



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

The June 27, 2006 Open House at the Canada Aviation Museum, was attended by approximately 575 people. Canada Lands invited participants to fill out and submit a Comment Sheet regarding visions for the redevelopment of the Rockcliffe site as well as opportunities, issues and concerns.

Approximately 60 Comment Sheets have been received by CLC. These comments are being used to help to guide the work of the CLC planning team as they begin to develop goals, objectives and initial designs for the site.

CLC has summarized the comments below. A complete transcription is included in Annex A and should be read in their entirety to get a full understanding of the ideas and opinions expressed. The subjects are in order of the frequency of comments on a particular issue.

- I. **Protect the natural features of the site** The significant natural features and trees on the site should be protected through ecologically based planning. There was widespread support for a generous park allocation. Some favoured leaving part of the site in its natural state. Some felt that Ottawa already had enough bike paths and parks.
- II. **Provide a diversity of housing and uses.** Many expressed an interest in living on the site, but did not want to see typical, suburban, tract housing. They called for a variety of styles and price points, ranging from singles to apartment blocks – keeping a maximum height limit of 6 to 7 storeys (others favoured 4 storeys). In addition to housing, people called for a mix of commercial, employment, recreational and institutional uses. There was frequent support for housing for seniors.
- III. **Minimize traffic impacts on neighbouring communities.** There was a general concern about increased traffic arising from development on the base and a request not to open up new access points to the base or to widen existing roads. Concern was also expressed about the possible Kettle Island Bridge.
- IV. **Sustainable Development.** There was wide support for sustainable development in terms of energy consumption, respect for ecology and the environment, social, environmental and economic development. This was viewed not only as “green” technological innovations, but also good urban design.
- V. **Public Consultation and participation.** CLC was encouraged to continue with an open and participative approach to the development. Many viewed the June 27, 2006 meeting as an excellent first step.
- VI. **Development Approach.** A variety of suggestions on this point with a desire not to create a suburban development and a caution not to sell land to the highest



- bidder. There were comments on the need for strong architectural controls and the difficulties in ensuring that the vision for the site was actually delivered. This section also included a number of personal “visions” for the site.
- VII. **Public Spaces.** There was support for new cultural institutions, recreational opportunities and a well designed public realm with a “destination” or focal point for the site.
- VIII. **Density.** Many were concerned with the density proposed in the City’s official plan and suggested that density should be consistent with the surrounding community.
- IX. **Pedestrian/cyclist friendly.** There was general support for a plan that would favour pedestrians and cyclists over the automobile. Some suggested the use of bike and foot paths to ensure linkages of natural spaces on the site.
- X. **Transit centered design with improved public transit.** People wanted more information on this topic and saw increased public transit as a possible solution to increased traffic. There was a concern that the light rail would not be implemented in time.
- XI. **Heritage.** There was a call to remember and commemorate the military history on the site.
- XII. **Promote Families.** A few commented that a sustainable development is one that supports families and friendships and fosters a sense of community.
- XIII. **Project team.** There was a concern about the lack of women on the team and the need to involve local firms.
- XIV. **Other.** There were a number of other comments on issues such as geotechnical concerns, existing studies and the government’s decision to transfer the lands to CLC.