

**Manotick – Minto Liaison Committee** (*hereinafter* the Committee).

*Date:* April 6, 2010; *Next scheduled meeting:* April 27, 2010.  
*Location:* Manotick Library; *Next location:* Manotick Library.

---

*Attachments:* **Appendix A** - Letter from Michael Clancy to Jennifer Murray re. Mahogany Bay Development.

---

*Members in attendance:* (MCA) Susanne Christie, Michael Clancy [MC], Jane Dormon [JD], Jan Hynes [JH], Michael Mirsky [MM], Brian Tansley [BT], David Young [DY], Wayne van de Graaff [WG], Nancy Viau [NV].

(MINTO) Jennifer Murray [JM].

*Guests:* Glen Brooks (Councillor) [GB], Derrick Moodie (Rural affairs) [DM].

***Agenda***

The Agenda was circulated and approved.

***Introductions***

BT introduced Wayne van de Graaff as the new member of the Committee. The presence of WG on the board fills a gap in representation, as WG represents Manotick residents (*hereinafter* Residents) living on First Line. WG was unanimously welcomed.

***Contact persons for local areas within the village***

To improve communications and to avoid overwhelming individual Committee members, BT suggested that individuals within the Committee should act as the “Go-To” persons within their communities. The details of how this would work need to be defined, but an initial example would be that members of the Committee should refer questions from Residents to their local Committee member.

GB commented that any questions from Residents that pertain to Ottawa City-controlled activities, e.g., installation of lights, etc., should be directed to the appropriate person in the City. To achieve this, all such questions should be channelled through GB's office.

***Presentation on Phase 1 Plan of Subdivision***

The presentation made by JM had been shown to a public audience previously (KIWANIS), but not all of the Committee members had seen it, so the repeat showing was appreciated.

While still subject to many approvals, the plan as shown was a pleasant surprise to many of the Committee members, with attractively disposed properties – the layout showing sensitivity to issues such as privacy, ease of access, and local traffic. JM explained that the houses will be arranged in clusters connected by “green corridors” ideally with a 15 minute walking distance between clusters. The disposition of the houses is also intended to prevent too many houses backing onto Watterton.

The intention is to explore the possibility of having some houses with garages at the rear, and having lanes running behind blocks of houses to allow people to park their cars from a laneway. DM commented that permission for this would depend on the City's ability to conduct snow-removal

activities.

The submission has yet to go to the City for approval. Minto are planning to wait until it can be packaged with the re-zoning application, sometime between the middle–end of May 2010.

***Call for items for preparation of a draft scoped issues list***

(note that while some preliminary discussion was held on the topics described below, it was quickly determined by the Committee that these topics need separate, dedicated meetings)

*Traffic*

Minto is to generate a traffic study (impact assessment) including a worst-case scenario

1. BT expressed concern about the effect of the truck traffic on the village during the years it will take to finish the development. JM replied that the logistics are to be determined, but it was noted that Jack Sterling had already already committed to *NOT* having this construction-related traffic using Manotick Main Street as a thoroughfare. BT commented that it is important not to mix construction and residential traffic.
2. BT asked about the plan to cut through from Prince of Wales to First Line; JM had no information on that.
3. BT wanted to know when Minto (Delcan?) expects the 25% reduction of traffic to take effect after the Strandherd Bridge is built (how long before a reduction in traffic will be noticeable). BT further asked whether there is a “Plan B” if the traffic reduction isn't “satisfactory”; JM warned that the traffic report will present data, but that it is up to the city to review and approve. The procedure is that Minto hires a consultant to draft these reports, then these are presented to City Staff who are responsible for recommending a solution.
4. GB commented that with the replacement of the “old waste systems” with the new sewers, there should be an increase in development in the Village core, and expressed a hope that any traffic plans concerning Manotick should be made with this increased activity in mind; JM responded that a new traffic report from Ron Jack (Delcan) should be ready within 3–4 weeks.

*Zoning*

To be determined when the application is in.

BT asked whether the rezoning of a parcel of land affected the zoning of any adjacent properties; JM responded that the answer, effectively, is no.

*Landscape/Architectural design*

1. With respect to saving the trees-of-concern (200-year-old oaks etc.) in the area targeted for the subdivision, JM informed that Sue Johns is doing the application for the subdivision, and that an arborist has looked at the trees to provide an inventory report, which is a requirement of the City (Tree Preservation Plan).
2. MC asked whether the topography of the area would be maintained; JM responded that it was not the intention to level the area uniformly, so some topography would be maintained, for example hedgerows would be maintained as much as possible (practicality permitting) and storm ponds used to help direct excess surface water (rain) away from houses.

***Schedule changes for future meetings***

BT reported that teaching commitments will clash with the initial plan to hold regular Committee meetings on Tuesdays. This clash will occur from May 11 to June 21, 2010.

***Other business***

1. Regarding services, the approvals for the draft plan of the subdivision are expected from the City sometime between the end of 2010 to early 2011. Given no unexpected delays, this would put the timeline for the first occupancy somewhere around mid-2012.
2. Storm-drain design will be involved in all phases. A strip of land (size and shape not yet finalized) will be donated to the City for this purpose.
3. JM commented that the expected price for the houses in the planned subdivision would probably be more expensive than their equivalent in Barrhaven, owing to the costs associated with developing a “Flagship Community” and acceding to requests made by the Residents.
4. JM also commented that for various reasons, the number of houses planned for Phase 1 have been dropped by 20%; however, there is no plan by Minto to increase the number of houses planned for any of the other phases in order compensate.
5. Some further preliminary discussion (*wouldn't-it-be-nice-if*) centred on possibilities for Mahogany Bay, as well as possible materials for the building envelope (note: materials detailed in Appendix C of the following report: “*Mahogany Community Phase 1 – Plan of Subdivision Planning Rationale*”).
6. BT asked that Wimmer & Cassidy present their ideas regarding the design of the subdivision to the Committee before summer 2010; JM will try to arrange it, but noted that for logistical reasons, their visit and presentation would have to coincide with a meeting with the City and (or) other meetings in Ottawa.

**Action Items**

- BT to circulate a new schedule for the Committee meetings
- JM and MC to have a separate meeting to address concerns strictly related to issues concerning the block of houses backing onto MC's property and that of his neighbours (setbacks, plantings, etc.).
- JM to inform the Committee when Wimmer and Cassidy will be able to make a presentation to the Committee (preferably before summer 2010)
- JD to append “As it was heard” notes from the facilitated session at the last meeting to the minutes for posting on the web
- JH to post minutes of the last meeting on the web

**Appendix A**

---

April 6, 2010

TO: JENNIFER MURRAY  
FROM: MICHAEL CLANCY  
RE: MAHOGANY BAY DEVELOPMENT

---

It's my understanding that the subdivision and zoning applications for Phase 1 of the Minto development have been, or soon will be, presented to the City. Given that my property and those of my immediate neighbours (Andrea Wade & Giles Kilburn, Martin & Uta Souter) will obviously be affected by the dramatic change in density which will directly surround our properties, we would all welcome your assistance in getting clarification on several issues.

1. Will we be rezoned?
2. Precisely what setback allowances will be accorded to the three bordering properties as above and given the size of these properties, will the setbacks be the same as those accorded to the bordering properties on Potter Drive?
3. What plans have been made to ensure that water levels in the pond are sufficient to continue sustaining the existing flora, fauna and wildlife?
4. As we are all on existing wells from the same aquifer underlying the development, how will our water be affected in quantity or quality?
5. What time lines can we anticipate as regards the new construction immediately surrounding our properties and what sort of barriers/fencing will be provided during the process to address pollution (dust, noise) and safety concerns?

Looking forward to hearing from you on these matters.

With thanks and best regards,