



COMMUNITY INFORMATION SESSION

Stonebridge Golf Community

Thursday, January 24, 2019
Nepean Sportsplex, Hall A & B
1701 Woodroffe Ave, Nepean, ON K2G 1W2
6:30 – 8:30 pm

Meeting Summary – DRAFT for Participant Review

On Thursday, January 24, 2019, over 200 people attended a Community Information Session hosted by the City of Ottawa on the Stonebridge Golf Community. The intent of the session was to re-engage interested stakeholders and obtain feedback for potential development in the Stonebridge neighbourhood. The information below provides highlights of the feedback received. A more detailed description follows in the body of this report.

This report was written by the third-party facilitation firm retained by the City of Ottawa to support the meeting, Swerhun Inc. It is based on comments received at the meeting, both verbally and written.

QUICK GLANCE OF FEEDBACK RECEIVED

- 1. The community shared concerns regarding a potential development in the Stonebridge Golf Community** including:
 - The lack of information regarding specific details around the potential of an application and development in Stonebridge
 - The potential for a new development to change the nature and appeal of the Stonebridge Community
 - Potential longer-term plans to develop the entire Stonebridge Golf Course
 - Development having a negative impact on property values
 - Negative impacts of increased density and intensification
 - The lack of adequate notification given to the community regarding this Community Information Session
 - A lack of information to support a meaningful discussion
 - A lack of trust and transparency in the City and Mattamy
- 2. There were mixed opinions regarding the value of setting up a Working Group involving residents, Mattamy, and the City to further discuss these issues.** Many participants expressed interested in being involved in the Working Group. Some expressed doubts that there was any value in a Working Group, while others thought it would be important to wait until a specific development application was submitted to the City before creating a Working Group.

NOTE: The intent of this summary report is to capture the range of perspectives that were shared at the meeting. It does not assess the merit or accuracy of any of these perspectives nor does it indicate an endorsement of any of these perspectives on the part of the City of Ottawa.

MEETING OVERVIEW

Over 200 people attended the Community Information Session hosted by the City of Ottawa on January 24, 2019 to discuss the future of the Stonebridge Golf Community. The majority of attendees raised their hands to indicate they live in the Stonebridge community, and some also indicated they were members of the Stonebridge Community Association. Also in attendance were Councillors Harder, Moffatt, Meehan, and Sudds, along with City of Ottawa staff and representatives of Mattamy.

The intent of the Community Information Session was to reset talks between Stonebridge Golf Community and Mattamy, that began in June 2018 and introduce a proposed process of discussions regarding any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community (see Attachment A for the Agenda).

Charmaine Forgie (Manager, Business and Technical Support Services, City of Ottawa) opened the meeting, welcomed all participants, and introduced Nicole Swerhun (Swerhun Inc.), an independent third-party facilitator contracted by the City of Ottawa to support and deliver the meeting. After a brief land acknowledgement, Nicole explained the facilitation team's role and reviewed the agenda for the evening.

Following the agenda review, Charmaine delivered an overview presentation on the regulatory framework that governs the City's role in land use planning, as well as the rights and responsibilities of landowners and the broader community. After the presentation, participants engaged in small table discussions intended to seek feedback on the "factors to consider" for any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community. These discussions also sought to determine a proposed process for bringing the community, the City, and Mattamy together to identify what common ground can be found regarding potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community. Following the small table discussions, there was a facilitated full room discussion where participants reported back to the full room on the feedback shared at various tables.

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

This summary synthesizes feedback shared during the plenary discussions at the Community Information Session and written feedback shared through the 50 completed feedback forms submitted at the meeting. Feedback has been organized and summarized under the following five sections based on the agenda questions and discussion:

1. Community concerns and advice
2. What additional information, if any, would be helpful to support your participation in and/or understanding of this discussion process?
3. Do you have anything to add and/or change to the early list of "factors to consider" related to any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community?
4. Who would you like to see involved in this discussion process?
5. Do you have any other comments, thoughts or advice?

1. Community concerns and advice

- **Change in the nature and appeal of Stonebridge.** Participants described the strength of their attachment to Stonebridge, their love for the community, and the fact that it has become their home. Participants are concerned any development of the golf course (as reflected in Mattamy's plan revealed last June) will change the nature and appeal of Stonebridge as a recreational golf community. Many participants purchased their homes in Stonebridge because of its relationship to the golf course.
- **The majority of participants shared views that opposed any development on the Stonebridge Golf Course and would like to see it maintained in its original state.** Participants said Stonebridge has a community feel and they do not want this to change. They said the golf course is an improvement to their homes and would hate to see it go. Participants who did not oppose development felt development should happen in a way that improves people's lives and brings people together. They suggested that the City follow a "do no harm" principle when thinking about what developments to approve, and to bias in favour of residents and taxpayers when making decisions, and not developers. They do not think that the City should approve all developments.
- **Longer-term plans to develop the entire Stonebridge Golf Course.** Participants expressed concern that there may be longer-term plans to develop the entire golf course. They are concerned partial development will set precedent for further development of the golf course. They would like to know whether Mattamy has a vision for the entire golf course rather than seeing developments take place in stages over the next 20 years.
- **Impact on property values.** Participants said they are concerned that development on the golf course will negatively impact property values, particularly if the long-term plan involves developing the entire golf course. They said that home values in Stonebridge are currently well above homes values in adjacent areas because of the Stonebridge Golf Course, the craftsmanship of the homes and streets and the community itself (a local realtor attended and shared her assessment that the premium for homes in Stonebridge is around \$111,000 higher than comparable homes in Half Moon Bay). Some said they would expect to get the premium they paid for their houses to be returned, should the golf course or part of the golf course be developed. Others said they were not interested in money, since that would not offset the negative impact on the quality of their life. Still others made the point that all residents of Stonebridge, whether their homes are immediately adjacent to the golf course or not, paid a premium to live in Stonebridge and therefore it's not useful to differentiate between those neighbouring the golf course and all other residents.

- **If Mattamy does develop, some participants felt it was important to maintain the same look and feel that currently exists in Stonebridge.** Participant assessments of the previous proposal shared by Mattamy was that the designs were completely different than the existing community. If they were to re-submit a development application, this participant suggested it would need to be completely redesigned to address minimum lot sizes, the approach to sidewalks, materials used, etc. Those who said that if Mattamy decides to continue with their proposal, they should maintain same look and feel that currently exists in Stonebridge.

Adherence to original development commitments. Participants said they felt that original neighbourhood development concepts (as developed by Monarch) should be considered a contract. There were questions about how much Mattamy is bound to keep the promises made by Monarch to purchasers. They commented that the City of Ottawa was proud to approve Stonebridge as a new recreational community when it was originally created and they should stand by this and support it. They said once a land use is established they do not think it's fair that the City come back years later and change it.

- **Impacts of increased density and intensification.** Participants said one of the roles of the City is to grow Ottawa in responsible way, and the first priority should be to 'do no harm' to existing communities. They said they are concerned that additional density in the area will bring more traffic and congestion and negatively impact quality of life. Questions were raised as to why the City of Ottawa needs to intensify development in the suburbs at all. They said that development should bring something valuable and different to communities, not more of the same.
- **Lack of preparation and notification for the Community Information Session.** Participants expressed frustration that the Community Information Session was delivered with one-week notice, and did not offer participants the opportunity to view an agenda or discussion question ahead of time to prepare.
- **Options other than development of the golf course need to be explored.** There were participants at the meeting who said they had been involved in previous situations against development proposals, and their experience was development applications are likely to be approved by City Hall. Recognizing this, they suggested working together to achieve the best outcome possible. They suggested that a land swap be considered, as an example, so that the golf course would remain undeveloped in exchange for providing Mattamy the opportunity to develop elsewhere in Ottawa.
- **Lack of information to support a meaningful discussion.** Participants felt the Community Information Session offered no new information regarding the potential for future development in the Stonebridge Golf Community. Participants had a strong interest in hearing from Mattamy on their plans for the golf course. Participants suggested Mattamy would not be willing to participate in such a meeting if they did not intend to submit a new development application in the future. Many said this facilitated discussion would be more meaningful if the community had a development proposal to respond to.

- **Lack of trust and transparency.** Participants said they feel there is a lack of transparency around how the City and Mattamy are engaging with each other and the community around the future of the Stonebridge Golf Community. They expressed concern that the City and Mattamy are discussing potential future proposals behind closed doors. There was interest in knowing how residents can submit an Access to Information Request, and the facilitation team committed to sharing the City of Ottawa website link in this summary:
<https://ottawa.ca/en/city-hall/accountability-and-transparency/accountability-framework/freedom-information-and-protection-privacy/access-information>

2. What additional information, if any, would be helpful to support your participation in and/or understanding of this discussion process?

Participants said they would like more information from both the City and Mattamy on a the planning process and the respective rights, roles, and responsibilities around development applications. Specific questions for the City and Mattamy are organized by theme below, followed by general questions.

NOTE FROM THE CITY OF OTTAWA: The purpose of the meeting was not for the City and Mattamy to provide answers to these questions at the meeting, and as a result, the third party facilitation team from Swerhun has documented the questions only. Answers/responses would be the responsibility of the City and/or Mattamy to provide, separately from this summary.

What the community would like to know from the City

Mattamy's original development application

- Can the City provide community members with the content of the original development application, which was then withdrawn?
- What stage of the application process was Mattamy's original application in before it was withdrawn?

Mattamy's potential future development application

- What discussions have begun with Mattamy regarding a new application?
- Will a development application be submitted before the facilitated process ends?

Development applications

- What are the reasons for rejecting or substantially modifying a development application? Which are the most important? Do any of these reasons apply to Stonebridge?
- Does this process ever result in stopping applications? How often?
- Does the City have the authority to stop the development of this golf course? To prevent any further development, in general?
- Do developers have to demonstrate that the approval of their application will have benefits to the residents of the communities?
- Why does the City allow developers to submit new applications instead of amendments to the original applications from when the entire community was planned and developed?

Current planning context

- Please share a copy of the approved Secondary Plan for the Stonebridge Community.
- Please share a copy of the South Nepean Town Centre CDP with all of the latest approved modifications.
- Please share a copy of the approved transportation master plan currently being followed.
- What are the plans for storm water, sewer, and potable water infrastructure for the next 20 years?
- What are the plans for schools and city recreational amenities for the next 20 years?
- What is the current land use for the Stonebridge community in terms of percentages of natural spaces, open spaces, natural features, parks, and recreational lands?
- What was the total estimated population planned for in the approved Secondary Plan for the Stonebridge community, and how does it compare to the total current built residential Stonebridge community?
- How does the current population density in the Stonebridge community stack up to open space/parks (passive and active) requirements (excluding the flood plain lands along the Jock River and the unstable slopes/woodlot)?
- What is the City's long term plan for Stonebridge? What is the City's vision for Barrhaven, for all suburbs, writ large? If it exists, why do we not follow it? This is a suburb conversation.

Land use and zoning

- Why is there a need for intensification in the suburbs when the City's current land use plan suggests intensification downtown?
- Why does the City approve zoning changes proposed by developers when that will have impacts on property values?
- Would the City be willing to negotiate a swap of undeveloped City owned land with Mattamy to retain the green space of golf course?
- Will the City subsidize Mattamy and uphold the covenants in the original land use?
- Why would the City consider changing the zoning in a master planned community that is only 10 years old?
- What is the existing zoning designation of the golf course? What was the zoning in place at the time of the original development application for the existing Stonebridge community?
- Is a zoning amendment required to develop on the golf course?

Original neighbourhood development requirements/commitments

- Is there any existing agreement (similar to the Kanata Lakes Golf Course's agreement with its former municipality) that would let the City of Ottawa take over golf course operations if its owner is unable or unwilling to continue managing it as golf course?
- Are there any restrictive covenants or commitments, legal or otherwise, to maintain the Stonebridge Golf Course as a golf course? As a championship golf course?
- Is there a condition in the subdivision agreement that precludes change in use?

Green space requirements

- Are there any policy requirements for greenspace in Barrhaven, and would the golf course be considered part of those requirements?
- In the original development plan for the golf course, did the developer have any obligation to provide green space, parks, and open space? Is the golf course included in the original development plan as such?

Property value

- Would the City compensate people for lost property value?
- What is the actual impact on property values if golf course is changed or eliminated?
- Will tax assessments go down for homes that are no longer “on the golf course”?

Other options to consider

- What alternatives are there to a proposal being brought forward by Mattamy? Does the community have a choice in the matter?
- Would the City consider purchasing the golf course lands?

Access to information

- How do community members request access to minutes of meetings between the City and Mattamy?
- Where can community members submit a formal complaint about Mattamy’s false advertisement over sales based on claims that each phase of development was to be the last?

Conflict of interest

- What is the municipal process for identifying and handling conflicts of interest between the City (Council and/or staff) and decisions on private developments?
- How will the City address conflict of interest concerns specific to Stonebridge (i.e. real or perceived conflicts between City Council and/or City staff and Mattamy?)

Working Group

- What is the time frame expected for the facilitator?
- How many facilitated sessions will be involved?
- What will the working group look like and who from Mattamy will participate?
- How urgent is it to move the working group forward (i.e. is there an imminent plan coming from Mattamy?)

General

- What would the City be willing to do to maintain the golf course?
- What are the Councillors’ and Mayor’s views about changing anything about the golf course?
- Would a petition or a class action lawsuit help residents have a meaningful input on any potential future development proposals on the golf course?
- How/why is the Kanata Lakes Golf Course situation the same or different than that of the Stonebridge Golf Course?

What the community would like to know from Mattamy

Current and longer-term plans for the golf course

- What are Mattamy’s long term plans for the Stonebridge Golf Course?
- Has Mattamy made any other development plans or studies on the development potential of any other parts of the Stonebridge Golf Course?
- Has Mattamy tried to sell the golf course? Is it interested in doing so?
- What would the timeline and future neighbourhood density look like for development if a new application is submitted?

Reasons for wanting to build on the golf course

- Besides financial gain, are there other reasons for redeveloping the golf course?
- With all of the property Mattamy owns in the community, why do they have to develop on this golf course?

Golf trends and financial viability of the Stonebridge Golf Course

- If the golf course is generating less revenue, what is being done to increase revenue?
- Will Mattamy disclose financials on the golf course, including profit/loss since becoming an 18-hole course?
- Is there a certain threshold of membership/use to keep the golf course viable?
- Has Mattamy considered whether decision to develop a portion of the course will make the golf course less desirable, therefore less profitable, making any revenue issues worse?
- Has Mattamy considered the positive impacts as Stonebridge Golf Course absorbs golfers after the closure of the Kanata Lakes Golf Course?

Compensation to homeowners

- Is Mattamy willing to compensate home owners for decreased property values? What happens to the premiums paid for homes in this neighbourhood and next to the golf course? Will Mattamy refund homeowners?

Previous commitments

- Is Mattamy bound by any promises articulated by Monarch in the original development plans to leave the golf course as-is? Sales promises that carry some weight.

Other options to consider

- Do any potential plans suggest extending the urban boundaries beyond Hole 5? If so, could these lands be used for development instead?
- Are there any circumstances under which Mattamy would not consider to develop the golf course?

General

- Why did Mattamy choose not to speak at this meeting?
- What does Mattamy want from this consultation process?
- Why is Mattamy unwilling to listen to community when asked to leave the golf course alone?

3. Do you have anything to add and/or change on the early list of “factors to consider” related to any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community?

Participants said that the following should also be taken into consideration for any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community:

- **Wildlife habitat, green space, and park space.** Participants said the City should consider that the golf course serves many non-golf purposes, providing an active park with wildlife habitat, open space, fresh air, trees and other health benefits. Other green spaces along Jock River are unstable, though residents continue to use and enjoy them.

- **Homes as retirement investments.** Participants said there are original Stonebridge home owners who purchased their last homes 13 years ago with the intention of retiring with a view out on the golf course. They suggest taking this into consideration as well.
- **Impact of additional density on infrastructure, traffic, roads, and transit.** Participants are concerned that the increased density will negatively impact traffic flow, negatively impact privacy and safety, and will cause a strain on area infrastructure, including schools, buses, and sidewalks. Development will also bring construction impacts like noise, dust, and congestion.
- **Lifestyle and quality of life.** Participants would like the City to consider how the end result of this potential development would affect the lifestyle, liveability, views, privacy, and overall quality of life of those who live on a golf course.

4. Who would you like to see involved in this discussion process?

Participants had the following messages to share around who should be involved in this discussion process:

- **Deal with all community members in the same way.** Participants suggested avoiding asking “who lives on the golf course”, because this sounds like the City would like to create two groups and deal with them separately.
- **All residents’ views should be reflected in the process.** Every single Stonebridge resident paid a premium to live in this area, whether they bought immediately next to the golf course or not
- **Every community association in Barrhaven should be part of this conversation.** Include community associations in Kanata, Stittsville, Manotick, Greely, etc., as well.

5. Do you have any other comments, thoughts or advice?

Participants suggested Mattamy consider turning the golf course into a community oriented course that could accommodate more people, particularly if revenue is declining. They said the Stonebridge community could come up with other ideas to help make the golf course more profitable, if need be.

NEXT STEPS

Charmaine thanked everyone for attending and participating in the process. She committed to circulating the presentation and a note to remind people of where they can express interest in being considered for participation in the Working Group. She said there will be more opportunity for community members to give feedback, and that the City will be reviewing the degree of interest in the proposed Working Group. You can email stonebridge@ottawa.ca to express interest in applying.

Nicole reminded everyone that in the next couple of weeks the Swerhun Inc. team will write a summary of the feedback received and questions shared at the meeting. The summary will be shared in draft for review by anyone who provided their email when they signed into the meeting

(to ensure that the summary is an accurate reflection of the feedback shared in the room). Any future involvement of the Swerhun team will be dependent on the City's decision regarding next steps in the process.

ATTACHMENT A. Agenda

The Future of the Stonebridge Golf Community

Kick-Off Community Information Session

Thursday, January 24, 2019

Nepean Sportsplex, Hall A & B

1701 Woodroffe Ave, Nepean, ON K2G 1W2

6:30 – 8:30 pm

AGENDA

The purpose of this Information Session is to kick-off a proposed process of discussions regarding any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community.

This includes:

- A review of the regulatory framework that governs the City's role in land use planning, as well as the rights and responsibilities of landowners and the broader community;
 - Sharing and seeking feedback on "Factors to Consider" that have emerged to date regarding any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community; and
 - Sharing and seeking feedback on a proposed process for bringing the community, the City, and Mattamy together to determine what common ground can be found, if any, regarding any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community.
-

6:30 pm Land Acknowledgement, Introductions & Agenda Review
Nicole Swerhun, Independent Facilitator, Swerhun Inc.

6:40 Overview Presentation
Charmaine Forgie, City of Ottawa

7:00 Early list of "Factors to Consider" & Proposed Process
Nicole Swerhun, Independent Facilitator, Swerhun Inc.

7:15 Discussion

1. What additional information, if any, would be helpful to support your participation in and/or understanding of this discussion process?
2. Do you have anything to add and/or change on the early list of "factors to consider" related to any potential future development of the Stonebridge Golf Community?
3. Who would you like to see involved in this discussion process?
4. Do you have any other comments, thoughts or advice?

8:25 Wrap-Up and Next Steps

8:30 pm Adjourn

