCA communication style. The proposed letters submitted by Bookmark the Core are attached at the end of these minutes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There was no time left for committee reports.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no time left for the review of the Board of Directors manual.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

(Christine McAllister / Rochelle Handelman)

Carried

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

MOTION 5

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