

June 18, 2019

Ann O'Connor

Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development
110 Laurier Ave West

Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

316 Somerset St. - D07-12-18-0055

Dear Ms. O'Connor:

ASH has reviewed the subject proposal and offers the following comments and suggestions.

- 1. On page 2 we would like to note that the rationale proposed, "Given its proximity to the University of Ottawa campus (within approximately 500m), it is anticipated that a significant portion of housing in this area accommodates the large student population." is incorrect and runs contrary to the Sandy Hill Secondary Plan, which states its role as a policy is:
 - "a. To preserve and enhance Sandy Hill as an attractive residential neighbourhood, especially for family living.
 - b. To provide for a broad range of socio-economic groups.
 - c. To accept a modest increase in population, primarily as a way of housing some of the growth in the Central Area labour force."
- 2. With respect to the Official Plan, 2003, we would like to note that this development "must be compatible with the existing community character so that it enhances and builds upon desirable patterns of built form and open space". We would note that none of the buildings in the surrounding area on similar lot sizes are 3 full storeys with a flat roof they are at most two and half storeys with peaked roofs.
- 3. We would argue that the following statements, also used to justify this design, are therefore also incorrect: "The development represents an opportunity for intensification through redevelopment in a manner which is compatible with the existing scale of development along Somerset Street, particularly in terms of density, building height and overall massing." And "The development responds to design and compatibility objectives of the Official Plan by proposing a three-storey apartment dwelling which is compatible and of a consistent scale with neighbouring low-rise development. ...The development contributes to desirable patterns of built form by providing for building setbacks, orientation and massing which complement the character of the street." The three-storey apartment building is neither compatible and of a consistent scale with other lots of a similar size, and therefore neither is its massing. The statements that follow about footprint and height are also incorrect.



- 4. It is also incorrect to say a street tree will be added, as a mature tree already exists in the front yard, and apparently will be cut down.
- 5. We would question the term "intricate articulation" and many other meaningless phrases in the design statement, as they make no attempt to describe how the building is compatible with the surrounding area by referencing neighbouring designs (because it is not compatible, in either form or materiality).
- 6. The Official Plan states that the design should 'accommodate the needs of a range of people of different incomes and lifestyles at various stages in the life cycle." This development is a 4-unit 16 bedroom building aimed specifically at students. This proposal does not address the shortage of accommodation for the missing middle in Sandy Hill, and exacerbates the gap that is appearing in our neighbourhood where no new developments are being built for the missing middle.
- 7. This development would not be attractive to families as storage is limited, no laundry facilities are offered, and the size of the living spaces ("Kitchen/Dining") is not conducive to family living as they are barely bigger than the bedrooms. The four bedrooms would be too many for a young professional or a couple. There is no elevator provided, so accessibility for families with children, seniors or the disabled would make it very difficult to rent in this development. It does not allow for a range of socio-economic groups.
- 8. As per above, these issues were raised in the pre-consult and have obviously not been addressed: "Please be aware that as per the definition of a "Dwelling Unit," each dwelling unit must function as a 'single housekeeping unit'. As such, there needs to be collective decision making about the care and use of each dwelling unit. To achieve this, please consider reducing the number of bedrooms and providing a larger interior amenity space for tenants. Consider how the site will function in its entirety and how the garbage, amenity areas, storage, communal areas (such as the kitchen), washing/drying machines will be shared by tenants. Consider the impact that the internal functioning of the site has on both the future tenants and the neighbouring community. ...

 Recommend providing more diversity in the internal make-up/built form to attract a variety of different tenants."
- 9. We trust the City will refuse the path abutting the driveway, which is not permitted. The building needs a re-design to conform to the Building Code with respect to egress, and to conform to the sideyard setbacks required by the zoning.
- 10. We trust the City will refuse the cantilevered parking space, which is completely unacceptable as compatible design and has been recognized as such in City studies.
- 11. We trust the City will measure to ensure the 30% soft landscaping rule is followed, and that all trees along the property line will be fully protected at all times during any demolition or construction. Please be advised that the neighbour on the property abutting the east side of the backyard has had the opinion of a professional forester and will require extensive protection of the trees' root systems and branches.
- 12. We trust the City will require private garbage pickup.

Overall, this development is unacceptable and requires a complete re-design to serve the purposes of all populations seeking rental accommodation.



Thank you for taking into account these comments, and we look forward to seeing the next iteration of the development application, and plans.

Please do not hesitate to contact ASH with any questions you may have.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Young

President, Action Sandy Hill

Susan yeung