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1 - Introduction

In October 2012, Canada Lands Company commenced an integrated Planning Act and Environmental Assessment Act process for the lands formerly known as CFB Rockcliffe. The purpose of the project is to prepare a Community Design Plan (CDP) for approval by the City of Ottawa.

A key component of the CDP process is the coordination and integration of the public consultation for the CDP, including the Planning Act requirements for an implementing Official Plan Amendment and the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for related environmental and infrastructure projects.

The planning and coordination of the infrastructure and environmental management requirements for the CDP, in consultation with the community, will help to ensure that the objectives of the City of Ottawa, the Community, other approval authorities and stakeholders are fulfilled.

Consultation is one of the key points for integration. The purpose of this report is to document the consultation process in support of the development of the CDP through the integrated Planning Act and Environmental Assessment Act process that has taken place from Fall 2012 through Spring 2014.

2 – Overall Consultation Objectives

Consultation activities for this project were undertaken with the goal of fostering open dialogue between Canada Lands Company (CLC) and community representatives, as well as various other stakeholders, including approving agencies, adjacent property owners, and the general public. A key party involved in the ongoing consultation is the Algonquins of Ontario (AOO). Initiating consultation early in the planning process allows the Canada Lands project team to identify issues of concern and address them in the development of this new future community.

Phase 1 of the consultation process coincided with Phase 1 of the CDP process, from September 2012 through January 2013. There was some overlap between Phases 1 and 2, so that members of the public could continue to provide ideas and commentary to the project team.
following the November 26, 2012 Ideas Fair. The project team will continue to receive comments from the public to address Phase 1 topics throughout the CDP process.

Phase 2 of the consultation process began in earnest in January 2013 and was focused on refining the input on key principles and objectives from Phase 1 and developing a range of design concepts for the new community. These design concepts were built from the community input and that of the technical agencies. The intent of Phase 2 was to get feedback on these concepts to set the stage for the development of a preferred concept in Phase 3 that would form the basis for a community design plan.

The approach to consultation has been designed to meet statutory requirements, facilitate on-going cooperation and coordination with relevant stakeholders, capitalize on the local knowledge possessed by the people who live and work in the project area, and satisfy the following study objectives for the first phase of consultation:

- Introduce the project and the Environmental Assessment process.
- Discuss the problems and opportunities to be addressed by the project, including an assessment of existing and future land use, travel demand, and transportation network requirements.
- Discuss potential solutions to address the problems and opportunities, including construction of new roads and an improved transit priority corridor.
- Establish a collective vision for the housing mix, employment centre opportunities, small retail and open space strategies.
- Introduce and refine the evaluation process based on input received through consultation.
- Introduce technical constraints influencing the location and design of the project.

3 - Public Notifications

Bilingual notification for the commencement of the Canada Lands Company Rockcliffe Lands Community Design Plan (CDP) as well as bilingual notification of all the major public events was provided through the following sources:

- Newspaper Notices: Ottawa Citizen, The Sun and LeDroit, Manor Park Chronicle and EMC News

Examples of the notices used in Phases 1 and 2 are included in Appendix 1.
Phase 1 - Publication Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park Chronicle</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Sun</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeDroit</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Citizen</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 2 - Publication Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ottawa Citizen</td>
<td>May 16 and 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC Website Notifications</td>
<td>Started April 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ottawa Sun</td>
<td>May 16 and 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online registration on CLC Website</td>
<td>Started April 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeDroit</td>
<td>May 16 and 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-blast Notification</td>
<td>May 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 – Public Advisory Group

A Public Advisory Group (PAG) was formed in October 2012 as the Canada Lands Project Team met individually with community associations and other organizations that were located in the vicinity of the Rockcliffe Lands site. The PAG is intended to play an important role throughout the community design plan process.

The list of PAG members and their community affiliations includes:

1. Bob Publicover, **Cardinal Glen Community Association**
2. Darlene Monkman, resident of **Drayton Private**
3. Maurice Hladik, **Fairhaven Co-operative Community Incorporated**
4. Andrew Wisniowski, **Lindenlea Community Association**
5. Marc Lessard, **Manor Park Community Association**
6. Roslyn Butler, **New Edinburgh Community Alliance**
7. Iola Price, **Rockcliffe Park Residents Association**
8. Norm Kruse, **Rockcliffe Mews and Carson Grove Residents Association**
9. John Murray, representative of the **Rockcliffe Yacht Club**
10. Jane Brammer, **Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association**
11. Mark Kaluski, Director, **Quartier Vanier Merchants Association (BIA)**
12. Mike Bulthuis, **Vanier Community Association**
13. Ross Taylor, **Vanier Community Association**
14. Betty Ward, resident of the **Cummings** community
15. Al Crosby, **Greenspace Alliance**
16. Penny Thompson, **Manor Park Community Association**
17. Alex McNiven, **Cardinal Glen Community Association**
18. Ajay Singh, **Cardinal Glen Community Association**
At its first meeting, the PAG discussed issues and concerns. The group also began to define their mandate along with roles and responsibilities. The PAG members agreed to inform their respective boards and members of any Canada Lands public event and important milestones. Their primary purpose has been to act as a liaison with their respective communities, sharing information and then bringing this back to the Canada Lands team. To ensure transparency and broader communication within the PAG and other groups that may be formed along the way, it was agreed that the Canada Lands Company would post meeting notes on its website in a timely fashion.

The PAG has met at key points throughout the process to provide input directly to Canada Lands and the consulting team. Meeting notes of all of the Public Advisory Group meetings are found in Appendix 2.
5 - Other Consultation Meetings

A - Phase 1

In addition to the initial PAG meeting, the Canada Lands Team met separately with representatives from the following community organizations:

1. New Edinburgh Community Alliance: October 3
2. Manor Park Community Association: October 3
3. Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association: October 5 and 26
4. Cardinal Glen Community Association: October 19
5. Rockcliffe Mews and Carson Grove Residents Association: October 19
6. Greenspace Alliance: October 31
7. Rockcliffe Park Residents Association: November 8
8. Community Council of Overbrook: November 9
9. Vanier Community Association: November 9
10. Lindenlea Community Association: November 16
11. Fairhaven Co-operative Community Incorporated: November 16 and 30

The Canada Lands Team also met with other community organizations such as the Rockcliffe Flying Club to discuss issues relating to the redevelopment of the Rockcliffe lands. Other organizations have voiced an interest in meeting with Canada Lands and it has met with such organizations, individuals and groups of interested parties during the CDP process. For example, Canada Lands has met with adjacent residential neighbours and groups interested in affordable housing.

B - Phase 2

Algonquins of Ontario

The Canada Lands Company maintains ongoing consultation with the Algonquins of Ontario. Prior to acquiring the lands, Canada Lands and the AOO entered into an exciting and innovative Participation Agreement, executed in 2010. This Agreement establishes a direct financial interest for the AOO in the development of one of the most desirable and valuable parcels of land in Canada. Opportunities exist between Canada Lands and AOO which include a host of initiatives pertaining to the commemoration of the history and connection of the Algonquins people with this site.

Canada Lands has asked the AOO for ideas for the overall name of the new community, including names for neighborhoods, streets, and parks. This naming process may also provide valuable insights into Algonquin commemoration to be developed in the future.
Other Community Gatherings

From time to time, particular neighborhood organizations and individuals have requested meetings with the Canada Lands Team to discuss the new development. In addition to the Public Advisory Group, Canada Lands has met with neighbours in close proximity to the site. These individuals reside on Drayton Private, Thorncliffe Village and Foxview Place, immediately to the south of the former CFB Rockcliffe.

Additional Special Interest Groups

Among other meetings, the Canada Lands Team has met with the Montfort Hospital, La Cité Collégiale, and local school boards. Discussions have been initiated with organizations interested in providing affordable housing to residents of Ottawa. Canada Lands attempts to address every request, big or small, whether it is a simple email or a phone call. The Canada Lands Ottawa office ensures that each individual receives answers to their questions in a prompt and timely fashion.

6 - Summary of Major Consultation Events

A - Phase 1 - November 26, 2012

Ideas Fair, November 26, 2012 – Canadian Aviation and Space Museum

Ideas Fair

The Ideas Fair drew 700 people between 3:00 pm and 9:00 pm on Monday November 26, 2012, at the Canadian Aviation and Space Museum. The event featured two presentations from the Canada Lands team, each followed by a Question and Answer period. The event also featured seven informative and interactive stations allowing young and old to express their views and aspirations for the future development. These stations included a 3D model of the site and an
Ideas Cloud illustrating an aerial photograph of the Canada Lands site. At both of these stations, the public was invited to write down on post-it notes what they would like to see on the site. As a result, comments addressed everything from open space amenities to various building types, both commercial and/or residential. Children were asked to choose among different play type structures by placing dots on their three favourite types. A speaker’s corner allowed participants to record on video their thoughts and opinions. The Ideas Fair also featured a booth from the Canada Lands Corporate Communications Office, illustrating the Company’s many other projects around the country.

A questionnaire and comment sheets were provided for additional feedback. The Canada Lands website was available at computer stations in several locations, indicating where people could go online to provide more information following the event. To date, more than 500 people have signed up to receive Canada Lands Rockcliffe newsletters.

Material covered at the Ideas Fair was available in French and English and presented on display. This material was also made available online via the Canada Lands Company’s project website at www.clcrochcliffe.ca. The City of Ottawa also featured a web page dedicated to the project.

A summary of the Ideas Fair discussions and commentary can be found in Appendix 3.

**Ideas Fair – Analysis of Comments Received**

The goal of the Ideas Fair was to allow Canada Lands Company the opportunity to meaningfully gauge the public’s interest and what they truly envisioned for the future of this new community. In order to achieve this goal, the Canada Lands team introduced the project by explaining the history of the site, where the project had left off in 2007 and what has transpired since. It was made very clear that this first event was an invitation to express all aspirations, since the Ideas Fair was at the very beginning of the CDP process.

The process for completing the Community Design Plan requirements was clearly explained. The presentations were made by Canada Lands Company’s consultants, including Brook McIlroy, Janet Rosenberg & Studio, MMM Group. Canada Lands Company’s Director of Corporate Communications and Director of Real Estate for Rockcliffe also participated in the presentation.

Public comments were grouped into themes and listed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land uses – general</th>
<th>Building Forms</th>
<th>A new Site Name</th>
<th>Kettle Island Bridge Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Density</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Overall Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Social Themes</td>
<td>Schools/Institutions</td>
<td>Trees/Green Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Types</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments repeated most often were the following (brackets indicate how many times these comments were noted):

- Housing affordability for all incomes (36) – single most repeated comment
- Transportation impacts on adjacent road networks - biggest issue (35)
- Protection of existing trees/forests/birds/animals, open space (64) – largest group of similar comments
- Interconnecting trails/fitness/walking/bikes (35)

Clearly the comments indicate a desire to preserve as much as possible the natural topography of the site; to enhance the area’s walkability and connectivity; to create a road network that will manage impacts on adjacent communities and; to develop housing within a broad range of affordability and building types.

**Consultation Phase 1 Summary**

In summary, based on the objectives we had identified for Phase 1, we are comfortable that these objectives have been met as indicated in the following:

- Introduce the project and the Environmental Assessment process. *Completed.*
- Discuss the problems and opportunities to be addressed by the project, including an assessment of existing and future land use, travel demand, and transportation network requirements. *Completed*
- Discuss potential solutions to address the problems and opportunities, including construction of new roads and improved transit priority corridor. *Significant progress made – continuing to refine*
- Establish a collective vision for the housing mix, employment centre opportunities, small retail and open space strategies. *Significant progress made – continuing to refine*
- Introduce and refine the evaluation process based on input received through consultation. *Significant progress made – continuing to refine*
- Introduce technical constraints influencing the location and design of the project- *Completed*
The primary purpose of Phase 2 of the community design plan process was to prepare and evaluate alternative land use design options for the development of the Rockcliffe site. In doing so, the team was also required to further advance the community design vision as the guiding force for activities in Phase 2 and to review alternative ways to address problems and pursue the opportunities identified during Phase 1 and the Ideas Fair.

Based on feedback from Phase 1, it was also determined that additional means were required to engage the community and affected and interested agencies in the process of considering alternatives. During Phase 2, it was decided that an interactive workshop based session would be a very useful tool to compliment the usual open house type of event. As well, additional meetings were held with community based and institutionally based groups in the area to provide greater outreach.

**Interactive Public Workshop and Open House**

The Interactive Public Workshop and Open House drew close to 300 people between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm on Saturday, May 25, 2013 at the Ottawa Conference and Events Centre. The event featured two separate areas:

- an open house drop-in centre with a variety of interactive stations including a visual PowerPoint presentation and a team of experts to answer questions from visitors
- a large room for an all-day interactive workshop with breakout discussion groups.

During the open house, participants were encouraged to:

- fill out evaluation forms
- write or draw on maps and boards
- write their thoughts, ideas and suggestions on post-it notes and/or comment sheets.
The open house portion of the day reported 136 people who signed in. More than 104 people attended the workshop and a total of 37 people completed the evaluation form.

As they had done in the first Canada Lands public event entitled Ideas Fair held last November 2012, Canada Lands Company again staffed a booth from the Corporate Office to illustrate the Company’s many other projects around the country.

Material covered during both the Open House and Workshop was available in French and English and presented on display boards. The content of the second event material was also made available online via the Canada Lands Company’s website and the City of Ottawa featured a web page dedicated to the project.

The display boards covered the following topics:

- Welcome and introduction to the Canada Lands Rockcliffe Redevelopment Project
- Community Design Plan and Municipal Class Environmental Assessment
- Overall Project Process
- Community Design Vision
- Project Progress/Status
- Three featured Alternative Community Design Plans

A summary of the Interactive Public Workshop and Open House can be found in Appendix 4.

**Interactive Workshop – Analysis of Comments Received**

This second public event was the kick-off of Phase 2 of the Canada Lands CDP’s public participation component. Based on comments received at the Ideas Fair, along with other
public comments and consultations held throughout the winter and early spring of 2013, the Interactive Workshop and Open House focused its discussion around the three new community design plan alternatives. The illustrations and descriptions of potential community design plans were the result of the opinions and suggestions voiced from the public in terms of housing mix, employment centre opportunities, small retail and open space strategies.

The interactive workshop began with a welcome from Councillor Peter Clark of Ward 13 (Rideau-Rockcliffe). An introduction to the event’s activities was then presented by Don Schultz, Canada Lands Director of Real Estate for Rockcliffe.

The three Community Design Plan Alternatives were then described by Anne McIlroy of Brook McIlroy and Janet Rosenberg of Janet Rosenberg & Studio, Canada Lands Company’s consultants on urban design and landscape architecture.

The alternatives were entitled: The Grid, True North and The Arc. These three design plans featured distinctive differences and characteristics in all aspects in order to allow for optimum innovation and promote broader public discussion.

Workshop participants were divided into tables of 8, each with a volunteer facilitator and scribe. The purpose of the workshops was to engage the participants in a group discussion and stimulate them to express their views so that common issues and comments could be recorded. It was not intended to record and catalogue individual responses only to capture overall comments and concerns. Momentum Planning and Communications, on behalf of Canada Lands and the City of Ottawa, held training sessions for the volunteer facilitators, most of whom were City staff or members of the Public Advisory Group (PAG) to ensure that each session was managed and information recorded in a similar fashion.

Participants were asked to review the three proposed alternatives under the following subject matters:

- Urban Lifestyles – Live, Work, Play: Aspects of the Community
- Blue (water) and Green (parks, trees, etc.) Infrastructure
- Connections: All Modes of Transportation
- An Overall Look at the Alternatives

A representative from each group then shared with the entire audience the comments from their respective tables. This commentary was recorded and analyzed to identify common themes and issues. This summary and analysis is included in Appendix 4B.

During the discussion, Ms. Jennifer Shepherd, a tapestry muralist drew and captured visual images and words that best described comments and opinions that emerged from the workshop table discussion summaries. The following image is an example of one of murals based on the workshop relating to the theme of Connections.
A comparative analysis of the three alternatives was also undertaken using an evaluation form (see Appendix 4C). This evaluation compared the alternatives on the basis of four primary areas of interest – Green Infrastructure; Blue Infrastructure; Urban Lifestyles and Connections. These areas of interest also connected directly with the content of the interactive workshops held during the day.

The following table represents the results from the 37 responses received at the Open House. Not all of criteria add to 37 as not everyone completed the entire form. The intent of the evaluation was not to choose one alternative over another but to provide a comparison as to how each achieved the identified objectives. The number in each box represents the total votes cast in that category. The colours added to the box showing the tabulated results highlight where the highest number of votes was recorded for achieving a specific objective (yellow); where the highest number of votes was recorded for partly achieving an objective (blue); and where highest number of votes was recorded for not achieving an objective (green).

As can be seen none of the alternatives came out as the best in all categories. Overall the conclusion reached (albeit on a very limited sample) would be one of strong support for combining elements from each of the alternatives to create a new draft preferred plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of adjacent woodlots</td>
<td>20 Achieves</td>
<td>12 Achieves</td>
<td>12 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Partly achieves</td>
<td>14 Partly achieves</td>
<td>13 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Does not achieve</td>
<td>1 Does not achieve</td>
<td>5 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of significant tree groupings</td>
<td>19 Achieves</td>
<td>9 Achieves</td>
<td>11 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Partly achieves</td>
<td>14 Partly achieves</td>
<td>23 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Does not achieve</td>
<td>4 Does not achieve</td>
<td>4 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of existing vegetation</td>
<td>18 Achieves</td>
<td>10 Achieves</td>
<td>9 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Partly achieves</td>
<td>16 Partly achieves</td>
<td>12 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>4 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of storm water ponds</td>
<td>10 Achieves</td>
<td>9 Achieves</td>
<td>12 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Partly achieves</td>
<td>12 Partly achieves</td>
<td>12 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Does not achieve</td>
<td>4 Does not achieve</td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates opportunity for open water on site</td>
<td>6 Achieves</td>
<td>14 Achieves</td>
<td>7 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Partly achieves</td>
<td>11 Partly achieves</td>
<td>13 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Does not achieve</td>
<td>3 Does not achieve</td>
<td>9 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **Yellow**: Highest Score for Achieves
- **Light Blue**: Highest Score for Partly Achieves
- **Green**: Highest Score for Does Not Achieve

The number in the box is the actual score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Lifestyles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable/cycling distances in Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>17 Achieves</td>
<td>16 Achieves</td>
<td>15 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Partly achieves</td>
<td>12 Partly achieves</td>
<td>15 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Does not achieve</td>
<td>1 Does not achieve</td>
<td>7 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active recreation (parks) and pathways well located</td>
<td>19 Achieves</td>
<td>14 Achieves</td>
<td>15 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Partly achieves</td>
<td>10 Partly achieves</td>
<td>8 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>7 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of land uses and proximity of these uses to each other</td>
<td>19 Achieves</td>
<td>11 Achieves</td>
<td>9 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Partly achieves</td>
<td>18 Partly achieves</td>
<td>17 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>8 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing densities, heights and types</td>
<td>19 Achieves</td>
<td>13 Achieves</td>
<td>14 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Partly achieves</td>
<td>12 Partly achieves</td>
<td>10 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>2 Does not achieve</td>
<td>7 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving yourself around in the community easily and with choices¹</td>
<td>17 Achieves</td>
<td>11 Achieves</td>
<td>12 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Partly achieves</td>
<td>11 Partly achieves</td>
<td>10 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Does not achieve</td>
<td>6 Does not achieve</td>
<td>10 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving yourself in/out of the community easily and with choices¹</td>
<td>20 Achieves</td>
<td>7 Achieves</td>
<td>13 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Partly achieves</td>
<td>12 Partly achieves</td>
<td>9 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Does not achieve</td>
<td>8 Does not achieve</td>
<td>9 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and alignment of roads</td>
<td>18 Achieves</td>
<td>8 Achieves</td>
<td>10 Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Partly achieves</td>
<td>11 Partly achieves</td>
<td>15 Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Does not achieve</td>
<td>8 Does not achieve</td>
<td>7 Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- yellow: Highest Score for Achieves
- blue: Highest Score for Partly Achieves
- green: Highest Score for Does Not Achieve

The number in the box is the actual score.
Consultation Phase 2 Summary

In summary, based on the objectives we had identified for Phases 1 and 2, we are comfortable that these objectives have been sufficiently met to proceed to the final phase of the project. The following is a summary of those objectives:

- Establish a collective vision to guide the development of alternatives land use concepts and to evaluate them. **Completed**
- Introduce a range of options for evaluation as required by the Environmental Assessment and community design plan processes. **Completed.**
- Evaluate the alternative development concepts to determine appropriate solutions to the problems and set the stage for preparation of the preferred community design plan. **Significant progress made – continuing to refine**

7 - Next Steps: Phase 3 - Community Design Plan (CDP)

In Phase 2, Canada Lands Company’s Rockcliffe Community Design Plan (CDP) process directed the public’s attention to looking at the long term future of a new community, and making connections not only within the site but also with the surrounding neighbourhoods. A preliminary design vision was developed based on the key principles identified by the community in Phase 1 and this vision, in turn, was used to guide the preparation of alternative design concepts for evaluation.

The Community Design Plan process was undertaken in order to seek out the best redevelopment ideas for the community design plan area of 134 hectares (330 acres) as required to meet the principles and policies of Ottawa’s Official Plan. As partners in this exercise, the City of Ottawa staff work hand in hand with CLC as the developer landowner, school boards, local businesses, employers and other interested parties to lay out a blue print that will then guide the development and ensure this designated area responds and conforms to the City of Ottawa’s Official Plan.

The need for an overall design vision was identified as a work in progress coming out of the Ideas Fair. Using the commentary and input from the Ideas Fair in combination with technical input from other stakeholders, the design team developed a preliminary design vision and a set of guiding principles at the outset of Phase 2.

During Phase 2, this vision has been a guiding influence in the development of the alternative concepts and their refinement into the draft preferred plan. The following is the vision as presented at the Open House:

*The redevelopment of the former Canadian Forces Base Rockcliffe will be a contemporary mixed-use community. It will be walkable, cycling-supportive, transit-oriented and built at a human scale. These principles will be realized through improved*
connectivity to the surrounding neighbourhoods, and by providing access to open space for everyone.

The site will connect to the history of the Algonquin people. It will celebrate its military heritage. Redevelopment of the former CFB Rockcliffe will demonstrate urban design and landscape excellence, innovation in sustainability, cultural/social dynamism, and a high quality of life. It will be forward-looking in its development approach by integrating the site’s natural ecological functions into the design.

While not specifically evaluated as part of the Open House and Workshop, the vision has been the subject of a number of written submissions and discussion with the Public Advisory Group. The wording of the vision also came under scrutiny as part of the development of the preferred plan to ensure that the plan and the future development vision were in accord. The result of this review has been the confirmation of the current wording in the design vision and the supporting principles. The full text of the vision and principles can be found in Appendix 5.

The three alternative design concepts presented at the May 2013 public event, the Grid, True North and the Arc, stimulated meaningful discussion and were distinct enough to provide the participants with sufficient data and information to help carve the next step: the preferred plan.

In Phase 3, Canada Lands Company will present a preferred design plan that will blend together the best of all three options. The preferred plan will be presented in early 2014 at another public event where comments, suggestions and ideas will once again be sought from all stakeholders.

It is anticipated that Canada Lands will submit its final proposed community design plan to the City of Ottawa in early 2014 for its consideration and approval.
APPENDIX 1 – Public Notices

- 1A - Phase 1 – November 26, 2012 – Ideas Fair
- 1B – Phase 2 – May 25, 2013 – Interactive Workshop and Open House
Vous êtes invités à la première
Foire aux idées des terrains Rockcliffe de la SIC

La Société immobilière du Canada organise une foire aux idées pour faciliter le partage de renseignements à propos du site de l’ancienne base des Forces canadiennes Rockcliffe. Les résidents auront la possibilité d’offrir leurs idées et suggestions concernant l’avenir du site. Les sessions incluront une présentation informelle, une station pour les enfants, et une foire aux idées interactive. La SIC a l’intention de formuler un Plan de conception communautaire avec l’appui de la communauté.


La Société immobilière du Canada offre un service de navette jusqu’au Musée de l’aviation et de l’espace du Canada, le 26 novembre 2012, pour les gens qui veulent se rendre à la Foire aux idées. La navette fera régulièrement l’aller-retour entre l’entrée principale du hôtel Montfort et le Musée, à compter de 15 h. La dernière navette quittera le Musée à 21 h 30 h.

Date : Lundi, 26 novembre 2012
Horaire : de 15 h à 21 h (1ère session à 16 h, et 2e session à 19 h)
Endroit : Musée de l’aviation et de l’espace du Canada 11, Promenade de l’Aviation, Ottawa

www.clcrockcliffe.ca

Join us for the first
CLC Rockcliffe Lands Ideas Fair

Canada Lands Company is hosting an ideas fair in order to share information about the former Canadian Forces Base Rockcliffe site. Residents will have an opportunity to contribute ideas about what they would like to see on this site. Sessions will include an informational presentation, a children’s station and an interactive ideas fair. CLC’s goal is to prepare a Community Design Plan with the support of the community.

In conjunction with the Community Planning on this project, Canada Lands Company is commencing (in association with the City of Ottawa) a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process for the water, wastewater, stormwater, roads, transit and active transportation infrastructure elements of the plan. More information on this process will be available at the meeting and on the project website.

CLC is pleased to provide a shuttle service to and from the Canadian Aviation and Space Museum on Monday November 26, 2012 for individuals taking public transit to attend the Ideas Fair. The shuttle will arrive and depart from the main entrance of the Montfort hospital at regular intervals beginning at 3:00pm.

Date: Monday, November 26, 2012
Time: 3:00-9:00 p.m. (Session one @ 4pm, Session two @ 7pm)
Location: Canada Aviation and Space Museum 11 Aviation Parkway, Ottawa

www.clcrockcliffe.ca

LeDroit (example) Ottawa Citizen (example)
APPENDIX 1B – Phase 2 – May 25, 2013 Interactive Workshop and Open House

Notice of Public Open House and Workshop

Rockcliffe Lands Redevelopment

Looking at the big picture: thinking long-term and making the connections

Canada Lands Company, in partnership with the City of Ottawa, is preparing a Community Design Plan and environmental assessment studies to identify a recommended plan for the redevelopment of the former Canadian Forces Base Rockcliffe lands. This project is being conducted using the integrated approach in accordance with Section A.2.8 of the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act and for approval under the Planning Act. Alternatives for providing water, wastewater, stormwater, roads, transit and active transportation infrastructure will be assessed.

The study team is hosting a Public Open House and workshop to share information and to continue to receive feedback from members of the public. The Open House is a follow-up to the ideas Fair held in November 2012, and participants will have the opportunity to review progress on the project to date, and discuss the direction of the plan in an interactive environment. Participants will have an opportunity to meet with representatives from the study team and to review and comment on:

- Existing site conditions and development considerations;
- The vision and supporting principles guiding the planning and development of the site;
- Alternative land use design concepts for the site.

The Public Open House will involve both drop-in hours and a workshop session. Advance registration is required for participation in the workshop session. Limited space is available. Please visit the project website at www.clrockcliffe.ca to register and for further details.

Ottawa Citizen (example)
APPENDIX 2: Public Advisory Group – Meeting Notes

- 2A – Phase 1
- 2B – Phase 2
Don Schultz, Director Real Estate CLC Rockcliffe welcomed everyone.

Round table introductions:

Stephen Willis, MMM Group, Ottawa,
Roslyn Butler, New Edinburgh Community Alliance
Darlene Monkman, resident of Dayton Private
Anthony Keith, Rockcliffe Park Residents Association
Gerry Lajeunesse, volunteer appointed Chair/Facilitator for the new PAG
Nancy Meloshe, Meloshe and Associates Ltd.,
Jane Brammer, Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association
Suzanne Valiquet, Momentum Planning and Communications
Norm Kruse, Rockcliffe Mews and Carson Grove Residents Association
John Murray, representative of the Rockcliffe Yacht Club
Bob Publicover, President of the Cardinal Glen Community Association
Mark Kaluski, Director, Quartier Vanier Merchants Association (BIA)
Maurice Hladik, Fairhaven Community Association
Selma Hassan, City of Ottawa, Planning Department
Andrew Wisniowski Lindenlea Community Association
Marc Lessard, Manor Park Community Association

Regrets: Mike Bulthuis, Vanier Community Association

- CLC Team presented the Summary of Recurring Themes that had been identified at various meetings held with community groups prior to the PAG. It was reviewed to create a base for discussion and to identify other issues and thoughts.
- A member asked about the term Dark Sky – CLC Team explained that this concerned lighting effects that could potentially have an impact on adjacent neighborhoods.
- It was noted the excellent location of the site being in close proximity to the water and the importance to water access for future populations residing on the CLC site. It was felt that interest may grow with the new site, a positive attribute as there are already 100 boats using the club, and dock access is limited.
- Process and transparency from CLC and the City were identified as important issues especially after the Inter-Provincial Bridge consultation exercise.
- CLC Team asked where did the question of traffic, transportation and transit rank within the various communities – the group answered with a show of almost unanimous hands.
• It was indicated the new CLC development will encourage new residents to drive through existing surrounding communities and this too was a growing concern.
• Noted that traffic will increase along St. Laurent Blvd that is already a busy arterial.
• Agreed that Beechwood and Sussex were also congested.
• Added that it was more than just cars, but transit as well. Used was the example of the Montfort Hospital as there is already congestion along that portion of Montréal Road and accessibility to these institutions is difficult.
• Noted that expanding Montréal Road will be a challenge and also that Codd’s to Montréal Rd is a steep and narrow hill to climb. Added that Hemlock/Beechwood will be extremely challenging as these streets are presently at full capacity.
• Noted as well was that streets on the site, like Burma for instance was presently a dead end - if opened up will increase traffic considerably.
• Asked if CLC will have access to NRC allowing for access to other main roads through NRC lands. CLC Team answered that CLC will indeed be proposing that idea but that for the time being CLC’s proposed ideas are very much at a preliminary stage and that CLC is hoping to have these kinds of proposals come forward at the Ideas Fair on November 26th as the Corporation is looking not only for the public to raise issues, but help find solutions too. No official word has been given yet, but a request has been made by CLC to NRC to include a portion of their land in the Community Design Plan. It may not be an official transfer but would allow for good land use planning that will permit to talk about better access points on the east side of the CLC site. Although this is still in early stages, CLC feels that this is an appropriate outlet for traffic to Montréal Road.
• Asked about designing a road for public transit only.
• Indicated that for the most part CLC needs access to adjoining lands to get to main transportation arteries. Mentioned that CLC would like to suggest to the NCC that access be given to the Rockcliffe Parkway.
• CLC Team indicated that the City was now going through its Transportation Master Plan Review. Added that a request has been made to review this idea and others that will benefit everyone, in a more holistic fashion by looking at creative solutions, and looking at better connections not just for cars but also for pedestrian, cycling and transit systems.
• Mentioned the new LRT Station at the Gloucester Centre and CLC Team added that it would be unrealistic to think that the LRT plans will change but also noted that one would like to see how better connections could be incorporated and It was agreed – in essence an improved service for the community.
• Mentioned that as we think of new solutions, we shouldn’t be inflicting new traffic burdens, created by travelers coming from the east going to downtown. Mentioned that this was the case when the base was opened as motorists used the base to get to Beechwood, the bridge and Gatineau. Although retailers on the CLC site may want the through traffic, residents will not.
Discussed was that traffic will depend on the population that will reside there and employment factors. Mentioned that 3,000 to 4,000 may not be a problem, but 15,000 would be as they would move off the base to go to work.

Mentioned that CLC is definitely committed to developing employment uses on the site as the markets are already indicating that notion, and dedicated bus lanes are a definite part of the strategy. Letters have been sent to both the City and NCC officials to enter into a more global look at what the transportation vision will be for this end of the city as CLC will be a large part of the changes that will occur over time.

Reference was made to the former base and how people both lived and worked there. At the time, surrounding businesses and retail thrived. Over the years, this changed once the base was closed. The strip mall located closest to the site has now a new restaurant and some upgrades have been done that seemed to have improved the situation.

Asked what about end of project date and density of residential population. Outcome depends on the transportation infrastructure network and what it can support. Hence importance of discussions with both City and NCC.

Asked about the formula used and it was indicated that the previous project was targeting up to 15,000 based on background documents of the City’s Official Plan. The previous plan did not have a heavy employment mix built into it – CLC needs to look at the residential and employment mix, along with what the market will dictate.

Testing a variety of transportation models will be essential while also taking into consideration intersections – it will be a process of looking at different options as no real concrete answers can be given at this time.

CLC recognizes that transportation is a serious issue and it is one of the formative pieces for this community.

Land use planners and traffic engineers have at times differing viewpoints. Added that communities look at how these changes affect them and commented that engineers sometimes try to convince communities that the system can take on more traffic whereas communities feel differently as they are the ones living and using the roads.

The CLC site will take between 15 to 20 years to build out incrementally. If issues become problematic they can be addressed by exploring new approaches and time will permit their incorporation. A phasing strategy will allow more flexibility to the development.

Reference made to Halifax, Vancouver and New York City mentioning that the waterway could be used as a new form of transportation such as Paul’s Boat Lines. This could help to get people off the roads.

Required would be a considerable sized dock, parking and bus access – with seasonality a big consideration. It could run until the 21st of November.

CLC Team added that from a transit discussion, rapid bus transit and connecting it to the LRT, along with connections to cycling and pedestrian systems, is likely to be the best solution.
- Asked about a successful bus system in place that could be used as a model. It was noted that Ottawa’s was one of Canada’s most successful. Here buses have priority lanes, with a combined ease of movement, along with increased bus technologies, CLC Team indicated that buses are still one of the best transportation solutions for our city.

- Raised the idea of incorporating a bus system, perhaps with smaller busses that would run more frequently to encourage as many people to ride the bus as possible. CLC team added that we would look at the entire area, outside of the air base site as well, and take a more holistic approach to what would work best to address the traffic issues.

- CLC Team added that given good choices, people will opt for transit, and leave their cars at home. Many opportunities exist between the site and the new LRT Blair Station – these will be fully explored.

- CLC Team had a very favourable response from the City in this regard and it was noted that the City had the very same desire to remove cars, thereby removing congestions on our roads and encourage and maximize bus ridership.

- Added that building a community for retired people may encourage more use of transit as they tend to not be out and about during rush hours.

- It was noted that although a good suggestion, CLC cannot regulate who will buy what. To avoid the concept of monoculture, proposing a mix of different types and sizes of units will encourage a broader mix of buyers. Shops, schools and basic services built right on the site, encourages people to stay in the immediate area. Also was mentioned that adding employment centres onto the site, helps as well to deter car use for those living and working there.

- Mentioned the importance of city zoning that allows for mixed commercial and residential side by side.

- Asked if this development would house a concert venue, for example, making it a destination, thereby increasing traffic, or is it to be that no one goes there unless they live there. CLC Team responded by explaining what the city’s official plan indicates – indeed this is to be a mixed community.

- Some portions of the site lend themselves better to mixed use, such as along Montréal Road, closer to the NRC site, but other areas do not. Likely this will not house a large stadium or major city site as those are already in existence elsewhere.

- NCC does own land adjacent to the site, and CLC has no jurisdiction over this land. As it stands it is not know what plans NCC may have for their portion of the property. At some point in time, the NCC may wish to build a National cultural institution.

- CLC Team defined the types of activities or facilities offered would be of “community scale activity”.

- **Communication phase:** CLC Team explained the process in which CLC would like to proceed. At the outset, meetings were held one-on-one, whereby CLC communicated the information about CLC’s intentions and explained at what stage CLC was at and who was involved bringing everyone up to speed on the development.
The next level would be the **consultation phase**, where the PAG provides feedback, with ideas and comments and CLC takes this back to the design team for review. The third step, the **collaboration phase**, would then be where we come back with the design team’s proposals, and we ‘roll up our sleeves’ and work collaboratively together in reviewing these proposed designs.

CLC Team explained that the PAG is a very important group, but that there are others who are also interested in meeting with CLC. For example, there are requests from social and housing groups and individuals interested in having a discussion about their needs and how will CLC accommodate them. Likely another meeting will be held with those individuals.

CLC Team explained that the common thread binding the PAG is primarily based on the fact that all live in close proximity to the site and that the PAG participants will be the most impacted by the development.

**NEW PAG Chair/Facilitator**

- Gerry Lajeunesse was introduced as the new PAG Chair/Facilitator.

**Group’s Mandate**

- The PAG should be a forum for discussion, communication and collaboration with responsibilities on all fronts, reporting back to respective communities while CLC reports back to the rest of team.
- With measures of good faith, respect and sincere intent, Community representatives have the responsibility of getting information to their membership and provide feedback to CLC and then get back to their own communities as the dialogue develops, all the while sharing issues, concerns and solutions.
- Added was the importance of the practical outcomes of the discussions, list action items and include an issue tracking mechanism.
- Mentioned was the importance of having concrete information, whereby a comment or opinion needs to be expressed in a specific timeframe.

**Procedure**

- The CLC team will come back with some facts and information that will help mold the lay of the land and the group will be asked to comment on these very preliminary site areas, very much with a theme related to connections. Once agreed, we will them move to built form and streetscapes.
- PAG will then establish timelines to get back with responses that reflect their individual community’s view points. Time will be needed to engage communities, and it was added that July, August and December are not conducive.
- It was noted that open and honest dialogue will be maintained throughout the consultation process about what CLC can and cannot do.
Communication Tools

- Most community representatives indicated that the majority of their communication is done by email as they have very good lists of names of their respective residents.
- Board meetings will be used to table an official response.
- Community newspapers and media in general, will be used to reach the community at large.
- All agreed that the Manor Park Chronicle and the New Edinburgh News were great vehicles to reach the surrounding communities.
- Facebook pages and websites were also identified as additional tools to get messages to residents.
- Email appeared to be the best method to get information back from residents while board meetings open to the general public could also be used for feedback purposes.
- CLC Team presentations at community meetings was suggested.
- Community representatives were asked if they felt comfortable being the official voice of their individual communities. Most said they would be.
- A month seemed reasonable as far as turnaround time was concerned to get feedback from communities.
- Noted that the reporting mechanism needs to be set so that all groups can be in the know of what other groups are saying.
- It was suggested the CLC website be used as the tool to communicate other group issues.
- Requested that visuals be provided to put up on community websites such as notifications, ads, photographs, and graphics.

CLC Team then moved to the Ideas Fair presentation scheduled for November 26, 2012.

The meeting ended at 9:15 PM
APPENDIX 2B - Phase 2

Meeting No. 2 – January 23, 2013

Location: Richmond Room, City Hall, Ottawa

Attending:

PAG Committee Members
Bob Publicover, Cardinal Glen Community Association
Darlene Monkman, resident of Drayton Private
Maurice Hladik, Fairhaven Co-operative Community Incorporated
Andrew Wisniowski, Lindenlea Community Association
Marc Lessard, Manor Park Community Association
Roslyn Butler, New Edinburgh Community Alliance
Iola Price, Rockcliffe Park Residents Association
John Murray, representative of the Rockcliffe Yacht Club, Manor Park Community Association
Inter-Provincial Bridge Committee
Ross Taylor, Vanier Community Association
Betty Ward, resident of the Cummings community
Al Crosby, Greenspace Alliance

Regrets
Norm Kruse, Rockcliffe Mews and Carson Grove Residents Association
Jane Brammer, Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association
Mark Kaluski, Director, Quartier Vanier Merchants Association (BIA)

Support
Chair: Gerry Lajeunesse, volunteer appointed facilitator
CLC: Don Schultz, Canada Lands Company
MMM: Meredith Lynes, MMM Group, Ottawa
MPC: Suzanne Valiquet, Momentum Planning and Communications
OTTAWA: Selma Hassan, City of Ottawa, Planning Department

Purpose:
To review public comments received at the November 2012 Ideas Fair and for CLC to provide the Public Advisory Group (PAG) with a status update on the project. A subsequent PAG meeting was tentatively scheduled for March 9, 2013.

Notes:
Meeting called to order at: 6:30 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Introduction / Agenda / Review of Meeting Notes (November 21, 2012)</strong></td>
<td><strong>MPC</strong> to send out Doodle calendar request to all <strong>PAG</strong> participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Andrew Wisniowski</strong> to track comments of the <strong>PAG</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study Team</strong> to post meeting notes on the project website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study Team</strong> to post bilingual Public Consultation Report to the project website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chair welcomed all and began a round of introductions.

The Chair asked if there were any corrections/additions to be made to the previous meeting notes. It was decided not to reference the individual who made the comments and just to leave the comments nameless.

The group advised that the **PAG** meeting notes were reviewed and endorsed by the **PAG**.

It was asked if it would be worthwhile to track the comments of the **PAG**. This way, comments could be identified as either “open” or “closed” and the **PAG** could follow what issues were raised, and how/whether they had been addressed. Andrew Wisniowski offered to keep track of comments received and how they were addressed in table format. It was added that in addition to tracking comments, there is a need to keep track of the “dis-satisfiers” that are important to the public. For example, individuals commented that big box stores are not an appropriate retail-use for the site. There is a need to track these types of comments.

It was asked whether the **PAG** would support meeting notes being made available on the **CLC** website. The group agreed this would be acceptable.

A request was made that all participants should submit dates where they are not available to **MPC**. **MPC** agreed to set up a shared calendar where **PAG** members could note their availability. **MPC** will circulate an email request to complete the calendar to all **PAG** members.

It was asked if there were any corrections/additions to be made to the Consultation Summary as prepared by **MPC**. All participants agreed that the summary was comprehensive and covered the comments/concerns that were raised.

It was stated that there is a need for more information about the Interprovincial Bridge and how it relates to this project. **CLC** responded that the two projects will operate independently of one another. It was added that **CLC** will not take an official position on the bridge corridor location options. **CLC** is, however, an interested stakeholder in the bridge planning process. Should the Kettle Island corridor be selected, **CLC** will be involved in the detail design of the project. **PAG** members raised the concern that if this is chosen as the preferred location, it will impact traffic volumes on the Aviation Parkway. It was added that the cost of the bridge is very high and that there is no funding earmarked for the project. We should not anticipate
that this project will be constructed in the short term and it does not make sense to put the CLC Rockcliffe project on hold until decisions relating to the bridge are certain. PAG members suggested that perhaps once the CLC Rockcliffe site is developed, there may be more people to oppose a bridge in the Kettle Island corridor. CLC will continue to provide the NCC with input on the interprovincial bridge project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Ideas Fair Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From CLC’s perspective, they were very pleased with the attendance at the Ideas Fair held on November 26, 2012. 435 people signed the register; however head counts were approximately 700.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MPC** summarized the comments received, as compiled in the 2 page summary. The “ideas cloud” was one of the most well-attended stations. **MPC** elaborated that 258 comments were recorded and put together in the 2 page summary. Several common themes were repeated and are bolded in the 2 page summary. Housing affordability for all incomes was the single-most repeated comment (repeated 36 times). **MPC** asked whether the group was surprised about the results: Some were surprised about the emphasis commenters placed on nature.

Questions were asked about CLC’s experience on other sites and how the comments received are integrated into the final design of CLC sites, and whether it is realistic that the suggestions being put forward will be implemented. **CLC** responded that the Currie Barracks (Calgary) and Garrison Crossing (Chilliwack) projects involved lots of consultation and that public participation was instrumental in guiding the planning and design of the sites. **CLC** added that the consultation for the Chilliwack project was different than this project as the sudden announcement of the base closing had an enormous impact on the community, as it was an important employment centre. The first consultation event for this project drew 2,500 participants.

It was asked if there were any buildings that would be preserved on the CLC Rockcliffe site. **CLC** responded that no buildings will be kept. DND removed Private Married Quarters (PMQ) buildings over a phased program. Some materials from the buildings were reused. DND, PWGSC, and **CLC** are in the final stages of demolishing the last 3 buildings on the site. In addition, the infrastructure underground is in poor condition and will be removed and replaced.

It was asked whether the acreage of the Chilliwack site was comparable to the Rockcliffe site. **CLC** responded it is. The area of the CLC Rockcliffe site is 125 hectares.

Examples of good CDPs were requested. **CLC** agreed to follow-up and find exemplary CDPs to share with the PAG. It was agreed that this would be

---

**Study Team** to post examples of exemplary CDPs to the project website.

**PAG** to provide the study team with examples of relevant projects.

**Study Team** to circulate picture of mature Bur Oak tree on the site and cross-reference age estimate of tree.

**Study Team** to share specialty reports with the PAG once they are finalized.
helpful. It was suggested that these be posted to the project website. CLC agreed that it is valuable for everyone to understand the level of detail that a CDP involves. It was explained that this CDP will also include design guidelines which will guide the designs put forward by developers in the future.

It was stated that there is a need to review the case studies that were recommended to be looked at by participants at the Ideas Fair (Chilliwack, Baba Yaga, Dockside Green etc.). These case studies may provide inspiration for the CLC Rockcliffe site. It was asked if CLC has videos of previous CLC projects which could be shared with the PAG. CLC responded that there are pictures of these projects available. It was added that if the group has any examples they would like to share with the study team, then they would be welcomed. Examples of good neighbourhoods in Germany and Japan were noted.

NB: The links to CLC project websites are as follows:

Garrison Crossing:
http://www.garrisoncrossing.ca/
http://www.CLC.ca/properties/garrison-crossing

Currie Barracks:
http://www.CLC.ca/properties/currie-barracks

It was asked whether there are plans to include employment lands within the site. CLC is committed to including employment areas on the site, with employment and residential uses mixed within the site. It was added that there is a science connection between the hospital and the NRC and the site. Including health sciences facilities as a land use on the site would be appropriate.

Questions were asked about the specialty reports currently underway for the project, and whether anything had been prepared about ‘environmental constraints’. Specifically, the PAG member was looking for a map which identified areas that could not be built on and should be protected. It was stated that it is important to understand what the environmental constraints are and where development can and cannot take place. CLC stated that a draft geotechnical report has been produced. CLC stated that once technical reports are finalized, they will be shared with the public and the advisory committees for review. It was pointed out that at the last meeting; the PAG reviewed an overlay of environmental features (water, greenspace etc.). These drawings were conceptual and prepared by landscape architects. The development will be planned around the significant natural areas. CLC added that the designers are working to design around mature trees on the site in order to save as many healthy trees as possible. This will help to develop a sense of having an established community. For example, the 160 year old
(possibly 300-350 years old) Bur Oak tree will be protected. CLC will circulate a picture of the oak tree. CLC will cross-reference the age of the tree with the arborist report.

It was asked whether there is contamination on the site. The PAG member elaborated that land contamination was the biggest hurdle for the redevelopment of LeBreton Flats. CLC responded that the land transfer agreement between CLC and DND assigned responsibility for the clean-up, demolition, and environmental remediation required. The remaining soil contamination has been identified and CLC will be working on cleaning the remaining contamination on a phased basis.

MPC asked the group to return to ideas for the name of the community and names used within the community. No one on the PAG was aware of any specific use of the land by Aboriginal populations. Knowing the history and land use of the site may be useful in generating names. It was asked if naming rights are part of the agreement with AOO. CLC responded that naming rights are not part of the agreement; however CLC has a commitment to commemorate Algonquins heritage on the site. Ongoing consultation with AOO is taking place. CLC is interested in commemorating the Algonquins, Military and Francophone heritage of the site. It was suggested that CLC not use the name ‘Rockcliffe’ – there is a need to differentiate between the different communities. It was also stated there is already confusion between Rockcliffe Mews and Rockcliffe Park. Too many Rockcliffes concentrated in one part of the city could be an issue. It was stated that it could become a safety issue for emergency services trying to locate an address.

It was asked what events will follow the Ideas Fair. CLC stated that the Public Consultation Report will be finalized, translated, and posted to the Rockcliffe website. CLC stated that the next major public event will likely take place in May 2013 and that a workshop format will be used. A shared calendar will likely be used to register members of the public into specific workshops. For members of the public who would prefer to attend the event without registering for a workshop, a drop-in session will take place in parallel with the workshop. CLC added that in advance of the event, the design team would like to meet with the PAG and review alternatives being considered for the site.

It was asked whether the Public Consultation Report could be circulated to area residents by the Community Associations. It was decided that the Public Consultation Report would be finalized and translated before being distributed more broadly. The complete package will be posted to the website and emailed to the PAG. There was debate about whether a condensed version of the Consultation Summary should be produced or circulated. It was decided that the newsletter being prepared for the project
would provide a briefing on the project and would also direct readers to the project website (www.CLCrkcliffe.ca/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. CLC Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLC described the Chilliwack project. Many lessons from the Chilliwack site can be applied to the Rockcliffe site, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Saving mature trees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixing and matching housing. Chilliwack included all types of housing integrated within the site. This adds to a sense of maturity within a community and creates a unique streetscape. It also avoids the uniformity of newer suburban communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design a neighbourhood for ‘aging in place’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was agreed that it is important to design a neighbourhood which is appropriate for our increasingly senior population. It would be interesting to look at opportunities to connect with the Montfort Hospital. CLC has a relationship with the Montfort. CLC has learned that the Montfort is still expanding and does not have room within their facility for all staff. Hospital administration and other medical businesses could be located on the CLC property. The PAG members were supportive of this idea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was stated that it is important that the site accommodate interim uses and not remain vacant for years (as per the City’s experience with LeBreton Flats). Options are being explored by CLC for interim uses of the site. CLC does not want to have underused or inappropriately used vacant land on the site as it is being developed. CLC is considering a number of ideas:

- Temporary parking for Montfort staff on the parade square. This may require rezoning, site plan approval etc. Access would be from Codd’s road with continuous shuttle buses and video surveillance. Approximately 500 stalls would be provided. CLC has consulted with the adjacent Fairhaven community about this use.

- Soccer field

- Tree nursery – CLC is interested in establishing a nursery on the site in the Spring 2013. This would be established with the Rideau Valley Conservation Foundation. The Foundation has its own tree planting program. CLC would provide the land for the nursery and would replant the trees within the site, and any surplus trees could be planted elsewhere in the region. A secondary tree nursery area would also be established. There would be signs explaining that this is a temporary use. CLC will be visiting the site the Rideau Valley Conservation Foundation next week. It was asked what the anticipated lifecycle of a nursery is. CLC suggested that the trees may be present for 5 years, some 10 years.

**Study Team** to consider the type of trees planted on-site, with preference for native and climate-appropriate species.
Concern was expressed that in Ottawa, temporary uses often become perceived as permanent. CLC responded that the parking structure currently used by the Montfort has a failed membrane which requires replacement – so there is a short-term need to find parking. It is understood that any agreement for the Montfort to park on the CLC site would be temporary.

It was asked whether the roads on the CLC site would be reopened in the interim, given that site visits etc. will be taking place. CLC responded that the site would be open to pedestrians, but not vehicles. Historically there has been gridlock on site roads during peak hours and CLC does not want to recreate this situation. The roads were never City of Ottawa public roads and CLC does not have the same capacity to police the roads as the Military once did. Furthermore, the roads are not sound and cannot handle the regeneration of that degree of traffic. It was asked how traffic would be controlled as development starts. CLC responded that construction areas will be fenced and that proper construction protocols will be in place.

It was asked who will build the buildings. CLC will create the legal parcels of land and install all required infrastructure (underground infrastructure, shallow utilities, roads, sidewalks, street furniture, parks etc.) in advance of development. This creates a marketing advantage. The CLC product is a fully-serviced lot sold to builders who are required to follow the Design Guidelines established as part of this planning phase of this project. It was asked whether a developer could technically rezone their property after purchasing it. CLC responded that over time, there is a chance this would be possible, however the first structure built on the property would be built to the terms set by CLC.

It was asked if it was possible that the Rideau Valley Conservation Foundation and the Ferguson Forest Center harvest seeds from existing trees on the property to ensure that native trees are planted on the site. The City of Ottawa purchases southern tree stock that is not necessarily appropriate for the local conditions. CLC agreed to raise this at subsequent meetings. The majority of trees planted by the Rideau Valley Conservation Foundation are conifers. The majority of trees currently on-site are deciduous. The Landscape Architect for this project is anticipating that climate change will also influence tree selection.

4. **Roles and Responsibilities of the PAG**
   The group reviewed its *mandate and procedures*. The Chair reviewed them. All agreed that the mandate and procedures are acceptable.

5. **New Business**
   Nothing additional.
Meeting No. 3 – March 9, 2013 – 1:00 pm

Location: 19 Fairhaven Way (Maurice Hladik)

Attended:

PAG Committee Members
- Darlene Monkman, resident of Drayton Private
- Maurice Hladik, Fairhaven Co-operative Community Incorporated
- Andrew Wisniowski, Lindenlea Community Association
- Roslyn Butler, New Edinburgh Community Alliance
- Iola Price, Rockcliffe Park Residents Association
- John Murray, representative of the Rockcliffe Yacht Club
- Jane Brammer, Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association
- Mark Kaluski, Director, Quartier Vanier Merchants Association (BIA)

Support
- Chair: Gerry Lajeunesse, volunteer appointed Chair/Facilitator
- CLC: Don Schultz, Canada Lands Company
- MMM: Meredith Lynes, MMM Group, Ottawa
- MA: Nancy Meloshe, Meloshe and Associates
- MPC: Suzanne Valiquet, Momentum Planning and Communications
- OTTAWA: Selma Hassan, City of Ottawa, Planning Department
- JRA: Lynnette Postuma, Janet Rosenberg & Studio
- BM: Matt Reid, Brook McIlroy

Purpose:
To review tree inventory; blue and green infrastructure elements; urban design alternatives and then conduct a site tour.

Notes:
Meeting called to order at: 1:20 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Introduction / Agenda / Review of January 23rd Meeting Notes**<br>Review of the notes from previous meeting on January 23, 2013:  
- Noted that the Burr Oak was estimated to be 350 years old  
- Information source: International Society of Arboriculture  
- Group agreed that the Doodle system worked well to book meetings. | MPC |
| **2. Presentation and discussion of tree inventory**<br>Lynnette and Matt expressed their enthusiasm regarding the project and a discussion on the tree inventory took place. It was explained that a study had been done in the previous undertaking by Forester Jim McCready.  
- 85 trees have been tagged and photographed  
- They have been analyzed, in terms of height, caliper size, estimated canopy, species and age.  
- 17 tree groupings have been created and analyzed in terms of condition and re-growth, etc. | CLC |

It was explained that the City has a new by-law with respect to tree maintenance and that as well of the Emerald Ash Borer.

It was mentioned that the Lindenlea Association paid to have their trees injected – they may have been able to rescue some 10 trees.

It was explained that there were two major systems – the Montfort Woods – and the NRC area at other end. Ecological systems should be maintained throughout the development.

Question asked about trees that weren’t on the ‘keep’ list, would they be removed or could they be saved and the answer was that trees provide buffer and can definitely be saved if considered important to the Community.

It was suggested that tours be offered and signage indicating general principles and indication of invasive types of species -a signage program done in conjunction with the City.

A suggestion of proper signage could be developed to indicate the various zones where trees will be protected.

A suggestion was made to have some of the ash trees started on an injection program. It was noted that CLC may support that type of program. Rideau Valley Conservation Authority will be working with CLC to begin a tree planting program over a 7 acre stretch area.

The idea of harvesting seeds from native trees was discussed and it was suggested to bring in volunteers if this is deemed to be too labour intensive.
It was noted that Buckthorn is a big concern. A discussion took place about technical studies and how does the PAG provide comment. It was noted that the PAG because of member expertise, would be an added value to the process. Some noted that this was an educational exercise and receiving the information from the studies was a good thing. Some suggestion about creating a Q&A to respond to the public’s queries would be a good idea.

Depending upon the requests, there may have to be a different way to deal with criticisms, and that would have to be on a case by case basis.

Noted that National Defense had done an excellent job when demolishing the existing former buildings. It was carefully done as trees were not damaged in the process.

| 3. Presentation and discussion of “blue and green infrastructure” elements |
| It was asked if there were any wetlands and response was that water flowed very well on the site. It was noted that the ground was mostly limestone, there are some pockets of sand to gravel – that drains better and helps in how to strategize where buildings will be located. |

| 4. Presentation and discussion of urban design alternatives |
| It was noted that some very preliminary map drawings had been brought to the PAG for review. It was noted that the site could potentially support 5 neighborhoods but how these are defined has not yet been done. Comments such as: Where would the playing fields be? Should they be located near schools? Who owns the park space? What will the property densities and heights be? Will it be the same in all 3 alternatives? How tall could buildings be? |

The CLC Team noted that there will be contractual agreements done with builders to respect building heights and other specifications. The Team talked about having flexible blocks and it was noted that the market analysis consultants were preparing design guidelines to assist in this area.

It was noted that it was important in mid to high-rise, that singles are not looking at a wall of windows and CLC Team noted that transitioning from one area to the other was key. Group noted that they liked a jog in the road.

Group noted that there should be some commemoration and educational centres dedicated to the Algonquins.

If there are to be some medical buildings they could be for palliative care, a retirement home or offices. CLC Team noted that these did not necessarily have to be located close to the Montfort Hospital.

Group asked if winding roads vs. straight or uneven grids were better. Noted that winding may be better for slowing down traffic but grid is better for pedestrians.
and cyclists. Some noted that they liked the idea of traffic circles and roundabouts. Asked what the biggest challenges were – response: limited number of access points. Asked where the existing water courses were. CLC Team noted that they will change topography as little as possible. Group noted that roads did not have to be 4 lanes. Noted: Westport System – Spray water in the winter.

5. Discussion of new community name
Deferred to next meeting

6. May public consultation event
Deferred to next meeting

7. Next Meeting – Date and Agenda Ideas
CLC Team noted that coming up was the meeting with the AOO on April 12, the public event on May 25th and some other meetings with Transport Canada.

8. Site Tour - 3:00 to 4:30 pm
A tour of the site was then conducted. Event ended around 5 pm.

Meeting No. 4 – April 30, 2013 – 6:30 pm

Location: Honeywell Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 110 Laurier Avenue West

Attended:

**PAG Committee Members**
Maurice Hladik, *Fairhaven Co-operative Community Incorporated*
Roslyn Butler, *New Edinburgh Community Alliance*
Iola Price, *Rockcliffe Park Residents Association*
John Murray, representative of the *Rockcliffe Yacht Club*
Mike Bulthuis, *Vanier Community Association*
Al Crosby, *Greenspace Alliance*
Jane Brammer, *Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association*
Betty Ward, resident of the *Cummings* community
Darlene Monkman, resident of *Drayton Private*

**Support**
Chair: Gerry Lajeunesse, volunteer appointed Chair/Facilitator
BM: Anne McIlroy, Brook McIlroy
CLC: Don Schultz, Canada Lands Company
CLC: Krista Durie – Canada Lands Company
JRA: Jessica Russell, Janet Rosenberg & Studio
MA: Nancy Meloshe, Meloshe and Associates
MMM: Meredith Lynes, MMM Group, Ottawa
MPC: Suzanne Valiquet, Momentum Planning and Communications  
OTT: John Smit – City of Ottawa, Planning & Growth Management

PURPOSE: To provide a status update on content being prepared for the upcoming Public Open House (POH) to be held on May 25, 2013, and to review the schedule and format for the POH.

Meeting Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction / Agenda Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A round of introductions took place. The agenda for</td>
<td>MPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the meeting was approved, with the addition of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review of a video tabled by the Greenspace Alliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review of March 9th Meeting Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were no amendments to the March 9, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting notes. Notes to be translated and posted on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overview of May 25th event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don and Suzanne provided an overview of the format of</td>
<td>MPC/CLC to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the upcoming POH, including details on:</td>
<td>circulate POH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Workshops, registration, and notification;</td>
<td>notice to all PAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Facilitators and scribes, and the request that</td>
<td>members and post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG members participate as scribes;</td>
<td>to CLC website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ An overview of the content to be discussed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the 3 alternatives, and topics of discussion).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A PAG member inquired about how feedback received at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the POH will be incorporated into the plans. Don</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responded that there is a design review process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whereby our Team will consider comments received and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how they might be integrated into the recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan. Don emphasized that the Team places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance on having a transparent planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accordingly, the Team will publish a Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report which will summarize comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received through consultation activities. The Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will acknowledge how comments received are reflected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the final recommended plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A PAG member asked whether thought was given to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grouping POH participants by neighbourhood. Don</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responded that the Team would prefer to have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different perspectives represented at each table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC is always happy to meet with community groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individually, if an interest is expressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dialogue on 3 alternative Concepts</td>
<td>CLC to send PAG members next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne McIlroy presented an overview of the three</td>
<td>iteration of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative land use concepts. All three concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have key organizing influences in common. These</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
include;
- Provision for an Algonquins commemorative site;
- Preservation of key natural features, including mature tree stands;
- A parade square as a new community resource/central park;
- An emphasis on walkability within tightly knit neighbourhoods.
- Special treatment of the NE quadrant of the site, where there are valuable natural features which should be enjoyed by all.

The 3 options were primarily differentiated by their road networks, and the resulting land use implications.

**Option 1: The Arc**
- 26-30m ROW Burma/Hemlock which were designed to meet in an arc and provide the most direct connection across the site.
- Central park located on the ridge, and connecting to the greater greenspace network.
- Less density towards the periphery of the site.
- Employment lands are accessed from within the neighbourhoods (ie: no direct connection from the parkway).
- 1 tall building site.

**Option 2: The Grid**
- An inter-connected road network.
- Mixed-use village main street.
- Largest central park, which is most differentiated in size from other smaller neighbourhood parks.
- Higher densities and mixed use sites concentrated around the central park.
- 1 tall building site.
- 2 employment areas; one on the east side of the site, one on the west. The west employment area is both visible and accessible from Hemlock.

**Option 3: True North**
- Codds Road is realigned to true north – this realignment promotes views northward towards the Algonquins commemorative site.
- This creates a unique street pattern for Burma and Hemlock roads.
- Two tall building sites – one on the west edge of the site, one to the east.

Jessica Russell added a number of points:
- Development of roads has been designed around existing tree groupings with the goal of protecting mature trees and their root zones;
- The team is working to identify significant individual trees for protection – at this point 13 trees have been identified.
- Stormwater management ponds are shown on the site – these ponds are situated and designed to work with existing topography. The Study Team is also giving consideration to how the ponds can be treated to enhance

Alternatives based upon April 30 PAG comments.

PAG members please return comments to CLC by May 16.

BM/JRA to provide PAG members with copies of the Alternatives once finalized for purposes of POH.
Members of the PAG asked the following questions:

Q: Will there be churches on the site?
A: The plan will reserve lands for community facilities in general; however the decision to develop specific facilities on the site (such as a church) will be market-driven.

Q: Would all three alternatives achieve the same population densities?
A: Yes – all plans have the same density targets. Plans for the third alternative were adjusted to reflect two different density targets; ~4,400 unit and 6,000 units. There are also different employment density targets.

Q: A PAG member expressed concern about how densities set in the CDP will be reflected in the final development, given that in some instances the City has approved building heights greater than those set out in CDPs.
A: John Smit responded that CLC is different than other developers and that CLC has a track record of being firm on the design conclusions that were reached in the planning stages.

Following this discussion, PAG members were asked to review large format printed versions of the plans and mark them with their comments.

5. Role of PAG during May 25 Workshop
Suzanne Valiquet described opportunities for PAG members to participate in the upcoming POH. Five PAG members volunteered to be scribes for the event. PAG volunteers were also invited to participate in a pre-POH Facilitation Workshop being held at City Hall on May 22 from 10:00 – 11:30 AM.

MPC to follow up with PAG volunteers

6. Community Name Discussion
Suzanne Valiquet provided the PAG with a list of names generated from feedback from the PAG. PAG members were asked to identify their first and second name preferences. CLC will use this feedback to help in selecting a name for the site.

MPC to circulate Doodle Meeting Request for upcoming PAG in June 2013

7. Next Steps: CDP and PAG
The Study Team will work to define a recommended plan over the course of the summer months, following the POH. The PAG requested that a meeting be held in June (prior to summer holidays) to review feedback received at the POH.

8. Other Business
The video tabled by the Greenspace Alliance was viewed. The meeting was brought to a close.
Meeting No. 5 – June 18, 2013 – 6:30 pm

Location: Billings Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 110 Laurier Avenue West

Attended:

**PAG Committee Members**
Bob Publicover, Cardinal Glen Community Association
Darlene Monkman, resident of Drayton Private
Maurice Hladik, Fairhaven Co-operative Community Incorporated
Marc Lessard, Manor Park Community Association
Roslyn Butler, New Edinburgh Community Alliance
Iola Price, Rockcliffe Park Residents Association
John Murray, representative of the Rockcliffe Yacht Club
Ross Taylor, Vanier Community Association
Betty Ward, resident of the Cummings community
Al Crosby, Greenspace Alliance
Mark Kaluski, Director, Quartier Vanier Merchants Association (BIA)

**Support**
Chair: Gerry Lajeunesse, volunteer appointed Chair/Facilitator
CLC: Don Schultz, Canada Lands Company
CLC: Krista Durie, Canada Lands Company
DEL: Ron Jack, Delcan
MA: Nancy Meloshe, Meloshe and Associates
MMM: Meredith Lynes, MMM Group, Ottawa
MPC: Suzanne Valiquet, Momentum Planning and Communications
MPC: Dennis Jacobs, Momentum Planning and Communications
OTT: Selma Hassan, City of Ottawa

### Discussion Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Introduction / Agenda Confirmation</strong>&lt;br&gt;The agenda for the meeting was approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Review of April 30th Meeting Notes</strong>&lt;br&gt;There were no amendments to the April 30, 2013 meeting notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>CLC Update</strong>&lt;br&gt;CLC provided an update, including the status of the project. The PAG members were thanked for their participation in the May 25, 2013 POH.&lt;br&gt;A meeting is being held with residents neighbouring the site on June 24, 2013. Attendees of the meeting may be invited to participate as members of the PAG. Issues to be discussed at the meeting will include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The transition of building heights from the existing neighbourhoods and across the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic generation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLC provided an overview of how it maintains consistency in the implementation of the master planning vision after the lands are sold to developers and builders. This overview was summarized in an email and circulated to the PAG on June 18, 2013.

4. Discussion of Transportation Planning

DELP provided an overview of the transportation planning component of the project and the preliminary existing conditions and impact analysis of transportation issues in the study area. The overview covered:

- Terms of Reference, including assumptions used in the transportation assessment, were submitted to the City for review and approval.
- As part of the project, data from the Origin-Destination Survey (2011) was reviewed to understand existing transportation conditions for neighbourhoods surrounding the site.
- For example, with a site with as many as 6,000 residential units, the transportation scenario needs to consider the movement of 15,000 – 20,000 individuals. The assessment looks at their mode split and direction of travel, among other criteria, to gain an understanding of how many individuals will be traveling on the network by different modes.
- Intersections surrounding the site have capacity to accommodate some of the traffic that will be generated by the future development of the site.
- The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual was used as the base reference for trip generation rates and assumptions were derived from this manual.
- One of the goals of the assessment is to understand how many additional vehicles the site will generate for both the AM and PM peak periods. This traffic will influence the functionality of intersections in the study area.

The transportation impact assessment will be completed following the selection of a preliminary recommended plan that details land uses and network connections. At that time, the study team will also develop cross-sections for different streets within the land use plan.

Members of the PAG raised a number of questions and concerns:

- Concern about whether roundabouts would be included in the design of the transportation network. DEL responded that roundabouts are a preferred intersection treatment in certain cases, and that the decision to use roundabouts is dependent on both intersection volume, distribution of that volume, and the type of traffic using that intersection. This will be determined later in the project.
- Concern about the level of traffic at the intersection of Brittany Drive and Saint Laurent. DEL responded that this intersection will be assessed as part of the final report.
- Concern about the existing level of traffic at the intersection of Lansdowne and Hemlock. **N.B.: DEL completed a traffic count for this intersection on June 20, 2013.**
- Concern that this project would trigger a need to widen Beechwood. DEL responded that there are no plans to widen Beechwood. There are plans to add segregated bicycle lanes to Beechwood.

| CLC to arrange a discussion with OC Transpo on transit issues. |  |
5. **Preliminary Overview of Comments from May 25**
MPC provided a presentation highlighting the comments received at the May 25, 2013 Public Open House. A copy of that presentation is attached to these notes.

6. **Additional Questions**
A PAG member raised concern about storm water management treatment and whether there is a way to ensure that all SWM ponds will be wet ponds. CLC responded that the study team is taking an innovative approach to the treatment of storm water management and landscape architecture. The site will include many types of storm water management features, including both wet and dry ponds.

A PAG member asked about how building types and heights will be mixed within individual land use blocks. CLC responded that the alternative plans shown at the POH communicated the *predominant* building form by block, however within each land use block; there will be different types of buildings. For example, an area designated for low-rise development could include both townhomes and stacked apartments.

7. **Next Steps and PAG Meeting**
The Study Team will work to define a recommended plan over the course of the summer months. The PAG requested that a meeting be held in the fall to review the preliminary recommended plan and plans for the fall POH.

---

**Meeting No. 6 – November 7, 2013 – 6:30 pm**

**Location:** Quartier Vanier Merchants Association (BIA) Office, 287 Montreal Road

**Attended:**

**PAG Committee Members**
Darlene Monkman, resident of Drayton Private
Maurice Hladik, Fairhaven Co-operative Community Incorporated
Andrew Wisniowski, Lindenlea Community Association
Marc Lessard, Manor Park Community Association
Roslyn Butler, New Edinburgh Community Alliance
John Murray, representative of the Rockcliffe Yacht Club
Betty Ward, resident of the Cummings community
Al Crosby, Greenspace Alliance
Jane Brammer, Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association

**Support**
Chair: Gerry Lajeunesse, volunteer appointed Chair/Facilitator
CLC: Don Schultz, Canada Lands Company
Caroline Lavigne, Canada Lands Company
MMM: Steve Willis, MMM Group, Ottawa
OTT: Selma Hassan, City of Ottawa
OC: Genya Stefanoff, OC Transpo
## Meeting Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Introduction / Agenda Confirmation</strong></td>
<td>Momentum will add more detail (e.g., key themes, how the results relate back to vision statement, how the results will be incorporated into the preferred plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The agenda for the meeting was approved after the following 2 additions were made:</td>
<td>Comments required from PAG to MPC by November 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Next Steps (PAG)</td>
<td>CLC team will review the proposal for access to the Rockcliffe Parkway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2. Review of June 18th Meeting Notes** |  |
| There were no amendments to the June 18, 2013 meeting notes. |  |

| **3. Public Consultation Report** |  |
| Evaluation Matrix (pp. 14 & 15): There is a coding error in the Green Infrastructure, Protection of significant tree groupings – a value that is not the highest is in yellow (Blue- 23, Yellow- 19). This will be corrected and brought back to the December 3 meeting. |  |

In general, more detail was requested in this report. In addition to the high-level summary, it would be helpful to provide a more detailed description of some of the workshop table discussions. A discussion of how the Canada Lands Company team is interpreting and intends to incorporate the workshop results would also convey a stronger message that the public’s views are being taken into account. |  |

| **4. CDP Vision** |  |
| MMM explained that the goal was to start with a simple vision and build upon it to a progressively higher level of detail. Explained the 7 principles derived from that vision statement: |  |
| 1) Guidelines regarding population level, density level, employment, commercial/retail/services |  |
| 2) Connection/Mobility objectives and targets: MMM stated that one of the assumptions with respect to Aviation Parkway access will be deleted. |  |
| It was noted that the proposed connection to the Rockcliffe Parkway should also be revisited. |  |
| 3) Commitment to protect significant trees, vegetation and natural features (see Agenda item 7) |  |
| 4) Priority for pedestrians, cycling, transit (see Agenda item 5) |  |
| 5) Urban space – It was noted that this will **not** be a suburban community but an urban neighbourhood. A comment was made that quality of design and construction is an important aspect of the community and CLC explained that this will be ensured through design guidelines and other contractual obligations placed on the builders. |  |
| 6) AOO commemoration (see Agenda item 6) |  |
| 7) Military commemoration |  |

Further to the discussion of the vision, CLC updated the PAG on recent discussions with the Aviation and Space Museum which has expressed the
goal to enhance connections between the museum and the community. The Aviation and Space Museum is interested in increasing visitors by making the museum a hub for community activities.

PAG members noted rather than an urban neighbourhood the vision should be more of an urban village integrated into the broader city but separate and distinct in identity.

5. **Transit Planning**

City of Ottawa currently updating their Transportation Master Plan.

There was a comment that due to the placement of this community, there should be good connectivity to both LRT and downtown.

When developing new routes, OC Transpo seeks to develop a network of routes and new communities may be served by modifying and integrating existing routes into a new community. Future levels of service will be based upon both existing ridership and potential ridership from the new community.

- Potential for Transit Shelter Integration into buildings on the site – there are two examples of this in Ottawa (Mackenzie King Station, Laurier Station), but these existing examples are not ideal from a visual appeal perspective but they have worked well in providing shelter for patrons using the service. CLC is keenly interested in the integration of transit stops and buildings within this new community.
- Transit priority measures are planned to be implemented on the site to give advantages to buses. Some examples include signal priority, left turn from curb lane, queue jump, signal indicator.

6. **Algonquin Commemoration**

Not all information about CLC consultations with the Algonquins of Ontario (AOO) is confidential, but certain communications and documents need to be approved by the AOO elected official (Algonquin Negotiation Representatives or ANRs) before they can be released to the public. The AOO letter addressing new community names is an example of a document that has been approved for public release. CLC asks for approval prior to sharing information regarding consultations with the AOO.

CLC provided an update on the AOO consultations, primarily with respect to commemoration of Algonquin heritage in the new community. An Elders Circle was held in April and an Elders Tour of the site was conducted on September 26. On that tour about 35 Elders visited projects in Ottawa including Rockcliffe, Rideau Canal Promenade, Landsdowne, future Pimisi LRT Station, and ended the day with a ceremony on Victoria Island.

There was significant interest amongst the Elders in medicinal plants on the site and a desire for some specialists to return to the site next spring and
Community names have been suggested by the AOO. If these ideas are not used for the overall community name, then they will be used to name parks, streets, neighbourhoods, etc. Such naming is very important to the AOO.

Update on the community name: It will take longer than originally anticipated to decide upon a new community name. This will now likely occur after the CDP has been approved by the City of Ottawa as CLC needs more time to ensure that an appropriate name is chosen.

### 7. Tree Protection Strategy

On earlier version of the plan, there were some significant trees that were in the way of roads. Those trees have been identified and the roads moved.

The goal is to avoid damage to trees. There is strong collaboration between Janet Rosenberg (landscape architect) and Anne McIlroy (urban designer). CLC is committed to tree protection on the site. The result of this collaboration is an acknowledgement of the need for strong tree protection guidelines and the importance of having a framework set out upfront that fosters the protection of trees-at-risk, which is something we have spoken about often in the course of this project. Sometimes we have gone beyond the ‘master plan’ thinking in this regard because we feel that good guidelines for tree protection established out-of-the gate along with careful design consideration in the CDP will help to ensure the practicality and feasibility of doing so down the line when it comes time for the individual parcels to be developed and their subsequent arborist reviews and tree conservation reports. This is particularly important for the trees at the edges of forest groupings, particularly if they are adjacent to development areas and significant specimen trees which also fall in development areas. Chilliwack is a wonderful example that if tree protection is made a priority, it can be achieved.

### 8. Update on CDP employment lands

**Western side** – Montfort hospital is predicting growth by approximately 1000 employees in the next 15 years. Because they are now a Class A teaching hospital, they have access to more capital funding from the province, some of which they intend to use for expansion to add:

- a parking structure
- research and teaching labs
- assisted living/aging in place
- an administrative building
- more space for administrative staff

**Eastern side** – CLC has recently been exploring an opportunity, which has the support of the NRC, for a research facility on the site. More details will be announced when the research organization confirms its capital funding.

Given the significant benefits of creating employment in this new community early, CLC is prepared to consider sole-sourcing the sale of land for this purpose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Next Steps in CDP Process – Tentative Target Dates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- After the January 22, 2014 public consultation event, the comments from the public will be incorporated into the final preferred plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CLC to submit CDP (and secondary plan/official plan amendment/proposed zoning) to the City of Ottawa by the end of February 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- City of Ottawa Planning Committee review of CDP anticipated in May 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- City Council decision on CDP approval anticipated in June 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Review of preliminary draft of preferred plan (items not addressed above)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG members noted some concerns regarding the connection to the Rockcliffe Parkway. During May 25th event, there were many comments regarding the need for this connection and the implications for cut through traffic. Support for pedestrian and cyclist connections were expressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC is requesting the public advisory group’s comments on the draft plans provided on November 7 at the next meeting on December 3. It was noted that the copies of the draft plan distributed at the meeting were not to be circulated beyond the members of PAG at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Next Meeting – December 3rd and Agenda Ideas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of next meeting will be the vision and principles and the draft preferred plan. CLC’s transportation consultant Ron Jack will present some preliminary findings regarding transportation. Preparation for the January 22, 2014 public consultation event will also be on the next agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3A - Meeting Notes of the Question and Answer Period

November 26, 2012 – 4:00 pm Session

Comment: That traffic from the project will be dumped on Montréal Rd, Blair Rd or Hemlock. Recommended to build in the area for the 54th and 63rd Ottawa South Scout Hall.

Team Response: CLC recognizes that transportation is a serious issue for the surrounding communities. Testing a variety of transportation models will be essential while also taking into consideration intersections – it will be a process of looking at different options as no real concrete answers can be given at this time. The team indicated that the City was now going through its Transportation Master Plan Review and that together we will work to look at a more holistic approach at finding creative solutions, and looking at better connections not just for cars but also for pedestrian, cycling and transit systems.

Comment: Given the demographics, need to look at affordable housings for seniors and bring in community support as required. It’s essential to have a mix of income groups and affordable housing, including the disabled.

Team Response: CLC is committed to offering a variety of housing types that will meet the demands of the city’s population in total. CLC is also committed to setting up special interest advisory meetings with organizations wishing to meet and discuss their ideas within the CDP framework that relate to affordable housing and social issues.

Comment: If there is an intention to apply for a LEED certification for the site as a whole or for specific areas.

Team Response: CLC is committed to having the site developed with leading sustainable technologies and systems. CLC will be considering which evaluation systems will be most effective in providing for truly sustainable development in this new community.

Comment: The projected Kettle Island bridge environmental assessment study is underway. Does CLC intend to participate in this project or oppose it? Because if the bridge does get built it would mean that the Rockcliffe Community project would have this bridge as well as trucks in their neighborhood.
Team Response: CLC is not taking a position regarding the Interprovincial bridge study. Once a location is chosen, and if this will impact the CLC’s Rockcliffe Lands site, then at that time CLC will be part of the public consultation discussions.

Comment: Will the roads be enlarged and will this be the first stage of the building project?

Team Response: The road network is yet to be designed as it will be done based on the input received from the public. Once the rezoning has been approved, CLC would build the roads, the sidewalks, put all infrastructure in place such as sewers, water pipes, lampposts, parks and common areas in place prior to any construction of buildings and homes.

Comment: Build co-op housing for veterans, for about 120 families, a mix of housing and high-rise, have on-site support, exercise and physio rooms, laundry and the property management office. As well as a park nearby that would celebrate veterans.

Team Response: CLC is committed to offering a variety of housing types. CLC expects that the new housing on the site will accommodate veterans, seniors, and other segments of society. Commemoration of veterans and the site’s military legacy will be incorporated into the development.

Comment: Take a look at Coconut Point, Florida. They have buildings of 3, 4 floors with the main level being retail. This way, residents have everything they need within their block. Cautioned against building luxury condos like they have in Coconut Point.

Team Response: CLC encourages everyone to share examples from around the world that they feel will be an asset to the design of this new community in Ottawa.

Comment: Will each building have a high standard for energy efficiency or they will simply comply with the municipal building codes? The aim should be to have each building have energy efficiency which will reduce the cost of home ownership.

Team Response: CLC will encourage and look towards high standards in all new environmental technologies from builders that will benefit the environment and the community’s well being.

Comment: The focus should be on transportation and transit, specifically at Beechwood and Hemlock at the intersection with the Parkway. What ideas does CLC have for allowing access to Beechwood and Hemlock, including transit?
Team Response: CLC expects that public transit will play a significant role in addressing transportation issues in and around the new community. CLC will be working with the City of Ottawa and the NCC to address access from the CLC site to Hemlock and Aviation Parkway in a manner that will mitigate impacts from private automobile traffic on communities to the west of the new community.

Comment: Look into 2 stories that came out recently on CBC, one is the Baba Yaga Community in France that was created by an elderly women and the second is the approach taken in Denmark for people with Alzheimer’s.

Team Response: CLC expects that public transit will play a significant role in addressing transportation issues in and around the new community. CLC will be working with the City of Ottawa and the NCC to address access from the CLC site to Hemlock and Aviation Parkway in a manner that will mitigate impacts from private automobile traffic on communities to the west of the new community.

Comment: How will CLC bring the community together in terms of community governance, policy wise? To have an active community and insure that the green spaces are used and not simply for social events?

Team Response: CLC is already working with community organizations that are interested in how open space will be used in the new community. The ideas from this consultation will be incorporated into the Community Design Plan.

Comment: How many residents is CLC planning on having in this new community? How many commuters will be travelling in and out each day?

Team Response: The previous project was targeting up to 15,000. The previous plan did not have a heavy employment mix built into it – CLC needs to look at the residential and employment mix, along with what the market will dictate.

Comment: How can residents from surrounding neighborhoods continue the dialogue beyond this consultation, i.e. a blog? Not just provide energy to this new community but find a way to generate energy within. Look into cogenerating done in Sweden.

Team Response: Feedback and continuous communication with residents can be done by phone, email, website, letter, fax, Facebook, and blog. CLC’s project website at www.clrockcliffe.ca provides a variety of communication tools that will be helpful in engaging the public in the Community Design Plan process.
Comment: was involved in the planning for Kanata and recommends looking at how it was done and learn from their mistakes. Noted that the Master Transportation Plan will be discussed in the spring of 2013, recommends to CLC to get involved before then regarding transportation and transit needs for this project because it will have a big impact as it will need to be identified in the TMP.

Team Response: CLC is already meeting with the City’s transportation department and will be involved in the update to the Transportation Master Plan.

Comment: How will this housing project attract more tourism and help youths stay out of trouble?

Team Response: It is possible that tourists and members of the broader Ottawa community may visit the site to see some of the commemorative elements that will celebrate the site’s military legacy and the region’s Algonquins heritage. Facilities and activities for youth will be incorporated into open spaces and community facilities. CLC is interested in meeting with members of the community to discuss social development in this part of Ottawa.

Comment: This land is very dear to her and her family. Some of the spruce and pine trees on the land are older than her great-grandfather and she would like to see them still standing after construction is completed. More drinking fountains were people can fill up their water bottles. To build something for people who enjoy walking and those walking with their dogs.

Team Response: CLC wants many of the future public spaces and community facilities to be actively used, with amenities such as street furniture, water fountains, and a variety of trail and pathway systems.

Comment: The issue of transportation and transit is the most important aspect of this project. It needs to be addressed.

Team Response: Public transit will play a significant role in addressing transportation issues in and around the new community. CLC will be working with the City of Ottawa to account for future traffic impacts of the new development.

Comment: Are there still land claims?

Team Response: The Algonquins of Ontario, the Government of Canada, and CLC have reached a Participation Agreement which allows for this development to proceed. The Participation Agreement addresses commemoration of Algonquins heritage, economic participation of the Algonquins of Ontario in the development, and consultation with the Algonquins of Ontario through all stages of planning and development.
Comment: Is CLC aware that a golf course in Gatineau was privately purchased and he recommends that CLC commence a dialogue with them because it could benefit both sides if the Kettle island bridge project if it does go through.

*Team Response:* CLC has heard of the proposed development across the Ottawa River from the CLC property, but has not yet met with the proponents of that development. CLC will be meeting with several representatives of the development industry, including the proponents of the golf course redevelopment in Gatineau, to better understand the development market in Ottawa.

Comment: For the next consultation meeting, show a chart of anticipated demographics, i.e. possible age profile, how many workers, seniors, children.

*Team Response:* It is a good idea to present demographic statistics for the surrounding communities and the Ottawa region. CLC will present such information at the next public consultation events.

Comment: Will the developer/builder be constrained in terms of what he can build or will he have free range? Noted as an example: the builder at Lansdowne Park.

*Team Response:* CLC requires that builders who buy serviced lots and blocks in our projects must adhere to architectural and development controls above and beyond municipal requirements. Such requirements will be enforced in this new community.

**November 26, 2012 – 7:00 pm session**

Comment: CLC mentioned that sustainability is an important part of the planning but without commitment, it does not mean much. Look at the 2030 net zero energy challenge.

*Team Response:* CLC will be considering which evaluation systems will be most effective in providing for truly sustainable development in this new community. Potential systems would include the 2030 net zero energy challenge and LEED.

Comment: How many residents will be living on this site? Will CLC integrate rinks, parks and schools?

*Team Response:* The amount of population in this new community will depend upon the capacity of future transportation and public transit systems to handle the traffic generated by that new population.
The City of Ottawa currently projects approximately 5,500 homes at ultimate build-out of this site, which could result in a population of approximately 12,000 people.

This is less population than was proposed during the previous planning exercise for this project. Those earlier plans were based upon the assumption that rapid transit would be more readily available to this new community.

CLC will include outdoor and indoor recreational spaces and facilities in the new community. In our discussions with the City of Ottawa and the school boards, we will promote joint use and integration of such recreational spaces and facilities with new schools.

Comment: The roads surrounding the site are already congested, and during the consultation CLC has mentioned the project is for a dense community and the slide-show depicted 6 – 10 story buildings. CLC said they will focus on transit but transit just isn’t there.

Team Response: CLC will be working with the City of Ottawa and OC Transpo to enhance public transit service in this area. The amount of development in this new community will be based upon the capacity of future transportation and public transit systems to handle the traffic generated by the new development.

Comment: Many loved walking around on the base and were saddened when it was closed down. Will it be possible for residents to have access to it again?

Team Response: Although the site will be closed to private automobiles until development occurs, CLC is considering the accommodation of interim uses on the site, some of which may provide for public use through pedestrian access. CLC is interested in hearing ideas from the public about what sorts of interim uses, pending development, would be appropriate on this site.

Comment: He participated in the previous consultation process in 2007. Would the slide-show presented tonight be made available for print or consultation after today?

Team Response: Yes, all presentation materials, including the display panels and presentations, will be posted on the project web site at www.clcroclcliffe.ca.

Comment: How will this project and process be affected if the Kettle/Aвиation Bridge goes ahead?
**Team Response:** This new community will be developed irrespective of what decisions are made about a potential interprovincial bridge. CLC will provide the consultants and agencies working on the interprovincial bridge study with information on the future development of this community as our planning work proceeds.

**Comment:** One of the arguments for the Kettle island bridge project was that there would be limited access to the Aviation Parkway but the CLC Rockcliffe Community project will greatly impact traffic because it gives full access to the parkway.

**Team Response:** No decisions have been made with respect to future access to Aviation Parkway. CLC will engage the NCC and the City of Ottawa on options for access to Aviation Parkway and other roads through this planning process.

**Comment:** Take into consideration the neighboring communities; make sure that this project is integrated into the community, for example sharing community centers, schools, etc.

**Team Response:** One of the design principles for this project is that CLC intends to re-integrate this new community with the communities that surround it. CLC will also integrate open spaces, schools, and community facilities in the new community, so that the neighbouring communities will also be able to enjoy those amenities.

**Comment:** Are there any contaminated lands on the base? If so, what is the plan for these lands?

**Team Response:** Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) have been prepared for the entire site. Much environmental remediation has been undertaken in the areas where buildings have been demolished. In the limited areas where environmental contamination still exists, CLC will perform the necessary environmental remediation to ensure that the site will be clean prior to development. Such environmental remediation will likely occur in phases in advance of the phased development.

**Comment:** Referring to Maria Cook’s article, is it correct that AOO have the first right of refusal on all sites? If so, it is important to look at quality price fairness.

**Team Response:** The Participation Agreement involving the Algonquins of Ontario (AOO), CLC, and the Government of Canada contains provisions that will provide the AOO with opportunities to purchase lots or blocks before they are sold in the public market. Those provisions in the Participation Agreement address fair market value for the price of serviced lots and blocks.
Comment: How will land development take place? Will there be open calls for proposals for disposal of lands? Will it have transparency or will it be like Lansdowne Park? He cautioned against it being too onerous or restrictive, so as to be fair to all builders, especially smaller companies.

Team Response: CLC will issue requests for proposals to builders who are interested in developing within the new community. Both small and large building companies will receive those requests for proposals. Of primary concern to CLC will be the quality of development, not whether the selected companies are large or small. All builders will be required to adhere to both City requirements and the standards required by CLC.

Comment: In the introductory comments, it was mentioned that CLC will not be using the plan from 2007 because of the multiples changes since then. One of the major changes noted were changes to the light rail plan. He did not understand this comment because the previous light rail plan did not run anywhere close to Rockcliffe and the current plan for the light rail will run through Blair station. He reinforced that the main issue in this project if transportation and transit.

Team Response: CLC is well aware that transportation is a significant concern for the surrounding communities. The amount of development on the site will be based upon the future capacity of the surrounding road network and public transit to carry the traffic generated by the new community. Given that the City has changed and will be revising the Transportation Master Plan, those changes will be reflected in the new plan for this community.

Comment: The site is currently being called Rockcliffe community by CLC, which is confusing because of the actual Rockcliffe community. It is suggested that AOO be asked whether they have a name for this land or if they would like to name it.

Team Response: CLC is considering a broad range of potential names for this new community and for the future neighbourhoods within it. The public are encouraged to submit their ideas for new community names. The new community will commemorate the military legacy of the site, the Algonquins heritage of the region, and other important cultural aspects of the area, such as the Francophone community.

Comment: Has CLC consulted with NRC? Because according to the proposed plan, one of the exits is through NRC land but their grounds are closed at 6pm.

Team Response: Yes, CLC is working closely with the NRC as we prepare the Community Design Plan. CLC is aware of the closed gate between the NRC and CLC lands and CLC supports the closure of that connection prior to development of the CLC Rockcliffe lands. The option showing a possible connection out of the CLC Rockcliffe site through the NRC lands to Blair Road is only shown as a potential
connection for discussion purposes only. This option and all other options for connections will be subject to further analysis and consultation with our neighbours.

Comment: Regarding the Kettle Island Interprovincial Bridge, is CLC neutral? And will it remain neutral throughout the whole project because this bridge will have a huge impact on traffic for this project?

Team Response: The National Capital Commission is taking the lead on the studies to recommend a preferred crossing location and corridor for an Interprovincial Bridge on the east side of Ottawa. CLC has advised the City of Ottawa and the NCC of our interest in analyzing and planning for transportation and transit systems to support our development within the broader context of present and future NCC and City of Ottawa transportation and transit infrastructure. To date, the only information we have is that the NCC’s transportation consultants are still conducting technical analysis prior to recommending a preferred Interprovincial Bridge corridor. Given the preliminary nature of our own transportation analysis and the need for more information on the comparative analysis of the Interprovincial Bridge corridor options, CLC is not able to take a position on any of those corridor options.

Comment: How many people does CLC plan on having to work on the site?

Team Response: CLC has not completed the analysis necessary to determine how much employment can be developed along with residential uses on this site. That analysis will take into account traffic impacts, the types of employment uses that will be compatible with residential development, and the market for additional employment development in this part of Ottawa. Further information on employment development will be shared with the public at future consultation events.

Comment: CLC has mentioned that this is a long term, phased development. When will this process be started? When would be the approximate date that houses will be going up for a family that is looking to move in?

Team Response: Assuming that CLC submits the Community Design Plan in 2014, we could be rezoning, subdividing, and installing the infrastructure for phase 1 by the end of 2015. It is possible that serviced lots and blocks could be sold to developers as early as 2016, with the first residents moving in as early as 2017. This, however, would be considered a “best case scenario”. Other factors could delay the development timeline beyond these dates.

Comment: One idea not mentioned tonight is for a new site for the Science & Technology campus. This could be part of the project.

Team Response: CLC will be considering science and technology facilities and businesses in the development of a strategy for developing employment within the new community.
Comment: Once the final demolitions are done on the site, will CLC reopen the roads for potential alternate routes for commuters?

Team Response: CLC will not be opening the roads on the site prior to development. These are not public roadways and were not designed to carry significant volumes of commuter traffic. The roads themselves are in poor condition and would not be able to handle the volume of traffic that short-cutting commuters would generate. Such traffic would also create adverse impacts on the NRC and surrounding communities. Future traffic and access to this site will need to be properly planned in accordance with City of Ottawa standards.

Comment: Regarding the social sustainability issue, how is CLC taking into account the needs of new residents, i.e. immigrants?

Team Response: CLC will be organizing a public advisory group to address social development and sustainability. We are interested in working with social agencies to discuss the types of social issues that CLC might be able to address in the development of a new community.
APPENDIX 3B - Summary of Comments Received

Some statistics on the event - 133 responses to questionnaire; 125 responses to CLC comment sheet and 435 people signed in.

Key words – affordable; all house types, architectural variety, green; existing trees; transportation, transit access; walkable; views; employment; small shops

The comments (some grouped) that were repeated the most were the following:

- **Housing affordability for all incomes (36)** – single most repeated comment
- **Protection of existing trees/forests/birds/animals, open space (64)** – largest group of similar comments
- **Transportation impacts on adjacent road networks biggest issue (35)**
- **Interconnecting trails/fitness/walking/bikes (35)**

The following table is a summary by theme of the comments received through Post It notes, Ideas Cloud, 3D terrain model and from the questionnaires. A number in brackets (4) indicates repeat comments. Those shown in **bold** were repeated five or more times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Types of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land uses - general</td>
<td>Strip malls; <strong>Parade Square as an Italian Piazza with lively action/people watching</strong> (12); Performing Art Centre; Military/War cenotaph/memorial (2); <strong>mainstreet &amp; small business (19)</strong>; Farmers Market (3); mixed uses (20); no malls (4); no box stores (8); library (3); new museum (Science &amp; Tech connect to NRC); <strong>safe walkable downtown/community (23)</strong>; light industry (high tech) near NRC (5); east end shopping; cemetery; on site employment (3); grocery store (3); restaurants (4); casino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Density</td>
<td><strong>High density concerns (6)</strong>, high density in pockets surrounded by green; medium density; low to medium; no crowding; low density (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>‘Passive House’; solar panels/exposure (8) – ‘MicroFit program’ (2); district heating (2); <strong>green roof/gardens (7)</strong>; geothermal (6); water protection (3); green house; green house design (2); LEED (6); electric vehicles/charging stations (4); Net Zero housing; Virtu car/Bixi bike; ‘O’ footprint (2); recycling/composting; windmill (2); eco-friendly neighbourhood (3); urban farming; natural green environment (4); reduce environmental impact; <strong>sustainable community (8)</strong>; green technology (2); energy efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing types</td>
<td>Extended family housing/multi-generational (8); high value single detached with 2 car garages (6); large family housing (6); need mix &amp; not tract housing – architectural variety (22); Bungalows/single family (7); independent seniors housing <strong>(one floor)</strong> (6); seniors multi-stage housing (2); no mansions (3); not ‘car-centric’ houses (5); one third for singles; rental; luxury condos with views; avoid over development of high rise condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Forms</td>
<td>mid-rise (11); no high rise (11); low rise (13); no stacked townhouses (2); heights to follow skyline; no buildings taller than tallest tree (Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Transportation impacts on adjacent road networks biggest issue (35); Accessibility to public transit (20); direct rapid transit/LRT/Monorail/street car to downtown (10); pedestrian/cyclist (7); direct transit (no transfers); Blair Road Station out of way; Hemlock – public transit corridor/cycling (4); parking restrictions (3); Hemlock at capacity – no widening (11); protect/ re-route Burma away from existing (4); parkway at capacity (2); restrict all vehicles within community – use shuttles to door; hide public parking; multiple access roads; transit must work before development; roundabouts – no traffic lights/4way stops; wide open boulevards for all modes and areas for stopping; control cars (4); road congestion; Traffic/transit through NRC? (2); solution for congestion on 174; Bike lanes (3); wide boulevards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social themes</td>
<td>Housing affordability for all incomes with family &amp; senior focus (36); wheelchair accessible (5); seniors orientation (5) ; equal opportunities youth-seniors (2); seniors care; social services for all ages (3); veterans housing (2); no low income housing (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Participation through internet (community mapping) (2); call process Rockcliffe CFB CDP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Algonquins connection (16); keep existing street names (2); WW2 heroes/vets; airplanes (Northstar, Lancaster Heights) (2); pioneer families (2); air force/base history (9); Billy Barker (3); Rockcliffe on the River (2); Rockville(4); Rockcliffe with something (5), Heights (5), Green (2), Place, Barracks, Garrison, Crossing, Point, Landing (3), Village (2), Station; Innovative; CFB Tomorrow; not anything Rockcliffe (4); Mynarski; Hugh Campbell; Billy Bishop; Featherstone Park; Un Trou de Verdure; Banker Heights; Place Aviation Place; Place Cliffside Place; Lands End; A Place for All; New Rockcliffe; Heritage Rockcliffe; must work in French &amp; English (3); Money Talks; Aviation with Heights, Park, Village; Montfort Heights; Jeanne Sauvè; George VI; Central Rockcliffe; Rockville Heights; Riverview; Avatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Interconnecting trails/fitness/walking/bikes (35); skate park (2); snow/toboggan park (2); splash pad; tennis, ball diamonds (2), arena/ skating rink (4), curling (all these were there before); dog parks (11); amusement park type centre (4); community gardens (14); riding stables (2); swimming pool (8); amphitheatre for summer (3); community buildings/studios (4); large play fields (2); marina; parks (4); playgrounds/active outdoor spaces (17); parkettes; sports facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Institutions</td>
<td>Open schools for all language and religion; elementary schools (7); Francophone elementary &amp; secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Integrate (4); interconnect (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Island Bridge impacts</td>
<td>Mentioned as concern 9 times; no bridge (3); trucks on parkway with new bridge; need bridge (2); connection to bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall planning</td>
<td>Community examples – Celebration (2); English county village with central green; Rotkreuz, Switzerland; Dockside Green; new urbanism; contemporary look; Bois Franc; Stonebridge (Ottawa); Westboro/Glebe (2); not Orleans or typical suburb (4); Calgary example; integration with surrounding community; Baba Yaga, France (seniors community); village like (4); Chilliwack; design with nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/green space</td>
<td>Protection of existing trees/planting trees/forests/birds/animals, open space (64); more trees/hedges – no fences (3); connectivity of trees/open space (3); plant native species (2); man-made lake (3); Trillium forest near Kindle Park; keep nature accessible (2) (fireflies in spring); more pine trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Land disposal/construction by open process; community governance mechanisms (co-ops, resident groups; open site to traffic in interim (2); avoid light pollution; <strong>views of river/Quebec (12)</strong>; more lights; underground parking; walking safety; too long until development/construction (5); City Hall delays (2); integration of municipal services; potential for developers to dominate and distrust developers (11); closure of airport due to noise; distrust of Ottawa planners (3); impact on adjacent area property values; phasing and interim uses; public art (4); without transit link and employment just a bedroom community; sell property to private sector now to get property taxes; keep sense of ‘green island within city’; too many consultants – no leaders; protect views from Escarpment (Foxview Place); no vinyl; no 2 car garages; dedicated Scout Hall; no development just park (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3C - Questionnaire

Questionnaire
IDEAS Fair
November 26, 2012

Welcome to Canada Lands Company’s Ideas Fair!

We want to hear your vision of this new community. Your comments will be recorded in our Community Design Plan report that will be presented to the City of Ottawa at the end of our exercise in Spring 2014.

Feel free to remit your completed questionnaire to any member of the CLC team here tonight, place it in one of our comment boxes, or if you wish you may email it to us at svaliquet@momentumplancom.ca or fax it to: 613-729-4204.

1. If you were to live in the former CFB Rockcliffe Airbase grounds, what would you like the see around you?
2. If you continue to live where you are what would you like to see on the former CFB Rockcliffe Airbase grounds?
3. What would you like it to be called? Please help us -- name the community.
4. What are your biggest concerns?
5. How do you think this is going to change our City?
6. Share your favourite memory of the former CFB Rockcliffe Airbase grounds.

If you would like to be kept up to date about this project please provide your name and email address.

Name:

Email address:
APPENDIX 4: Interactive Public Workshop and Open House
May 25, 2013

- 4A – Agenda
- 4B – Summary of Comments Received
- 4C – Evaluation Sheet
## CLC Rockcliffe Workshop Agenda

**Ottawa Conference and Event Centre**  
200 Coventry Road  
May 25, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Registration/Arrival</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 a.m.  | • Introductions  
• What we heard November 26th  
• Overview of Day | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 9:25 a.m.  | Overview of Alternative Design Concepts        | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 9:40 a.m.  | Workshop #1 - Urban Lifestyles                | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 10:25 a.m. | Workshop #1 – Report Back                     | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 10:55 a.m. | Workshop #2 – Green and Blue Infrastructure   | Room 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 11:45 a.m. | Buffet Lunch                                  | Room 106 D                                    |
| 12:45 p.m. | Workshop #2 – Report Back                     | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 1:05 p.m.  | Workshop #3 – The Connections                 | Room 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 1:50 p.m.  | Workshop #3 – Report Back                     | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 2:10 p.m.  | Workshop #4 – Alternative Design Concepts     | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 2:50 p.m.  | Afternoon Break                               | Room 106 D                                   |
| 3:10 p.m.  | Workshop #4 – Report Back                     | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |
| 3:30 p.m.  | Workshop Wrap-up                              | Rooms 106 A – B – C  
Participants at assigned tables |

Open House and Displays – 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. - Rooms 106 E – F - G
APPENDIX 4B - Summary of Comments Received

May 25th Open House and Workshop Summary

Some statistics on the event – 136 signed in to Open House and estimates of actual attendance were over 200 visitors; 37 responses to Option Evaluation form and 97 people pre-registered for Workshops and another 7 registered at the door for a total of 107.

Key Words

The following tables are summaries of the key words/themes from the various inputs received during the May 25th consultation events. A number in brackets (x) indicates the number of times comments were repeated. Those shown in bold were repeated five or more times.

A full transcript of the Post-it notes, the Workshop flip charts, evaluation form results and detailed e-mail messages are on file.

Workshop 1 – Urban Lifestyles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land uses - general</td>
<td><strong>Central village core with mixed uses</strong> (10); employment at edges (2); pedestrian mall in core; institutional zoning for churches; no single detached on ridge; community centre (Sportsplex model) (2); mix retail/commercial employment in taller buildings (3); mixed uses in employment areas (2); spread retail, small corner stores (2); more retail space (4); high density housing too far from core (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings - forms/Density/height/types</td>
<td>Shadow concerns from tall buildings (2) in SE; more single detached (2); tall buildings (11 to 12 storeys) on edges (6); underground parking for high density (2); <strong>more mid-rise (5 to 10 storeys)</strong> (5); Land use/buildings should complement topography; don’t segregate low-rise and mid-rise; lower density overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Main road curved to slow traffic; no parking on main arterial just side streets; main transit spine includes cycle lanes; concern with cut through connection from Montreal Rd to Hemlock (3); access to Rockcliffe Parkway; movement on site must be easy for all modes (2); concern that main roads separate/divide community (2); grid most accessible; transit (plus bikes) only road; cycling infrastructure; public transit key to density; no connection to Rockcliffe Parkway;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social themes</td>
<td>seniors housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall design</td>
<td>Protect accessible views of river for all (2); village atmosphere walkability (2); grid too square needs variety (2); more urban than suburban (2); grid less tied to landscape/topography; curvilinear more attractive &amp; connects with topography (2); relationship to adjacent uses; mixed use more urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Pathways/parks</td>
<td><strong>Active playfields for all ages</strong> (5); park locations distributed for equal access (2); community park at ridge; pathways (bike &amp; pedestrian) important &amp; must link parks (7); parks related to village core (3); park size too suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Institutions</td>
<td>Concern over # of schools (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/green space</td>
<td>Green space near high rises; landscape &amp; view best features; protection of ridge and views (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Overall unit count unresolved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Workshop 2 – Blue & Green Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land uses - general</td>
<td>Village square/core adjacent to park; retail along transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Recycle sewer water; blue/green systems need to be there from Day 1; need well defined greenway system; surface storm system should not connect to underground – keep all natural; preserve natural topography; north-south orientation better; green infrastructure works best in grid pattern; curvilinear best for blue infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings - forms/ Density/height/types</td>
<td>More single detached;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Separate bike lanes; support grid approach as most flexible/accessible; pedestrian crossing of major roadways – don’t create separations; speed concerns on main road; concerns re traffic from parkway; need connection to Rockcliffe Parkway;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm ponds</td>
<td><strong>Visible storm water ponds with standing water (7)</strong>; maintain/support natural drainage/ponding at Lang’s Road (2); standing water not good (mosquitoes, wildlife, geese) (3); depth of ponds – safety (2); concern re dry ditches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall design</td>
<td>Grid not topography friendly – prefer curvilinear;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Pathways/Parks</td>
<td>Ensure link of new paths to existing system (4); well built trail system (4); <strong>3 large distributed parks plus smaller but functional neighbourhood ones (6)</strong>; prefer natural drainage not man-made ponds; <strong>need to ensure linkages between open spaces especially northern ridge (7)</strong>; need parkettes (3); large active playfields; design for all ages; coordinate with NCC; urban parks preferred; parks and ponds supported (4); wetlands in parks limit use;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commemoration</td>
<td>Military history (4); recognize past and present culture (2); plaques (3); <strong>aviation history (6)</strong>; Francophone (2); <strong>Algonquins emphasis (7)</strong>; main entry points (Codds and Hemlock) (2); public art (3); <strong>naming – parks, roads, facilities, neighbourhoods (9)</strong>; prefer distribution not one big monument; use architecture; retention of Hemlock maintains link to past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/green space</td>
<td><strong>Keep views open from north ridge to water (no singles or road development) (11)</strong>; protection of Montfort Woods with additional open space (2); conserve existing woodlots (3); trees require proper irrigation or water nearby; provide adequate green areas with mid to higher density (4); protect single trees (3); maximise green space; natural versus need for recreational development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Underground infrastructure not under roads to avoid digging up;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Workshop 3 – Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land uses - general</td>
<td>Village square (core retail); more retail especially groceries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Virtu car (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings - forms/ Density/height/types</td>
<td>Tall buildings and density on edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Access to 417 via Aviation Parkway; avoid vehicular bottlenecks on main road and entry points; connections to other neighbourhoods (2); <strong>public transit access off main road – shuttle service (6)</strong>; speed controls on main roads (3); <strong>segregated bike lanes (not just lane markings) – particularly main road (7)</strong>; link to Rockcliffe Parkway not Aviation; need links to Blair through NRC; green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
roundabouts (2); public transit links to Blair and Montreal Roads; **discontinuous main road reduces cut through (5)**; transit stops must be comfortable; separate/segregate modes (vehicle, cycle, pedestrian); wide sidewalks important; Codds as transit route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social themes</th>
<th>Daycare centres; special needs housing/services;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall design</td>
<td>Grid pattern provides best connectivity for all modes (4); curvilinear preferred design – natural (4); like main street/spine design (2); grid pattern slows traffic (2); keep blocks short;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Pathways/Parks</td>
<td><strong>Good paved pathway system important (5)</strong>; links to north ridge key (2); <strong>link to existing pathways off site – show on plans (5)</strong>; pathway links between parks/green areas/schools (2); keep parks off main roads – safety; <strong>bike paths key links (5)</strong>; must be all season not just for good weather; no roads separating north ridge only pathways (3);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Institutions</td>
<td>Locate close to parks with good road access;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/green space</td>
<td>Keep schools away from forested areas – safety;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Tech infrastructure to connect new wave of interconnectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workshop 4 - Looking at the Overall Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land uses - general</td>
<td><strong>Village core/square – central location (13)</strong>; retail services along main road; employment on edges good (2); combine employment/commercial with high rise residential (2); <strong>no single detached blocking ridge (5)</strong>; employment isolated on edge; mixed uses in areas and in buildings (2); <strong>more retail (7)</strong>; community centre (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Community gardens; Virtu car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings - forms/ Density/height/types</td>
<td>Less segregation of housing types (4); spread high rise over site in key locations; more single detached (3); less high rise more mid rise; high rise on edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Take steps to avoid cut through traffic through design (2); central spine road with transit (2); no roads separating ridge (2); access to Aviation and Rockcliffe Parkway; access to Montreal Road; <strong>no vehicle access to parkways (6)</strong>; roundabouts (2); segregated lanes for modes – vehicle, cycle pedestrian (2); make it easy to cross main roads (2); transit link to Blair; transit shuttle; speed on main road – traffic calming (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social themes</td>
<td>Affordable rental housing (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm ponds</td>
<td>Need to be open accessible with water – seen as feature (3); no dry ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall design</td>
<td>Prefer curvilinear over grid pattern (3); traditional urban; short blocks (2); walkable community; grid pattern discourages cut through; curvilinear relates to topography (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Pathways/Parks</td>
<td>Links north-south to ridge (3); 6 metre paved path system key (3); <strong>equal distribution of major parks (8)</strong>; large central park (3); spaces for all ages (2); pocket parks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Institutions</td>
<td>Keep schools off main roads (3); co-locate with parks; too many schools (2); keep away from employment and retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commemoration</td>
<td>Spread over site; Aboriginal centre (3); aviation history (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/green space</td>
<td><strong>Protect/access north ridge for park/views (9)</strong>; more protection for Montfort Woods; conserve existing woods/trees; natural space protection; impact on natural areas for playfield development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Single detached along boundary of with neighbours (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Open House and Written Comments**

The following table is a summary by theme of the comments received through Post It notes from the Open House. There were also several detailed email messages with comments received after the event which have been summarized and included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land uses - general</td>
<td><strong>More retail needed and in core (village square) location (10); employment near NRC good; outdoor cafes; employment needs to on transit spine SW location isolated (2); employment at gateways/edges (2); community centre (Sportsplex model) (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Community garden plots (2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings - forms/ Density/height/types</td>
<td>Mix housing forms in some areas – less segregation (4); quality architecture not tract housing (2); tall buildings good near Montreal Road (4); tall buildings not appropriate along Aviation Pkwy; reduce number of tall buildings (2); <strong>More single detached (13);</strong> bungalows for seniors; too much low-rise multiples (2); prefer mid rise to low rise multiples (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td><strong>Concern with cut through connection from Montreal Rd to Hemlock (8); no connection to Aviation Pkwy (1); bike lanes important; transit spine good idea (2); access to Rockcliffe Parkway (6); main road (spine) needs to be continuous – no right angle turns (2); right angle turns good for traffic calming; bus service to downtown; Codds Road good connection to site (2); links to proposed NCC institution in NW; access to Aviation Parkway (link to downtown and Quebec); multiple points of external access (2); link to Blair Road through NRC important (2); sidewalks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social themes</td>
<td>Affordable seniors housing; retirement homes, assisted living (4); non-profit housing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td><strong>Grid (9); curvilinear (6); small blocks with squares/parks (Savannah example); fewer housing units/density overall (3); no development on northern ridge as it separates community from river (6); like single detached on north ridge (6); village feeling/ walkability (4); keep low rise preferably singles along southern edge near existing houses;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Pathways/Parks</td>
<td>6 metre path system important; prefer bike paths not lanes on road (2); active play fields;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Institutions</td>
<td>3 school sites too much (4); not on main road; link with parks for more space; keep school sites central; 3 schools needed (Eng/ Fr needs); keep away from shopping areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td><strong>Trees/green space</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Island Bridge impacts</td>
<td>Large central park (4); spread larger parks to be accessible from all neighbourhoods; reduce larger parks slightly and add in pocket parks particularly in medium density areas; park overlooking river(3); keep original trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Original street names; military heritage (2); protection of area near Drayton Private (7); Algonquins influences; many builders not sole source; IT infrastructure (wired community); ensure continuation of flying club;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our purpose today is to obtain comments and suggestions on each alternative concept as an overall approach or design to assist us in a comparative analysis working towards the identification of a preferred concept. Your comments will be very helpful as we move towards the final selection. The final choice may be one alternative concept as presented today or a combination of elements from each to create a new concept.

Please compare the alternative design concepts relative to the criteria noted and indicate by marking the appropriate box which in your opinion best supports or addresses that criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of adjacent woodlots</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of significant trees</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of existing vegetation</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of storm water ponds</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates opportunity for open water on site</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Lifestyles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable/cycling distances in Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active recreation (parks) and pathways well located</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of land uses and proximity of these uses to each other</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing densities, heights and types</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving yourself around in the community easily and with choices¹</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving yourself in/out of the community easily and with choices¹</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and alignment of roads</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
<td>Achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
<td>Partly achieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
<td>Does not achieve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ¹ This refers to your opinion as to which alternative appears to provide the most convenient and accessible ways to move around the community and for travel to other parts of the City. You should consider both distance travelled and how you travel – on foot, by bicycle, by transit and by car.

Thank you for providing your input. If you would like to receive further information on this project as it moves forward, please provide your email address.
Vision Statement

“The redevelopment of the former Canadian Forces Base Rockcliffe will be a contemporary mixed-use community. It will be walkable, cycling-supportive, transit-oriented and built at a human scale. These principles will be realized through improved connectivity to the surrounding neighbourhoods, and by providing access to open space for everyone. The site will connect to the history of the Algonquin people. It will celebrate its military heritage. Redevelopment of the former CFB Rockcliffe will demonstrate urban design and landscape excellence, innovation in sustainability, cultural/social dynamism, and a high quality of life. It will be forward-looking in its development approach by integrating the site’s natural ecological functions into the design.”
**Principle #1:** The Rockcliffe Community (name to be changed) will be designed to be a compact and complete mixed-use community accommodating its future population in a range of housing types.

### Design Objectives:

The community will provide a mix of uses to support a complete community that allows people of all ages to live, work and play at Rockcliffe.

The community will include mixed use areas, residential areas, employment areas, a comprehensive open space system and local schools. The employment uses will be primarily office uses with a limited amount of commercial on the site in proportion to the size of the overall community. Commercial and retail in the new community could serve the general area (including residents outside the new community) but will not compete directly with established business along Montreal Road? I think we should be able to develop certain commercial, retail, or service uses that may be lacking in the general area (e.g., grocery supermarkets, restaurants, small specialty retail) and which could attract patrons from surrounding communities.

Housing will be provided in a number of different forms ranging from single-family dwellings to row housing, walk-ups, lane-oriented housing and apartments. The overall site will provide a range of unit sizes to provide for a reasonable proportion of affordable units.

The plan will concentrate the highest densities along Burma Road, and adjacent to the parade square. Generally transition density down from this central location within the site.

### Key Assumptions/Targets:

CLC will target to achieve approximately 5,000 to 6,000 residential units on the site, and devote up to 20% of the net developable land area to employment uses. The overall goal is to achieve between 100 and 120 persons plus jobs per net hectare (net of protected greenspaces).

CLC will target to have no more than 10% of the units on the site as single-family dwellings.

A minimum of 20% of the units on the site will be in apartment form. Depending on height restrictions from the Rockcliffe Airport, they may be in low, medium or high rise forms. The remaining units will be multiple attached dwellings other than apartments.

Housing types will be dispersed throughout the development, provided they can comply with height regulations related to the Rockcliffe airport.

CLC will provide a maximum of two school sites of approximately 6 acres each. The sites will have dual zoning so that should they not be used for schools in the future, the alternative use will be predetermined.
**Principle #2: The Rockcliffe Community will be designed to re-connect the site with the surrounding city fabric, with appropriate land use transitions from adjacent land uses and open spaces**

**Design Objectives:**

CLC will seek to create as many road and pathway connections to the surrounding primary road network as are feasible. This includes new or enhanced connections to the Rockcliffe and Aviation Parkways and connections to the surrounding city streets on Hemlock, Codd’s and Burma Roads. These roads will be extended to connect with each other in the centre of the site.

Low density residential development will be situated at the southern edge of the site where adjacent low density residential uses exist. From that point, intensity of development will increase towards the core of the community.

CLC will provide two employment precincts on the site. One employment precinct will be on the eastern boundary of the site in order to provide an appropriate transition from the National Research Council site. A second, more intensive and urban form of employment precinct will be situated on the western side of the site. The second cluster may be designated as a mixed use area. The plan will also provide for employment uses in mixed use developments around the central community core or along the major transportation routes.

Since the site is an infill location that was previously serviced, the new community can be serviced by linking to the existing municipal water and wastewater infrastructure, but with a full replacement of buried local services as each phase of redevelopment is constructed.

**Key Assumptions/Targets:**

CLC will seek approval to improve the interchange between the Aviation Parkway and Hemlock Road by providing ramps for both northbound and southbound traffic.

CLC is seeking a new collector road which would link Montreal Road (at Burma Road) to the Rockcliffe Parkway at the intersection that currently provides eastern access to the airport site.

CLC will realign the northerly extension of Burma Road to curve eastward away from the existing residential development located on the southern boundary of the site.
Principle #3: The community will be designed around an integrated greenspace strategy that protects key natural features, and where the open space is part of a functioning ecological and natural framework.

**Design Objectives:**

The plan will protect significant trees and vegetation of high and moderate significance.

The plan will capitalize on the unique topographic characteristics of the site. Retain existing grades and maintain and enhance significant views (i.e. Ottawa River, Codd’s, Burma, and Hemlock Roads).

The plan will work as much as possible with the existing terrain and natural drainage patterns to avoid major cut and fill requirements.

The plan will create an interconnected network of urban public space that functions both privately and publicly.

The community design will provide visual and physical connections to the Montfort woodlot.

The plan will provide for active recreation areas, passive greenspace, protected natural areas, and a vibrant network of green fingers penetrating development areas coordinated with the natural drainage strategy.

**Key Assumptions/Targets:**

The City has asked CLC to provide one hectare of usable park space for every 300 units in the development. CLC will continue to discuss this target with the City, taking into account the amount of significant greenspace in the immediate area and the fact that this target could undermine achieving the overall site population targets. Regardless of the target, CLC is committed to providing a variety of greenspaces that add to the character and the quality of the community.
### Principle #4: The community will be designed to prioritize mobility by pedestrians, cycling and transit over private vehicle use.

**Design Objectives:**

The community will be connected to the fabric of the City by a series of collector roads that provide appropriate space for cycling in segregated facilities, walking and efficient transit service that has priority at intersections.

The plan will have pedestrian scale neighbourhoods based on a five-minute walking distance, with particular emphasis given to short walking distances to local school sites and convenience retail.

The community design will include multi-use pathway connections to the existing NCC pathway systems on the Rockcliffe and Aviation Parkways. It will also connect to the neighbourhoods to the east.

The plan will be designed to prevent automobile cut-through traffic through the National Research Council lands.

### Key Assumptions/Targets:

The overall population density target for the site is 100 to 120 persons + jobs/ha in order to support high quality bus transit service through the site. The bus priority system will originate at Blair Station on the Confederation Line, and enter the site from the south-east. It will traverse the site and exit the site at Hemlock Road on the western side for further connection to the Downtown core.

The objective is to support Transit Priority bus service.

CLC is exploring the use of the existing ramp system from Montreal Road to the NRC lands as a means of entering the site. This will facilitate taking bus service through the NRC site before it enters the Rockcliffe site.

CLC will seek a transit-only connection through the NRC site, and work with the NRC to provide a multi-use pathway connection at the northern end of the site to Blair Road.

NRC tentatively supports a bus connection through their site, but they do not support directing local automobile traffic through their lands.

CLC and the City will need additional consultation on the cross-section design of local roads and collectors. CLC has decided that local road rights-of-way will be no less than 18m. The right-of-way of the collectors will depend on factors such as the configuration of segregated cycling facilities, turning lanes, landscaping on the sides and in any medians, and on-street parking.
**Principle #5:** The community will be a vibrant hub of activity with dynamic and attractive urban spaces, in an aesthetically and sustainably designed contemporary set of urban neighbourhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to naturally-oriented open spaces, the community will include a number of active urban public spaces such as squares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City and CLC will use the Urban Design Guidelines of the Community Design Plan to ensure the implementation of a high standard of architectural and open space design. Furthermore, CLC will use its own architectural guidelines to ensure any development partners achieve excellence in built form design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided they are permitted under Transport Canada regulations related to height near airports, any tall building elements will be located in locations that are sensitive to view corridors to the Ottawa River, and at key gateways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC will set sustainable development performance requirements for the implementation of built form and infrastructure on the site. CLC will work with the City and RVCA to develop a pilot project to promote innovative practices on the management of storm water on the site. CLC will also promote innovative practices in the energy design for the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community will be designed with key gateways (at Hemlock and Montreal Road) which will have aesthetic distinctiveness.

The community design will protect for connections to a future cultural institution on the NCC site to the north.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Assumptions/Targets:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For initial consideration, CLC will target 25% of the open space dedication for use as public urban squares, pocket parks and activity areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The former Parade Square, or a new park located in the general vicinity of the former Parade Square will be the principal and central urban public space on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future federal cultural institution will remain undefined during the period of the Community Design Plan, but the plan will nevertheless consider connectivity to that site when it gets developed in a future undetermined time period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC will explore the feasibility of district energy, co-generation and geothermal energy options in consultation with the National Research Council and the Montfort Hospital. CLC will adapt a sustainability framework with priorities, objectives, indicators, targets, monitoring, and evaluation systems that best reflect the context of the site, the city, the region, and CLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle #6: The community will reflect and respect the heritage and legacy of the Algonquin peoples and serve to connect cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Objectives:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community design and participation in the development will provide a meaningful connection to the history of the Algonquin people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to consultation with the Algonquins of Ontario, a site will be set aside on the ridge area at the northern boundary of the site overlooking the river for an appropriate use. That use may be commemorative, or it may be designed to provide education on aspects of Algonquin culture. This is subject to further discussions with the AOO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to consultation with the Algonquins of Ontario, CLC will use street naming, public art and commemorative signage to celebrate the association of the site and the region with the Algonquin peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC will continue its ongoing consultation with the AOO, both during preparation of the CDP and during subsequent municipal approval and development processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Assumptions/Targets:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any final decisions on these design objectives require further consultation with the Algonquins of Ontario.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle #7: The community will commemorate the military heritage of the site and the contributions made by service people to Canada.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Objectives:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CLC will use street and park naming, public art and commemorative signage to celebrate the past military heritage of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Assumptions/Targets:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The key aspects of the military heritage that should be represented are the associations with aviation, the Commonwealth Air Training programme and the generations of service families who lived on the site.