



Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association

Summary: Technical Review of Development Application # D02-02-13-0068 Regarding 45 Ruskin St.

- The development application violates the Ruskin Agreement signed by the Civic Hospital residents, representatives of The Ottawa Hospital and the City of Ottawa in 1996.

“To ensure that the use of the City-owned lands on the north side of the Civic Hospital (bounded by Ruskin, Reid, Hutchison and MacFarlane) which was originally taken over by the City of Ottawa as open space, is limited to a surface parking lot of not more than 270 parking stalls and the adjoining green space, all in existence as of 1995. The lot is primarily for the use of Civic Hospital patients and visitors;

The period of the usage is for not less than 30 years, beginning in 1995. The Hospital will continue to monitor its parking operations and will assess all other options for the supply of parking facilities appropriate to the demands which it faces during this time period. Subsequent to this time period, the use of these lands as a park will be re-evaluated. Area residents, the local community association, the City and the Civic Hospital are to be included as participants in the re-evaluation.”
- Contrary to TOH assertions in the public meeting on June 24, 2013 and in the lease agreement between the City of Ottawa and TOH regarding 45 Ruskin St, this lot is not the only necessary option for parking compliance for the UOHI expansion. Only 60-80 patients and visitors will be for the UOHI of the 466 new spots produced. The vast majority of people parking in the proposed garage will be staff, patients and visitors headed for other parts of TOH which are likely to be in closer proximity to P1, P6 or P7. In other words, the proposed garage can be justified neither by the volume of additional spots required in close proximity to the expanded UOHI nor obviously by the need to locate parking in close proximity to the clinical destination of non-UOHI patients and their families.
- Traffic in the immediate area around the garage will increase over today’s volumes. The consultant CastleGlenn, Carling cannot be considered a valid route to access parking on the south side of the hospital because of potential traffic blockages. Currently, according to CastleGlenn’s own figures, Parkdale see 576 vph during the morning rush hour; Ruskin sees over 286 vph and Carling sees 700 vph. However, Carling has 3 lanes in each direction as compared to 1 each on Parkdale and Ruskin. Therefore, Parkdale is actually 3x busier than Carling on a lane per lane basis and Ruskin has greater volume than one lane of Carling. Further, it is estimated that the proposed garage will result in a 25-30% increase on Ruskin west of Macfarlane, and 14-18% on Parkdale, depending on which base year is used.
- The Civic Hospital neighbourhood is being asked to compromise personal safety for privacy. Due to the privacy requirement of the berm to make it more fitting with the residential location, block lights, noise and vibrations, there will be reduced

“unobstructed sight lines” to the garage from public spaces or adjacent buildings making this a very hospitable area to criminals or other dangers. It creates narrow alley way between the berm and the garage walls particularly on the Hutchison St side that could be used to entrap persons passing through the space. This is a direct contradiction of the Official Plan: 4.8.8 Personal Security

“Everyone in Ottawa should feel safe and be safe in Ottawa’s public spaces, whether they are taking an evening stroll in their neighbourhood, parking in a large parking structure, or cycling along a recreational pathway. The City uses the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in its review of development applications to enhance personal security in the design of spaces that are accessible to the public. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design is based on the philosophy that the physical environment can be designed and managed to reduce the incidence of crime and fear of crime. Also, community safety audits by community associations and other groups are used periodically to assess the safety of specific locations and to provide guidance to improvements by the City and property owners.

When reviewing development applications, the City will consider measures to enhance safety and security through such means as:

- *An overall pattern of design that avoids creation of enclosed areas or areas such as narrow recesses between buildings that could be used to entrap persons passing through the space;*
- *Preservation of unobstructed sight lines for persons passing through public spaces and opportunities for public spaces to be overlooked by people in adjacent buildings or other public spaces;”*

5. *The plan for the proposed structure does not comply with Official Plan 2.5.1 Urban Design and Compatibility*

“In general terms, compatible development means development that, although it is not necessarily the same as or similar to existing buildings in the vicinity, nonetheless enhances an established community and coexists with existing development without causing undue adverse impact on surrounding properties. It ‘fits well’ within its physical context and ‘works well’ among those functions that surround it.”

Currently, the surface ground lot with 270 parking spaces, which is dedicated to the use of UOHI patients and visitors sits in an established residential neighbourhood. Over the years, alterations to the 45 Ruskin lot have been made so that it would fit within this context of the established community including the creation of the berm and parking use limitations. The lot has a 9-5, Monday to Friday use pattern for most of its patients when, generally, the local community is at work. Evenings see low traffic and it creates no noise or light disturbances that cannot be blocked by the berm. It is a somewhat controlled site, with signage indicating to all traffic in the area that its use is for the UOHI only.

The new structure changes the fabric of the neighbourhood and does not fit well within the established patterns. The new proposed structure is a 4 storey garage with 725 parking spaces to be used by all visitors, patients and staff of the Ottawa Hospital not just the limited use of UOHI visitors and patients. It will be a 365 day, 24/7 use facility and TOH cannot control or limit access. There will no longer be a regular use pattern as is currently in place and it will see people requiring access and egress late into the evenings. This is based on the fact visitor hours are until 8 p.m. in most areas of the hospital, 9:30 p.m. in others and the emergency area is operational 24/7. With the

addition of formal staff use, traffic noise will be heard at shift changes at all times of day and night.

6. The hospital has requested a rezoning of 45 Ruskin to I2, Major Institutional, the same as the TOH property adjacent. City zoning requires that a property zoned I2 has direct access to an arterial road. The Ruskin lot does not have direct access to arterial routes which are Carling or Parkdale. Traffic will not be routed through the campus but will be accessed via small residential Ruskin St., which is lined with family homes and will be expected to handle more volume at peak than a single lane of Carling Avenue. This does not support the intent of the zoning requirement to ensure that large scale, high traffic generating institutions are not accessed via small residential streets.

This rezoning also contradicts Official Plan 4.11 Urban Design and Compatibility policy 2a and 2b.

“Policy 2a. Traffic: Roads should adequately serve the development, with sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic generated. Generally development that has the potential to generate significant amounts of vehicular traffic should be located on arterial or major collector roadways so as to minimize the potential for traffic infiltration on minor collector roadways and local streets;

Policy 2b) Vehicular Access: The location and orientation of vehicle access and egress should address matters such as the impact of noise, headlight glare and loss of privacy on development adjacent or immediately opposite. Vehicular access and egress for development that has the potential to generate a significant amount of vehicular traffic should be oriented on streets other than local streets, wherever the opportunity exists, considering traffic safety and other transportation objectives of this Plan; [Amendment #76, OMB File #PL100206, August 18, 2011]”

7. The City's Private Approach By-law requires that the driveway entrance/exit to a property used for public purposes which has more than 300 spaces must be at least 75 metres from the nearest intersecting street line (in this case, Ruskin) where the distance is measured at the street line (in this case, MacFarlane). TOH has indicated in response to CHNA questions that the entry and exit to the proposed Ruskin garage are only 50 metres from Ruskin. We also note that TOH's response implies that it is treating the entire portion of Macfarlane itself between Ruskin and the garage entrance as a private approach. This is not valid as the revised lease applies only to the property at 45 Ruskin, not to Macfarlane Ave itself.

8. There are contradictions in the development application:

- The proposed zoning would require a setback of 7.5 metres along Ruskin rather than the proposed setback of zero. CastleGlen sites this very reason for why options on the Carling side of the campus cannot be used. It states that reduced space due to setback requirements don't allow it to increase current lot footprints for P6, and P7.
- With regard to expansion of P4, the Emergency parking lot at Melrose and Carling, CastleGlen indicated that east bound traffic would need to be routed north on Parkdale then around the campus to enter westbound onto the campus so that emergency vehicle access would not be infringed upon. This was rejected because it would be *“putting additional traffic on both Ruskin and Melrose.”* Page 9 Traffic and Transportation Overview. It appears that for this option increasing a portion of traffic to a smaller garage on the Carling side of the campus is inappropriate however, a greater increase of traffic on these streets for a larger garage on Ruskin is acceptable.

9. The assessment of the parking lot alternatives to Ruskin were cursory and simplistic. Each lot was assessed on an individual basis and compared in size, parking volume and cost to Ruskin. There were only negatives to the on campus lots and positive for the Ruskin lot. This was clearly not a critical assessment.
- With a City of Ottawa subsidy in the form of \$4.8 million in forgiveness of rent, Ruskin is made feasible when the other lots are not subsidized.
 - While bylaws are bent in favour of Ruskin they are inflexible with regard to all other lots (personal approach, setbacks in particular).
 - There were not combined solutions for on campus lots. For example, putting P6/P7 together or a reduced expansion of P1 to save cost with an altered expansion of P4.