



Minutes of the ASH Board of Directors

February 26, 2018

7:00 PM to 9:00 PM

Present from the Board: Chad Rollins, Ralph Blaine, Larry Newman, John Verbass, Trina Cooper-Bolam, Scott Williams, Megan Reilkoff and Susan Young. Councilor Fleury, Constable Lemay and Jen Thurkleson were also present. Pat Archer and Bob Forbes sent regrets.

Introductions were made

2 Review and Approval of Agenda

The agenda was accepted as amended on a motion from Susan/Ralph

3 Approval of The minutes

The minutes of January 29, 2018 were approved as amended on a motion from Ralph/John

4. Councilor's Report

Constable Lemay gave a report on crime statistics for the previous month. He also reported that he is keeping abreast of Police plans for St Patrick's day. In answer to a question he explained that officers now face more restrictions when using pro-active measures on the street and as a result some officers may be inclined to forego this avenue of interacting with citizens.

Councilor Fleury reported on the following items.

- The development proposal for **All Saints** will go to Planning committee tomorrow (Feb 27)
- He reviewed items discussed at the **Town and Gown** Committee including plans for St. Patrick's Day and Sprint Cleaning.
- The **Chateau Laurier** has re-submitted their development plans and will hold a consultation meeting this Wednesday evening.

- An **R4 presentation** was made by the City on February 15. Councilor Fleury agreed to ask his assistant to arrange a meeting with ASH so that ASH might voice its concerns about the R4 proposals of the City Planners. **He asked ASH to give him a good date for such a meeting.**

- A consultation on **Rooming Houses** is underway. Councilor Fleury expressed his disappointment with the current proposals from the City and expressed the opinion that the Rooming House regulations need to be restructured from the ground up. The City has asked for feedback on this issue by March 30th. It was agreed that ASH should encourage our members to respond to this appeal for feedback.

- **The Egyptian Embassy** has resubmitted its plans and the Councilor has asked them to consult with ASH on these new proposals.



- **Gazebo Project** - Councilor Fleury encouraged ASH to make a formal submission for a City grant for this project. There was a discussion about the mechanics and advisability of making a submission to the City for matching grants.

Motion 4.1 [Feb26'18] that ASH submit a request for a matching grant from the City for the Gazebo project. (Trina/Ralph) – Carried

- On the feasibility study for the proposed **Truck Tunnel** the councilor reported that the Federal government is still holding back on committing funds for this project. Chad suggested ASH hold a meeting with the Mayor and the local MP to try to encourage some action in this dossier.

5. Reports and Updates

a. Executive Report

The Executive did not meet in since our January Board meeting.

b **Treasurer's Report** - Pat was absent.

c Committee Reports

i **By Law enforcement** –

Larry asked Board members for their impressions as to whether or not any progress has been made in decreasing the number of violations of the solid waste by-laws. The consensus was that there has not been any significant improvement.

Jenn Thurkleson of by-laws stated that City policy is that fines for violation of by-law infractions be assessed against the property owners although occasionally a tenant might be fined if s/he is caught in the act by a by-law officer. She says they are focusing on dealing with landlords to find solutions to chronic cases of by-law violations. She also stated that they would focus on the 10 worst cases ASH has underlined. She stated that “The system is not user friendly for mass complaints”.

She explained that when a complaint has been received by the City, by-law must then issue a notice of violation (NAV). If there is no compliance with this notice within three days the City can issue a fine. However, if there is still no compliance or if, after a short period of compliance, the owner continues with the same violation then another NAV must be issued with another wait time for compliance before another fine can be assessed. Much concern was expressed by the Board that this system did not appear to be effective in changing the behaviour of absentee landlords in Sandy Hill. Chad suggested that the by-law committee meet with Jen to explore ways to make by-law sanctions more effective.

Jen agreed to submit reports on progress made with 311 calls at future ASH meetings. She also reported that the **KPMG report** on by-law services has not yet been released and said that it might be available in June.



II. Communications and Membership (See Ralph's Report attached)

- Ralph updated this report to note that, of the 5 members whose membership were set to expire in March, four have now renewed. In response to a question from John, Ralph agreed that in most months the number of members renewing their membership was less than the number of memberships that had expired that month.

- **Save Sandy Hill Committee (see Ralph's Report attached)**

Ralph reported that this committee would meet on March 6th to refine the campaign proposal from Pippa Rogers.

III. Engagement with the University (See Susan's report attached)

Susan expressed concern that the University has not planned any on-campus activities for St. Patrick's day. Chad raised some questions about the University's plans for managing the new Viner residential complex on Laurier. Susan agreed to re-send her draft of the letter ASH would send to the University asking for a meeting with the "new" president to outline ASH concerns.

iv. Heritage/Planning

Trina reported on the recent hearing about the fate of 231 Cobourg (Ugandan Embassy property). Chad expressed concern that the City depends upon research done by the property owner in these cases to bring to light possible heritage and other factors that might weigh against development proposals. In this case the report submitted by the property owner missed an important heritage element.

Trina reported her intention to call regular monthly meetings (at mid-month) of the Planning Committee (which any interested member of the Board might attend) to review development proposals received by ASH.

Trina also noted that she and Chad will be attending a Heritage event organized by the Rockcliffe Community group on March 14 and 15th.

Trina noted that she is exploring the possibility of requesting a grant from the Trillium Fund to finance a "capacity building" exercise for ASH.

Trina listed the three development proposals currently on the agenda of the ASH Planning Committee.

v. Transportation –



John reported that the residents of Chapel are continuing their efforts to get two-thirds of the residents on a section of this street to agree to alternate-side parking as a traffic calming measure.

He also reported on current City approaches to implementing traffic calming measures throughout the region.

John suggested that ASH join with the Lower Town Community association to address the issue of Truck traffic on King Edward.

Motion 5.1 [Feb26'18] that ASH collaborate with the Lower Town Community Association in writing a letter to the Mayor, our MP and our MPP asking for a meeting to get a report on the progress that has been made in funding the feasibility study for the proposed Truck Tunnel. (John/Ralph) – Carried

John agreed to draft this letter.

6. Old Business

a. R4 Review (see Chad's letter attached)

Chad reported on the February 15th meeting hosted by the City at which the City Planners reported on their draft proposals for the R4 review to an invitation only audience. He also reviewed some of the timelines set by the City for the R4 review process. Chad will write to the City asking for the **report done by Urban Strategies**.

It was agreed that ASH would convene a meeting in mid-March to adopt a response to the City Draft Plan for the R4 review. Chad asked all Directors to submit their concerns about the Draft Plan as soon as possible so that a written report of these concerns could be circulated to Directors before the mid-March meeting.

b. Proposal to Petition for Increased Bunkhouse Assessments -

Megan reported that once the Gazebo submission is taken care of she will look into this proposal.

c. Cultural Memory Workshop – Committee

The following motion was tabled at the January 26th meeting until this meeting:

Motion 5.1 [Jan 29 '18] that all activities of the committee organized by Trina and arising out of the meeting of the Cultural Memories Workshop held on January 17, 2018 be conducted within the auspices of a duly constituted committee of ASH. (Ralph/Larry)



This motion was tabled to the March meeting of the Board as the terms of reference for this committee, which was to have been circulated to the Board after the January meeting, have not yet been supplied to the Board. Trina agreed to supply the Board with the terms of reference of this Committee.

d. ASH AGM

Motion 6.1[Feb 26'18] that the 2018 ASH AGM be held on May 16, 2018 at Bate Hall in All Saints. (Susan/Ralph) – carried

Trina suggested that ASH consider rotating the location of our AGM among different sites in the community.

Chad agreed to produce a sign-up sheet for the various jobs related to setting up the AGM.

e. Ice Rink – Susan reported that the season is over for this winter.

f. One and Only

Motion 6.2[Feb26'18] – that \$500 be allocated for advertising next year's One and Only craft fair. (Susan/Scott) – Carried

7. New Business

a. Rooming House Memo from City – Call for Feedback

There was a suggestion that a reminder to members to respond to this appeal could be put on the ASH website. Board members were also encouraged to give their input.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM

Next Meeting – March 26, 2018



REPORT OF THE ASH MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

February 23, 2018

The Membership Committee has not met since the last Board Meeting. We still hope to organize an on-going door to door membership campaign.

So far we have sent out renewal requests to 77 ex-members (we are down to the “M’s” on the list). Of these, three have re-joined and three have notified us that they have moved. Ex-members are those whose memberships expired at least on year ago. Many of these people are still active in the community but do not respond to email appeals to rejoin ASH. It may be worthwhile to organize a special door to door campaign for these cases?

We also sent out the regular notices to those ASH members whose memberships were set to expire in March 2018. There were 5 such notices and four of them did renew.

We sent out three renewal requests for those expiring in February 2018. One of these has renewed

We sent out two renewal requests for those expiring in January 2018. One of these renewed.

Ralph Blaine



REPORT OF THE SAVE SANDY HILL COMMITTEE

February 23, 2018

The activities of this committee have resumed after the return from vacation of Pippa Rogers, the media consultant we have been working with. The committee has discussed, via email exchanges, the details of how to organize the next steps in the proposed media campaign. Pippa has submitted a draft proposal for this campaign. We plan to meet in early March to discuss this draft proposal with a view to making a presentation to the Board - hopefully at the March Board meeting. I would like to thank all of the members of the committee for devoting their attention to and sharing their views on how the mandate of this committee should be addressed. I would particularly like to thank Suneeta Millington for taking the initiative to keeping our work moving along.

Ralph Blaine



Here are my notes from this evening's meeting. Thanks to François Bregha for also attending, and he may have some additions/clarifications.

1. St. Patrick's Day. This year it is on a Saturday, in warmer weather. The Ottawa Police will be asking for additional resources, as will By-law, and they will be coordinating with the University. Once OPS have submitted the request for the additional resources, Mathieu will follow up with the Superintendent to emphasize the need. The University has no plans for an event on campus at any point on that day, and in fact it is hosting their Spring Open House that morning. It was noted that having parents witness police cars and partying in the neighbourhood might be counter-productive. There appears to be no appetite by the OPS to actually stop people from entering a party block; they will speak to any hosts and confiscate liquor. Mathieu suggested the drunk truck be parked across the street from the party address to deter participants. There will be a call on the Tuesday or Wednesday before March 17 so everyone is briefed on the plan. I will be out of town on March 17, but will send out notes from the call and would strongly suggest a few Board members be watching and ready to Tweet/FB Mathieu (I find he reacts very quickly to these methods of communication).

2. Clean up the Capital - Mathieu strongly encouraged the University to participate and organize teams. The discussion turned to Move Out weekend, which is April 27 and 28. By-law is ready with extra pick-up but I asked whether the University's Sustainability Office could be more involved, Mathieu suggested they work with Helping with Furniture so bigger cast-off items go to charity rather than the landfill. There is the Free Store on campus that takes smaller items. I suggested both services be advertised to students together.

3. The University reported on the Special Constable project. They are still info gathering, but have spoken to Carleton and other universities. They are waiting for the Safer Ontario bill to pass, presumably as it entails some changes to the program. Beyond our primary interest in this, which is greater enforcement capacity albeit on University property only, the University is interested because having a Special Constable status allows them to information share more easily with other agencies such as OC Transpo, the OPS, etc. on security risks. I followed up with a question on the Off-campus Student Code of Conduct as there is a court case involving two UofO students on-going where such a Code could have been applied. Nothing is happening, the University management is very open to it, we would need to raise in a meeting with the President, and be well-prepared for push-back by the student federation (where apparently the paid staff with corporate memory would be a large stumbling block, rather than the elected folks).

4. I also raised the eligibility criteria for the problematic Telfer award. This award is run by UofO's Alumni association. Michel (not sure of his last name, but from the University) undertook to get us the criteria, which date from the 1980's. If we want something done to update them, two ideas are to gather a group of SH UofO alumni to work on it, or reply to the Dean of the Telfer school (who replied to François' letter on the subject) strongly suggesting this be a project for a class on Corporate Social Responsibility.



5. Michel from the University provided further info on the Friel and Laurier residence, which will be UofO managed. It is for first year students. There will be no external UofO branding on the building, only internal. The ground floor will remain commercial, so far, a gym, a coffee shop, a pizza place and a juice bar are going in (there are 3 more commercial spaces to let). Mathieu suggested the University could support PMR's work by somehow integrating SH historical names into the building (names of floors, for example). There was interest. François noted that the first Francophone named to the Supreme Court had lived at that address.

6. Mathieu updated on: the R4 review (his office will circulate the presentation given last week to the group, I will circulate it to the Board); that By-law is making progress on garbage issues - in particular with presenting enclosure options to landlords, apparently Mathieu's office gets a fair number of calls from landlords about this issue, which he considers a good sign; the gazebo, talks are progressing - I mentioned that they had stalled on the \$450K number, he was not aware, but suggested if we run the project it would be way cheaper (!) like \$140K and mentioned other matching funds.

7. Mathieu and the University are ready and willing to work on the UofO accommodation website, whenever we are ready to engage, i.e., the ball is in our court (again).

Susan



REPORT FROM THE GAZEBO COMMITTEE

Hello Chad and Susan (and any other Board members interested in the gazebo project),

I submitted a draft of the gazebo application to Renée Proteau (Parks and Rec Planner) so that she could provide me with her feedback in advance of the March 1 deadline.

Please see her below reply. In particular, if you scroll down below her signature, she has identified the costs she expects to see on the application. As you will see, the project involves more costs than the cost of the gazebo itself. [For example, look at the contingency budget of **\$142,000 for possible remediation of contaminated soils and replacement of the concrete slab.**] In a nutshell, **Estimated project total - \$497,000; Requested Grant amount from the City - \$248,500**

Renee indicated to us at the gazebo meeting on Jan. 23 that we need to aim to have a higher paper budget assigned to the project because once the City assigns the budget, we cannot get an increase later if we need it. So many of the numbers are scary paper numbers.

Although the estimate provided by Renée is potentially more than the project will actually cost, I am concerned that the total cost will end up being way more than ASH originally thought, such that the \$26,000 from the Homestead account does not even come close to covering our one-half share of the project total. Even if we go the pre-fab gazebo route, the total cost of the project would not drop substantially.

With this information in mind, is this a project that ASH still wants to move forward with? May I have your thoughts please?

Megan



LETTER FROM ASH PRESIDENT – R4 DRAFT PROPOSALS

February 19, 2018

Councillors Fleury and Leiper,

I was pleased to have an opportunity to speak to each of a bit last week at the City's presentation on the R4 Review. We discussed some concerns regarding the study and its resulting proposals, I will try to summarize those concerns herein. Please note that this is my initial reaction and not an official ASH position.

With regard to Phase 1, my primary concern relates to the rooming house definition. ASH and others have been raising concerns about the existing definition and the City's ability to enforce it for a number of years, so I am glad to see that the City intends to rewrite the definition to be clearer and more enforceable. However, the proposed definition relies on the concept of "single housekeeping unit". The definition for this is,

“Single housekeeping unit” means a person or group of people who:

1. may or may not be related;
2. live together as a household;
3. exercise a meaningful degree of collective decision-making and responsibility for the management of the interior of the dwelling unit

If I understand it correctly, in order to verify that a unit is a rooming house bylaw staff would need to determine whether or not the occupants constitute a "single housekeeping unit". To do this, they would have to be able to gain entrance to a unit and have sufficient time and access to be able to ascertain whether or not the people in the unit share responsibility and make collective decisions. I understand that this concept may be desirable as it is tested in court but I question how a bylaw officer will actually be able to ascertain whether or not the occupants really constitute a single housekeeping unit. Ultimately, I think this definition would remain virtually unenforceable. I also worry about the resources we have for bylaw enforcement, we keep adding duties to them without additional resources.

I also find myself wondering why staff are proposing to eliminate landscape area requirements and to reduce amenity space requirements. Some of our biggest concerns with these bunkhouse buildings have been around the damage to mature trees, the loss of green space, the lack of permeable surface on the property, and the mass of the buildings themselves. The landscape and amenity space requirements help



to reduce the overall permissible mass and to ensure that there is some landscaping and permeable surfaces.

With regard to Phase 2, I was pleased to see that staff talked about the design of new buildings and said they would want to find ways to ensure that new development in mature neighbourhoods was better designed and respected the character of the area. I think this will be of paramount importance. What seemed to be missing in the presentation was any consideration for further reducing the permissible building envelope. As ASH has pointed out before, zoning in Sandy Hill currently allows a building envelope between 2 and 2.5 times the permissible building envelope in comparable neighbourhoods in Toronto, such as the Annex. This is likely the case for all of our mature neighbourhoods. This issue was supposed to be addressed in Infill 2, but was not. Why are we not addressing this?

If I may, personally I think we need to do away with all the current residential zoning and start from scratch. Why should any area permit single-family homes exclusively? And why do we have relatively urban neighbours that are full of single-family bungalows on huge lots? I think we would be much better served to have fewer residential zones with more permissible uses and tighter building envelope requirements. For example, perhaps we should have simply low-density, medium-density and high-density residential areas. In low-density you would be permitted all types of residential development other than apartment buildings, the height would be limited to 3-storeys, and a limit would be placed on the maximum density. In medium-density we would allow all forms of residential development including apartment buildings, the height limit might be higher depending on the current predominant heights, and the permissible density would be higher and have both a minimum and a maximum. Finally, in high-density areas all forms of residential development, including high-rise, would be permitted and there would be a minimum permissible density. I hope that Phase 2 will do more than just tweak existing zoning, we need to have a new vision for how are mature neighbourhoods will evolve in the future.

Thank you for taking the time to discuss these issues with me, and for reading this email. I am hoping that we can do a better job of engaging the community in Phase 2 of this review. It is frustrating to see City staff present things as a fait accompli.

Best regards,
Chad Rollins