



February 4, 2019

**Stonebridge Community Association**

PO Box 34014

3777 Strandherd Drive

Ottawa, ON, K2J 5B1

E-Mail: [save.stonebridge@stonebridgeca.com](mailto:save.stonebridge@stonebridgeca.com)

Website: [www.stonebridgeca.com](http://www.stonebridgeca.com)

Facebook: [www.facebook.com/StonebridgeAssociation](http://www.facebook.com/StonebridgeAssociation)

Dear Charmaine Forgie (City of Ottawa):

I would like to thank you for hosting the Community Information and Comment Session on January 24<sup>th</sup>, and Councillors Harder, Meehan and Moffatt for taking the time to attend. I understand that the City will share the presentation and distribute an *As We Heard It Report*. We look forward to receiving these.

While the SCA awaits further contact from the facilitator Nicole Swerhun, please find below feedback on the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting based on comments provided by meeting attendees, along with follow up questions that we request responses to so that we may be appropriately informed, and to enable us to fulfill our mandate to the residents of the Stonebridge community.

I am hopeful that with further information we are able to build confidence in the facilitation process ahead. I look forward to receiving your timely reply, and will be available to provide any clarification or to discuss as required.

Sincerely,

**Jay McLean**

President

Stonebridge Community Association

Email: [jay.mclean@stonebridgeca.com](mailto:jay.mclean@stonebridgeca.com)

CC: Mayor Watson  
Councillor Harder  
Councillor Meehan  
Councillor Moffatt  
Nicole Swerhun



## Summary

The SCA is committed to participating in the facilitation process, but unfortunately the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting did not provide a level of detail on this process, in terms of basic scope, structure, methodology or intent to assure residents that this process is designed to effectively consider the concerns of the Stonebridge community and other interested parties.

We also understand that the facilitator will be responding to questions and serious concerns raised by participants at the meeting, including those submitted by the SCA, and we look forward to receiving these responses to develop a better understanding of the facilitation process, including clarity on the role that the SCA will play, and how residents will be able to participate. Although we remain committed to the facilitation process, we seek confirmation that options to be considered will include no future development on the Stonebridge golf course, and that the details of Mattamy's future plans to develop on the Stonebridge golf course are recognized as a key input to the facilitation process.

## Meeting Feedback

Based on feedback received from residents of the Stonebridge community since the meeting on January 24<sup>th</sup>, as well as other participants in attendance, this initial meeting was unfortunately not well received for numerous reasons outlined below.

- 1. Residents of the Stonebridge community were provided insufficient notice of the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.** The SCA was notified by the City of the date of this meeting on January 10<sup>th</sup>, and the SCA immediately expressed concern with very short notice. The SCA requested clarification on the purpose of this meeting from City councillors and the City, as this was unclear when notified. The SCA visited City Hall on January 14<sup>th</sup> to meet with the City, when the purpose of this meeting was then clarified as relating to the facilitation process. The SCA requested that an agenda was prepared to be included in the meeting notice and the City agreed. With only 8 business days from the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting date, the SCA officially requested that this meeting was rescheduled to provide Stonebridge residents and other interested parties a minimum of 15 business days notice. This request was denied (written rationale available upon request). The SCA received notice from numerous Stonebridge residents that they would be unable to attend the meeting on January 24<sup>th</sup>, as they were out of town at the time. A request was made to the City to make this meeting accessible remotely, either in real-time or by providing a video recording. The City responded that this would not be possible as they did not have the



necessary set up. The SCA conducted a live stream of the meeting that was made available on the SCA Facebook page in real-time and remains posted.

- 2. The review of the City's development application process that led the meeting was perceived as misplaced, and the allotment of time exceeding the review of the more pertinent facilitation process was imbalanced, given that there is no development application at hand.** It was understood by the SCA that the main purpose of this meeting was to introduce the proposed facilitation process to all interested parties. The meeting segment providing for the review of the facilitation process lacked information on the scope, structure, methodology and intent needed to assure residents that this process is designed to effectively consider the concerns of the Stonebridge community. Questions submitted by the SCA to the City as early as November 15<sup>th</sup> regarding the facilitation process remain unanswered. These unanswered questions and others are included at the end of this letter.
- 3. Missed opportunity to send materials/documents in advance.** The City indicated that no preparation was required for the meeting, and no additional information regarding the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting would be circulated to attendees in advance. Only at the meeting were attendees presented with numerous questions at the table that could have easily been circulated in advance to allow participants to prepare their responses and reduce the amount of valuable time spent assembling and verbalizing responses during the 1 hour allotted for table discussion.
- 4. No discussion took place regarding the scope of the facilitation process.** Based on an extensive community-wide survey completed by the SCA last Fall, the vast majority of Stonebridge residents are strongly opposed to any future development on the Stonebridge golf course. The facilitation process is expected to include the consideration of options that involve no future development on the Stonebridge golf course. Table handouts and some comments made during the meeting suggested otherwise. The SCA submitted this critical concern at the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- 5. Principles of Swerhun facilitation not evident at the public information session.** During the facilitator selection process the SCA learned of key principles of public engagement prescribed by [Nicole Swerhun](#), through direct conversation, interview of parties who previously participated in facilitation led by Nicole Swerhun, and related research. This meeting for the reasons shared above did not reflect these principles, principles that we view as being essential to the success of the facilitation process.
- 6. Uncertainty around Mattamy's plans.** At the Public Information Session that Mattamy hosted on June 27<sup>th</sup> last year, resounding opposition to the Mattamy Phase 16 development application was expressed by the Stonebridge community. One of the major concerns with Mattamy's application related to the uncertainty around Mattamy's future plans to develop on the Stonebridge golf



course. Today this uncertainty remains. Mattamy's future plans are viewed as a key input to the facilitation process for the clarity of all stakeholders.

### **Meeting Follow Up Questions**

Timely responses to the following questions are requested on behalf of our community, well in advance of any scheduled meeting to follow.

1. Will the scope of the facilitation include consideration of options that do not involve the development of the Stonebridge golf course?
2. What do Planning staff consider the critical factors in the approval/rejection of a future proposal to develop on the Stonebridge golf course?
3. Who are the parties involved in the facilitation process?
4. Will all stakeholders be interviewed by the facilitator prior to the first facilitated session?
5. What are the terms of reference for the facilitation process?
6. What are the relevant factors and their level of importance in the facilitated decision making process?
7. How do individuals who did not attend the meeting learn of opportunities to participate in working groups?
8. How will the smaller working groups be identified and formed?
9. Is the SCA recognized as a key stakeholder in the facilitation process?
10. Is the SCA recognized as a representative voice of the Stonebridge community?
11. When will the SCA have an opportunity to provide detailed information on the issues that the community has with Mattamy's plans to develop on the Stonebridge golf course?
12. What is the duration of Nicole Swerhun's contract with the City?
13. What is the statement of work for Nicole Swerhun's contract?
14. Where can the SCA access other publicly releasable information related to Nicole Swerhun's contract?
15. Has an engagement plan been provided by Nicole Swerhun?
16. What is the timeline for the facilitation process?
17. How many facilitated sessions will be conducted as part of the facilitation process?
18. How will the facilitated sessions be structured?
19. How will the facilitated sessions be moderated?
20. How will the facilitated sessions be recorded?
21. Will individuals be able to participate in working groups remotely?



22. How will the facilitated sessions be reported on?

23. What will be subject of each facilitated session?

**For Consideration**

- Ensure that sufficient notice is provided for all future meetings in order for interested parties to attend and prepare
- Promote each meeting to ensure that all interested parties have every opportunity to participate
- Schedule facilitated sessions at times of year when the majority of the participants are available (not December-April or July/August)
- Ensure that wherever possible relevant material is distributed in advance
- Provide a method for remote participation and multiple channels for feedback
- Ensure sufficient time is allotted between meetings to prepare, with consideration given to the part-time volunteer efforts of the SCA, and our mandate to collaborate with the community throughout the process
- Consider the availability of representatives of the SCA when scheduling future meetings