



Stonebridge Community Association
www.stonebridgeca.com

August 23rd, 2017

Meeting at City Hall with:

Councilor Jan Harder
Jeannette Krabicka – Parks, Planner
Colin Simpson – Transportation, Program Manager
Allison Sterling – Councilor Harder’s office
Kevin Wherry – Parks, Program Manager
Mary Ellen Wood —Planning, File lead
Rosanna Baggs, Transportation,
Jay McLean - SCA
Aline Gossein – SCA

Background:

This meeting was set-up by Councilor Harder in response to the email I sent her on August 14 and in continuation of the correspondence we have had throughout the summer. You should all have copies of that correspondence. See extract of pertinent emails after the minutes below:

Aug. 14th e-mail

*I still need to answer a board member's question: what are the criteria for the decision whether a park would be implemented or not? Could I please get more details?
With regards to traffic remediation at the intersection, I must say we are quite confused: plans posted on devapps include a traffic signal; our communications with the City over a month ago were focused on the type of remediation that would be offered: round about vs. traffic signal.
In this instance, I do not have to poll the community to let you know that not providing traffic remediation at this intersection is not acceptable to the community.
The argument to support the decision is that the numbers do not work to support any traffic remediation solution at this intersection. Could someone clarify what those numbers are? What is the source? Those are questions I am sure to be asked when the community finds out this latest development.*

Minutes of meeting:
3740 Jockvale

- Mary Ellen Wood reviewed application process; (FYI I posted those on in the development folder on google drive in Oct. 2015);
- A revised plan to the proposed development was presented – it included 51 units comprising semi-bungalows on the golf course edge and across the proposed street from them some attached semi-bungalows and townhomes; this leaves a small triangular parcel adjacent to Jockvale.
- Parks reviewed the proposed triangular parcel of land and have declined the proposed parcel as a park block based largely on the design criteria and guidelines not being met in the Park & Pathway Development Manual, as approved by Council in 2012.
 - o Triangular parcel does not relate to the associated community; it is not centrally located.
 - o The parcel is located along a major roadway, rather than along the community local road.
 - o No community pathway network is proposed, access to the parcel is along the busy Jockvale Road.
 - o Adjacent built form should front onto Parkettes, provide ‘eyes on the park’. The proposal only had residential backyards, providing no visual or physical connection to the block.
 - o There is a proposed fill of approximately 2.3m along the rear fence line of the residential units abutting the triangular parcel, thereby resulting in a ‘perched’ park block, park users would be looking down upon the back yards of the residences, this is an unacceptable park grading condition.
- WE ARE NOT TO SHARE THIS INFORMATION WITH THE PUBLIC AS IT IS STILL UNDER NEGOTIATION BETWEEN THE CITY AND UNIFORM;
- Aline has hard copy of proposed development plan – no copies (digital or paper) will be made to respect City’s requirement for confidentiality;
- Councilor Harder has requested cash-in-lieu of parkland (CIL) funds for this parkland (\$70K+) and suggested that these funds be used to augment existing park/pathways in the Stonebridge community (see email of June 28th);
- Devapps should be updated in mid September with new plans;
- Numbers do not justify traffic remediation at the Golflink- Jockvale/Longfields intersection;
- City has taken the action to review accidents in more recent years and reassess the safety of the intersection, including the traffic assessment reports released in February 2016 by Traffic Assessment Specialist Tom Carmody;
- SCA participants restated that the community will continue to insist on traffic remediation at this intersection as it has over the last few years;
- Councilor Harder stated that to justify traffic remediation, builder may have to increase density;
- Councilor Harder proposed to host a public consultation meeting to correspond with her open house on October 24th at the Cedarhill Golf and Country Club, 5pm-7:30pm, 56 Cedarhill Drive.

Other topics:

- Stone wall borders in neighborhood are not being maintained; they are full of weeds;
 - o City will look to see which contractor they are using to maintain the landscaping around the stonewalls; they have issues with some of their contractors;
 - o SCA to send pictures of unkempt walls and clean walls.
- Geocaching – driving game players to destroy walls as they seek prizes; advised that there is a website where we can locate Geocaching Ottawa and post a request that prizes not be hidden in walls of community.
- Resurgence of rumors that Mattamy is planning to build on golf course; Councilor Harder has not heard anything on the matter; she has since then checked with planners and have assured us that nothing is being planned. We should keep in mind her comment to the effect that:
 - o We cannot force someone to run a business;
 - o Barrhaven is running out of land.

Emails pertinent to the 3740 Jockvale development:

Jul 28, email from Councilor Harder

Regarding the pink house I have agreed that the City cannot force the applicant to do any road remediation given the very low impact 51 units will add. Additionally the "Park" Uniform has designed is not desired by the City so I am asking for CIL. That amount should be in the neighbourhood of \$70k +. I am suggesting you to look at this amount to possibly augment a current Park/pathway in Stonebridge. As I know more I will share Jan

June 14th email to Councilor Harder

Hello Jan,

The only means we have to collect data from the community is to put out a survey; unfortunately, since the association is managed by volunteers, it takes time – it is not impossible.

I have gone back to your first email stating that Uniform felt that a traffic light was what the community wants to see. We are pleased to see that the builder is taking our comments into consideration as it continues to plan the development. The developer is most likely referring to a letter the SCA sent on June 13th, 2016 to the City and developer where it is stated:

“Residents demanded that there be no approval for any type of construction activities on that site prior to the installation of a traffic light at Golflinks and Jockvale whether Jockvale has been widened or not; issues with substandard

LOS were raised at the time of the Orchard development and have not yet been resolved which are causing concerns with the community at this time.”

Please note that a traffic light was mentioned because we did not consider the option of a roundabout or any other options. The primary concern of the community has always been to improve safety levels at this intersection. Whichever solution makes most sense considering future evolution of this road should be acceptable.

I trust this helps in your decision,

June 2, email from Councilor Harder

Good Morning Aline,

This week I met with staff to discuss the intersection at Golflinks Dr. and Jockvale Rd.

As you are aware, sometime around 2026/2027, as part of the Phase 3 of the Transportation Master Plan, Jockvale Rd. is to be widened. And in that widening plan, a 2-lane roundabout has been designed for that intersection. This is what will be.

At present, this intersection does not have the traffic numbers to warrant any additional controls to what is there currently. In fact, even with the additional traffic added by the proposed Uniform Development at 3470 Jockvale, no additional intersection controls will be needed.

However – the developer is proposing to install intersection controls, as this will help not only their development but the community. What they are currently proposing is a signalized intersection as they feel this is what the community wants. However, all of the work would be wasted when the widening of Jockvale Rd happens and the roundabout is built - all of the work would be “throw-away”. City staff feels it makes more sense to build a single lane round about that could easily be widened at the appropriate time and I tend to agree. I hate seeing money wasted and I think the opportunity to do something with this intersection should be used.

Could you please let me know what you, and the community’s thoughts are on this as soon as you can? I would like to see this wrapped up quickly.

*Thank you,
Jan*