

3. REVITALIZATION OF LANSDOWNE PARK

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That Council receive this report for information.

DOCUMENTATION:

1. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 9 June 98.
2. Extract of Draft Minute, 23 Jun 98, immediately follows the report and includes a record of the vote.

Our File/N/Réf. 45-96-0020
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 9 June 1998

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator
 Planning and Environment Committee

FROM/EXP. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET **REVITALIZATION OF LANSDOWNE PARK**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council receive this report for information.

PURPOSE

The City of Ottawa has received two proposals for redevelopment of Lansdowne Park. The purpose of this report is to advise Planning and Environment Committee and Council about the process the City of Ottawa intends to follow in pursuing a public/private partnership for redeveloping Lansdowne and the Regional role in the development approval process.

BACKGROUND

On 8 June 1998, the City of Ottawa received two responses to its request for proposals for the revitalization of Lansdowne Park. Following a preliminary review to ensure that the proposals provide the information required in the request for proposals, City of Ottawa staff will undertake a more detailed technical evaluation.

After the proposals are made public on 18 June 1998, a Public Advisory Committee will hold a series of public meetings scheduled for later in June to discuss both proposals. The Committee will recommend one proposal. Its recommendation, along with the technical evaluation by City of Ottawa staff, will lead to selection of a preferred proposal by City of Ottawa Council in the summer, 1998. The preferred proposal will then be subject to additional public consultation. In the fall, City of Ottawa Council is to receive a report on the consultation and provide direction to staff on negotiations with the successful proponent. Once an agreement has been negotiated, the proponent is to apply for the necessary development approvals.

Redevelopment of Lansdowne will likely require an amendment to the City of Ottawa Official Plan, site plan approval and a zoning by-law amendment. These applications will be pursued under the provisions of the *Planning Act* and will entail additional public consultation. Depending on the nature of the proposed development, subdivision approval may also be required to create public roads and parcels of land for sale. The Region is the approval authority for plans of subdivision and local official plan amendments. It also reviews site plans with respect to Regional road access and servicing requirements.

An amendment to the Regional Official Plan to remove the Major Community Facility designation may be required if the public facilities on the site are substantially reduced. A decision on the need for such an amendment can be made once the details of the selected proposal are finalized. If the Central Canada Exhibition relocates, a Major Community Facility designation would be required for the new site through an amendment to the Regional Official Plan.

CONSULTATION

The City of Ottawa is conducting a consultation program.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This process has no financial implications to the Region.

*Approved by
N. Tunnacliffe, MCIP, RPP*

JF/md

Extract of Draft Minutes
Planning and Environment Committee
23 June 1998

REVITALIZATION OF LANSDOWNE PARK

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 9 Jun 98

Mr. Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department, explained this report arose after he had received some questions about how the Region would fit into the City of Ottawa's process regarding Lansdowne Park, and indicated possible places where the Region would have input. The Commissioner noted this was a City-driven process. As Lansdowne Park was City land, the Region's involvement was through either the approval of a Local Official Plan Amendment (LOPA), or subdivision, if required, and then potentially, depending on which proposal was successful and what it might contain, the potential of a Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA).

Mr. Tunnacliffe said the site was designated Major Community Facility in the Regional Official Plan for two reasons: 1) The Central Canada Exhibition, which is held there and is a major draw, and which, if it were to relocate, would require a ROPA, presumably, to designate the new location, and; 2) by virtue of the fact that the football field, arena and associated trade show space, etc., which makes it a major Regional draw. Mr. Tunnacliffe noted if the facility was to be demolished entirely, or significantly reduced, there might be a requirement to take away the Major Community Facility designation at Lansdowne Park itself. The Commissioner said that until it was known which proposal was successful, and what exactly it contained, nothing more definite could be established. He noted this was the point at which the Region would have input, likely to be some months down the road.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, the Commissioner replied that he had not yet had an opportunity to see the two proposals in the public domain currently under consideration, but had read about them in the newspaper. He noted that if the proposals were going to get rid of the football stadium, the C.C.E.A. and the hockey arena and trade show space, then the site would require an amendment to the Regional Official Plan to remove the Major Community Facility designation. Mr. Tunnacliffe said that if something were to be left, staff would have to study the proposal, its scale, perform analyses, and then report back to Committee, noting that staff had not yet been involved in the process.

Mr. Tunnacliffe confirmed for Chair Hunter that the area was designated General Urban Area with Waterfront Open Space along the canal, and with an overlay to indicate the location of the Major Community Facility. He also confirmed that housing, as allowed in any General Urban Area, did not need a special designation.

Councillor Munter noted that the Region was the approval authority in terms of an amendment to the City of Ottawa Official Plan, but asked Mr. Tunnacliffe if the Region's scope was narrow and specific.

Mr. Tunnacliffe replied that the LOPA would have to conform to the Regional Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statements, but that in the Urban Area, this was not particularly onerous. The Commissioner also said there would have to be conformity on policies regarding

Extract of Draft Minutes
Planning and Environment Committee
23 June 1998

infrastructure and transportation, so the Region would be satisfied that whatever demands were going to be placed on Regional systems could be met.

Councillor Stewart felt that if the Region viewed this facility as a major Regional draw, it would be more up-front and less costly and time consuming for the Region to state its intentions at the outset, rather than disapproving a designation or rezoning that would change the Official Plan designation, after a long and involved City process.

Mr. Tunnacliffe said the difficulty with this was that the City of Ottawa was driving the process at the moment, one the City wished to follow through with and come to a conclusion. Following this, presumably, the City would be approaching the Region if Official Plan Amendments were required.

Councillor Stewart said she was aware of this, and had also been contacted by developers wondering if the Region was going to put the brakes on the process at the last moment. She reiterated that she felt if the Region was the approval authority, it should decide up front what it was or was not going to allow.

Responding to questions from Chair Chiarelli regarding appeal processes and time frames involved, assuming the City of Ottawa would have adopted a LOPA on January 1st, 1999, Mr. Marc outlined the following scenario, dealing with the prospect that a ROPA was determined to be required.

Mr. Marc noted that under this process, the Region would have to deal with the amendment within a 90 day period (April or May of 1999). A decision would then be made by Regional Council, either in favour or not, following which there would be a 20 day notice period of the decision. During that time, people could appeal the decision to the OMB or not. If appealed, it would go to the OMB to get on a list by June of 1999. Mr. Marc noted the Board's timetable has improved, but offered there is a six month time frame between the time a matter is listed and a hearing is convened, which would bring the process to January of 2000. Mr. Marc also noted the ROPA would not have to go to the Ministry for approval, as the Region has been exempted from Ministry approval.

Chair Hunter acknowledged the presence of Micky Green, Chairman of the "Revive the Pride" campaign, who wished to address Committee on this issue, and emphasized this was an information report for discussion by Committee about the process the City of Ottawa would potentially be following, were they to pursue a redevelopment proposal for Lansdowne Park. The Chair noted that his hesitancy with hearing the speaker was not with what the speaker had to say, but rather one of process; that the speaker was on one side of an issue that might necessitate the holding of an Official Plan hearing where all parties were to be heard, on issues of whether Lansdowne Park should be redeveloped, the nature of the redevelopment etc; properly the forum of an Official Plan hearing. Committee Chair Hunter reminded the speaker he had been given the opportunity to speak on an understanding that the parties representing development interests who wanted to change the nature of Lansdowne Park were going to

Extract of Draft Minutes
Planning and Environment Committee
23 June 1998

make their presentations as well. Subsequently, the proponents had withdrawn their request to do so. He also reminded the speaker that his comments would not form part of the public hearing process; they would form part of the minutes of this meeting but not of the Region's decision-making process on the development of Lansdowne Park.

Micky Green, Chairman of the "Revive the Pride" campaign, introduced Messrs. Rose and Slattery, also of the campaign, and gave Committee a brief presentation regarding the group's efforts to return CFL football to Ottawa (on file with the Regional Clerk).

Following his presentation, Mr. Green asked if he could submit his 18,000 signature petition, and was told by the Chair that although he could do this, he might wish to save it to present at either a Regional Official Plan or a Local Official Plan public hearing where it would form part of the public record.

Mr. Green then asked if a submission at this point would constitute the document being placed in public record from where they could be referred to at the time of a subsequent public hearing.

Mr. Marc said he believed if there was any intent on referring to them as part of some Official Plan Amendment process, the appropriate time to file them would be during that process.

Mr. Green said he appreciated Committee's position on this issue, but stated his concern that the process might not be before the Region before the year 2000. He believed that if this was allowed to continue in this manner, one municipality could unilaterally have an impact on the entire Region. Mr. Green also felt that Regional taxpayers might be owning these facilities in three to four years if one-tier government were adopted. He said he wanted to have the petition recognized as the voice of 18,000 Regional taxpayers on the issue.

At Councillor van den Ham's request, Mr. Green outlined the petition's main statement: "*We the undersigned declare that the facilities at Lansdowne Park including the Ottawa Civic Centre and Frank Clair Stadium, including the south side stands, are invaluable to the commercial, cultural, recreational and sports fabric of our community. We strongly demand that local politicians do what it takes to save these local assets from destruction. Likewise, we vow to remember those who act to save these facilities...*"

Noting that the Revive The Pride campaign had amassed over 18,000 signatures, Councillor van den Ham then asked who spoke for the other 300,000 plus Regional taxpayers.

Mr. Green acknowledged the Councillor's question as valid, and added his belief that no one issue would have the input of the entire taxpayer base. He also issued a challenge to either of the proponents to develop a similar level of support from within the community.

Extract of Draft Minutes
Planning and Environment Committee
23 June 1998

Chair Hunter believed Councillor Stewart had raised a good issue, and opined that if there was a Regional Official Plan issue here, perhaps the City of Ottawa should bring its application up front before getting too far into the development approvals process.

Mr. Tunnacliffe said he would encourage pre-consultation and discussion. He offered that as the City was making its decision over the summer, and as their staff came to a conclusion, they might want to submit an application early, as the Planning and Development Approvals Department would begin to process it straight away.

Councillor Stewart noted the Park was already committed to certain events into the future for a number of years. She asked what would happen if the City and the Region had made a decision, approved by the OMB, to get rid of the Major Community Facility designation, and subsequently wanted to change it at a later date.

Mr. Tunnacliffe said assuming the facility had not been demolished, but the Region had gone through the planning process, and had taken the Major Community Facility designation off, he presumed the designation would be put back on again through another amendment, if it was the will of Council.

Councillor Stewart congratulated Mr. Green for bringing the issue forward and for collecting the 18,000 signatures. She said the petition was impressive, and underscored the Regional nature of the facility as well as its substantial heritage in the City of Ottawa and the Region of Ottawa-Carleton. The Councillor thanked Mr. Green and wished him luck with his group's efforts to bring back Rough Riders football to Ottawa.

Chair Chiarelli thanked the Commissioner for his report and asked if he was advising that Committee, Council or staff should be doing nothing with respect to this issue until the City formalized an application for an Official Plan Amendment.

Mr. Tunnacliffe informed that this was the normal process to date, and that if Committee or Council wanted staff to take action, staff would have to be directed to do so through Committee. He outlined that the normal process would be for an applicant to go through the planning justification for whatever they want to do, and then to bring forward a request to amend the Official Plan.

Further responding to questions from Chair Chiarelli regarding possible collaboration with City of Ottawa planning staff on such issues as traffic studies or traffic input, Mr. Tunnacliffe noted Regional staff would be cooperative around the issues relating to Regional interest, which are primarily the Official Plan regulating the Major Community Facilities and Regional Infrastructure. He said the applicant needs to know about the requirement for water and sewer, and what the Region's view of the transportation impact might be.

With regards to servicing for the site, the Commissioner also explained that the developer would be responsible for the infrastructure on the site, and that the Region was responsible for

Extract of Draft Minutes
Planning and Environment Committee
23 June 1998

water right to the development. Mr. Tunnacliffe said he presumed there would be a local sewer involved which would intervene between the site and the Regional collector sewer.

Chair Chiarelli asked if the Department had developed any preliminary assessment as to the nature of servicing and/or costs that might be required on the part of the Regional Municipality to service a site that would contain in the order of 2,000 or 2,500 residential units plus hotel, etc.

Mr. Tunnacliffe replied the Department had not, however, he did not believe it would be significant in the sense of significant costs related to the amount of development proposed. He noted there would be some costs, but they would not be significant on a per-unit basis.

The Commissioner also confirmed for Councillor Munter that Committee or Council could not turn down a ROPA until there was a ROPA application, and that a Motion could not be passed saying a proposal would not be considered or rejected until there was actually a proposal to reject. He noted the other alternative was to have staff investigate changing the Plan ahead of time.

Mr. Tunnacliffe indicated in response to Chair Chiarelli's question, that anyone including either proponent in this issue can initiate a ROPA.

Mr. Tunnacliffe stated with respect to zoning changes at the City of Ottawa, Regional staff would be circulated and can provide comment to the OMB regarding conformity with the ROP in response to Councillor Beamish's questions. He further noted, staff have designated authority to appeal if there is a problem.

Councillor Stewart asked if staff are doing everything possible to work with the City of Ottawa on this issue to which Mr. Tunnacliffe said the City's position appears to be that this is their process and once it is completed they will come and talk to the Region. He added the developers have been in touch with PDA staff when preparing their proposals.

Councillor Legendre inquired if the Region has the authority with respect to zoning when next to a Regional Road. Mr. Marc confirmed and explained the Region has authority over zoning within 45 metres of the boundary of a Regional Road. He noted that that authority has never been exercised.

Committee Chair Hunter thanked the delegation for their comments and there being no further discussion, the Committee received the report.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council receive this report for information.

RECEIVED