

BUILDING CONSENSUS

Ottawa Ward Boundary Review

Report on Public Involvement – Round One

1. Introduction

Between November 8 and December 10, 2004, the Ottawa Ward Boundary Review project received a wealth of thoughtful comments on the redesign of ward boundaries for the City of Ottawa. Councillors and the mayor, individual citizens and community groups shared their insights and concerns with the project consultants. They proposed solutions which best meet the needs of their respective communities, but also considered the requirements of others and of the City as a whole.

The following report outlines the approach to round one of involving the public, describes who we heard from, how many people participated and summarizes what we heard. The report ends with some general conclusions and an overview of the next steps for the project.

This “Report on Public Involvement – Round One” is a companion report to the “Background Report”. The latter reviews in detail the numerous factors relevant to the design of ward boundaries such as Ottawa’s major communities, size of wards and communities of interest and physical boundaries. Both reports provide the context for the next step in building consensus, which is a public discussion of a series of options for new ward boundaries for the City of Ottawa.

2. Approach

The theme of this ward boundary review is “Building Consensus”, achieving, to the greatest extent possible, solutions for new ward boundaries which satisfy the various stakeholders and avoid lengthy and costly adversarial appeals. To reach this goal it is necessary to consult widely.

Round one of the public involvement process was aimed at informing the public and other stakeholders about the Ottawa Ward Boundary Review project and soliciting general opinions and information about the City’s current ward structure from as wide a variety of people as possible.

To this end, an array of communication materials was produced in both official languages, including: a Public Consultation Workbook with information about the

project and an electronic feedback sheet on a special ward boundary review web site; a printed version of the workbook and feedback sheet, distributed through public libraries, Client Service Centres and Councillors' offices; a bookmark promoting the dates and locations of the six general public meetings, also distributed through public libraries, Client Service Centres and Councillors' offices; a media release; and, advertisements in community newspapers and the major daily papers inviting the public to attend any of the six public meetings.

The Public Consultation Workbooks and feedback sheets were also available at the public meetings, as were the bookmarks, a brochure with answers to "Frequently Asked Questions", 2004 and 2015 Population Estimates by ward, and a map showing Ottawa's current ward structure. (The latter three items were also posted on the project web site.)

During round one extensive interviews took place with all of the councillors and the mayor and a number of community groups.

At the public meetings display maps were used showing Ottawa's current provincial and federal electoral riding boundaries, current ward boundaries and a map called "Future Directions", which illustrates the City's development policies according to its recently adopted Official Plan.

By way of introduction the public meetings began with an overview of the project, issues with the current ward structure and an outline of the project's mandate, as determined by City Council. It was emphasized that Council had not imposed any constraints on the Review, i.e. there was no requirement to equalize populations among wards or stay within the present number of wards.

Next came a brief explanation of the framework this Review is using to arrive at a series of options for new ward boundaries. This framework includes: communities of interest (inner urban, suburban, and rural); Official Plan growth policies inside and outside the Urban Growth Boundary and the Greenbelt; population projections; and, physical boundaries.

Following these introductions members of the public enthusiastically shared their general opinions and detailed suggestions on whether and how to revise the current Ottawa ward structure.

3. Who We Heard From

Overall, more than 250 people participated in round one of the Ottawa Ward Boundary Review public process. 125 people attended the six public meetings and community group meetings. 51 feedback sheets were returned at the public meetings or faxed to the project office, and another 27 were returned on-line.

Written submissions, by e-mail or in person, were made by 62 individuals and associations. There were 22 interviews with all of the councillors and the mayor.

Some participants invested an extraordinary amount of time and effort in their submissions. One provided the consultant team with an extensive set of overheads proposing a new system of governance and wards for Ottawa. Another designed a special web site with an analysis of data from other cities and provinces and specific suggestions regarding revised ward boundaries.

Opinions and suggestions came from every ward. Not surprisingly, the greatest interest in the Review is in Kanata, followed by Rideau, West Carleton and Goulbourn.

Given that round one of the public involvement process was asking for general feedback and that there were no concrete proposals to react to, the level of interest expressed by so many Ottawa citizens is truly rewarding. Their opinions and suggestions will inform the next stages of the project.

4. What We Heard

4.1 General Comments

It is evident that Ottawa is still suffering from the repercussions of its forced amalgamation in 2000. There is a pervasive feeling, strongly expressed throughout the round one public process, that amalgamation has resulted in service cuts, higher taxes and a less responsive political system. Most citizens do not realize that provincial downloading of urban services and the cutting of subsidies for rural services have contributed to this situation.

People consider the new city too big and impersonal, lacking pride and commitment by individuals. Council is seen as very divided. There is a vague sense that more change, such as may result from this ward boundary review, may be detrimental at this stage. All residents, whether rural, suburban or urban, are equally convinced that their communities are suffering the most from a lack of adequate infrastructure.

On the other hand, there is a realization that “we need to make amalgamation work” and that the fabric of the new city needs strengthening. People are willing to pay higher taxes for good services. As one resident expressed it, “if I get value for my taxes, I’ll pay and smile”.

More specifically, there is greater understanding among the various communities of each other’s issues than may be apparent on the surface. People are coming to grips with the concept that “one size cannot fit all”. They suggest practical approaches which distinguish between the needs of urban and rural areas to by-laws relating to such issues as weed control, tree cutting and leaf burning. There

is growing respect for different lifestyles and the value that both urban and rural residents add to the new city. As one urban resident remarked during one of the public meetings, “the rurals have their own problems, they need an airplane to get around in their wards”.

Among the people who advocated change in ward boundaries there was virtual unanimity that any new structure would have to be in place in time for the 2006 municipal elections and that a hearing before the Ontario Municipal Board should be avoided.

4.2 Municipal Representation

There were wide-ranging comments on how a new ward structure should be designed and how Ottawa’s geography should be divided for municipal government purposes. Some suggested using the federal/provincial riding boundaries, others the regional wards of the former Ottawa-Carleton. Most advocated a re-arrangement within the existing ward structure. In order to break with the past, it was proposed to re-align ward boundaries so that they cross the borders of the pre-amalgamation municipalities.

Suburban voters felt under-represented vis-a-vis urban voters. Rural voters felt dominated by the suburban communities in their wards and under-represented on City Council. And urban voters felt that the balance of power was skewed against the central wards by rural over-representation. They also felt a lack of respect from their suburban neighbours.

Many comments advocated parity of voting power, i.e. “one person-one vote” or “rep-by-pop” or “no special status for any ward”. If a pure “rep-by-pop” ward structure could not be achieved, populations in Ottawa’s various wards should at least be similar, within a 15% - 20% range or a maximum deviation of 33%. Suggested ward population numbers ranged from 20,000 to 55,000. It was acknowledged that the fastest growing wards could, initially, have lower population numbers than their more stable counterparts. There was also a suggestion that ward populations should be based both on the number of residents and on the number of jobs.

A number of people proposed an automatic ward boundary review every 9 or 10 years.

In response to suggestions which advocated voter parity across the whole City of Ottawa, the concept of “effective representation” was discussed at great length. To achieve effective representation, factors other than population must be weighed as well, such as ward area (time and distance), physical boundaries and communities of interest.

It was suggested that restrictions on growth in rural areas through Ottawa's new Official Plan are responsible for the lack of population growth projected for the rural wards and should not be used as an argument against them.

Opinions were divided as to whether a mix of suburban and rural communities in the same ward is desirable. Some people thought that separating these communities might polarize them. Others believed that the currently "mixed" wards of Goulbourn and Cumberland do not work very well and suggested that Ottawa City Council now only has 2 or 3 truly rural councillors. It was pointed out that the OMB hearing on the 2001 - 2003 ward boundary review dismissed the idea of mixed urban/rural wards based on court decisions elsewhere in Canada.

People appreciated that it is easier to represent mature, stable urban wards than the fast growing suburban wards or the inner city wards which deal with many city-wide problems such as homelessness, expanding cultural institutions, transportation issues, drug use and the like.

In order not to divide communities, large roads or other physical boundaries as well as the Urban Growth Boundary of the Official Plan were suggested as ward boundaries.

4.3 Number of Wards and Governance Issues

There was a range of opinions as to whether new wards and councillors should be added. A large number of people suggested that there should be an increase. Someone pointed out that pre-amalgamation Ottawa had over 80 full and part-time municipal representatives. Someone else thought an odd number of wards would be helpful to the functioning of Council.

Many comments recognized that the rapid growth of Bell-South Nepean, Kanata and Gloucester-Southgate are preventing those councillors from being able to represent their constituents effectively. There was the hope that these large wards could be accommodated without impacting other wards too much. There were also specific proposals on how to divide the high-growth wards and re-align adjacent wards to make the system more manageable.

Most people were comfortable with adding up to three or four wards. One suggestion was to create a minimum of 27 wards and a maximum of 33 to achieve effective representation, while maintaining "democratic credibility" through similar though not equal population numbers. This proposal argued that between 51 and 61 wards would have to be created, if Rideau remained small, both in size and population.

There was seemingly no concern with the added costs the City would have to incur, if the size of Council were increased. Participants at the public meetings

pointed out that these costs would be a very small percentage of the City's total budget and that this is "the price that has to be paid for democracy".

Other people were adamant that the size of Council should remain as is, that the number of rural wards should be maintained, but that the urban/suburban wards should be divided differently. Some proposed that the rural wards be decreased to 3 or 4 and that Kanata be divided. Still others suggested expanding the rural wards to include the rural parts of the adjacent suburban wards.

There was a comment that the number of wards inside the Greenbelt should become equal to the number outside the Greenbelt, as well as an opinion that 2 wards inside the Greenbelt should be eliminated and the population re-distributed. There was also a proposal to decrease the number of wards to 14.

Among the people who thought that the size of Council should remain the same or should decrease there were many who advocated for an increase in councillors' budgets. Variable budgets for councillors' offices were seen as a way to deal with the uneven workload generated by differences in number of constituents. Also, there was a feeling that the role of councillors should change from being involved in providing services to individual constituents to assuming more of a policy-making function. Competent staff could handle a large part of the constituency work.

There were also those who thought that the mandate of the Ottawa Ward Boundary Review should have included consideration of other types of governance systems. Given the fact that Ottawa is expected to continue to grow and that the size of Council cannot increase indefinitely, a different system of governance was seen as inevitable, eventually.

Possibilities outlined included: variable wards, i.e. wards with different voting powers; ward councils or community councils with certain powers and limited budgets; boroughs with advisory councils responsible for making certain types of decisions and with control over certain parts of the City budget; and, three independent cities and/or the re-introduction of regional government.

4.4 Overview

Round one of the public involvement process sought both general comments and specific suggestions for ward boundaries. In such an extensive public involvement process a wide divergence of opinions can be expected. This is reflected in the comments outlined above. There seems to be an understanding that there are three main communities in the new City of Ottawa, but beyond that people have different ideas on the best approach to local government. During round two alternatives for new ward boundaries will be available and the debate will become more focused.

5. Ward by Ward Comments

This section of the Round One Public Involvement Report outlines comments received by ward. None are considered more important or less important than others. Many conflict with each other, as people have different ideas about how to design the best possible system of representation. Some suggest small, technical changes which will make a boundary easier to understand, others re-unite communities and still others revise one or more wards substantially. For ease of reference, suggestions which affect more than one ward are also listed in the section(s) for the other ward(s).

5.1 Orléans – Ward 1

Suggestions:

- Make Trim the boundary with Cumberland rather than the creek;
- Highway 174 is a barrier between North and South Convent Glen;
- Part of Queenswood Heights is in Ward 1, while the other part, Innes to Des Épinettes, is in Cumberland; however, it seems to work with two councillors;
- Consider expanding Beacon Hill-Cyrville into Ward 1;
- Move the southern boundary of Ward 1 to Innes (if an extra ward is added here, or if Beacon Hill-Cyrville is expanded into Ward 1);
- Do not move the area north of Innes into Ward 1; and
- Add current and future subdivisions from Cumberland to Ward 1.

5.2 Innes – Ward 2

Suggestions:

- The eastern boundary is appropriate;
- Blackburn Hamlet is a self-contained community;
- Notre Dame Des Champs is split between Ward 2 and Cumberland; not sure whether this is worth changing;
- Leave Notre Dame Des Champs with Ward 2;
- Pineview Golf Course can move to Beacon Hill-Cyrville;
- Add the National Research Council property south of Montreal Rd. into Beacon Hill-Cyrville; and
- Green's Creek should be southern boundary of Beacon Hill-Cyrville.

5.3 Bell-South Nepean – Ward 3

Suggestions:

- Divide Ward 3;
- Use the Rideau River, Highway 416, Highway 417, Fallowfield and Eagleson to make two wards;

- Create a new ward bounded by Highway 417, Highway 416, Fallowfield and Terry Fox or Huntmar (this would include Bells Corners);
- Move Bells Corners into Bay, Baseline or Knoxdale-Merivale;
- Kanata could be connected with Bells Corners;
- Fallowfield village should not be left on its own;
- Bankfield is not a good boundary, but Barnsdale is appropriate;
- Make Fallowfield the southern boundary and Cedarview the western boundary with Knoxdale-Merivale;
- Move Merivale Gardens, Grenfell Glen, Pine Glen and Country Place to Knoxdale-Merivale;
- Cedar Hill and Orchard Estate should remain in Ward 3;
- Expand the Riverside South community across the River into Ward 3;
- Move the southern and western rural areas to adjacent rural wards;
- Perhaps the rural parts of Ward 3 could be moved into Goulbourn (the area west of Highway 416); and
- Perhaps add Manotick to a new Ward 3.

5.4 Kanata – Ward 4

Suggestions:

- Keep the western boundary of Ward 4;
- Move most of the former March Township to West Carleton (divide at Old Carp or March/Riddell);
- Keep all of Ward 4's rural area together;
- Use Urban Growth Boundary as new boundary with West Carleton (not Old Carp);
- Move the Greenbelt to Riddell and March Valley into Bay;
- Do not divide Ward 4;
- Divide Ward 4; at Hazeldean, or Terry Fox or Highway 417;
- Stittsville could be joined with Glen Cairn in Ward 4;
- Stittsville/Corel Centre/Glen Cairn/ Bridlewood could be a new ward;
- The Katimavik and Hazeldean communities must stay together;
- Connect the small area inside the Urban Growth Boundary (now in Goulbourn) with Bridlewood;
- Do not separate Grierson Lane from Ward 4;
- Move the Kanata West lands into Ward 4;
- If Stittsville becomes part of Ward 4, the cost of services should not go up automatically;
- If adjacent areas are to be joined with Ward 4, add Stittsville, Bells Corners and Dunrobin;
- Create a new ward in Bell-South Nepean bounded by Highway 417, Highway 416, Fallowfield and Terry Fox or Huntmar (this would include Bells Corners);
- Ward 4 could be connected with Bells Corners; and

- If appeals to the Official Plan are successful, include the affected lands in any revised Ward 4; if the appeals are not successful, the lands should remain with Goulbourn.

5.5 West Carleton – Ward 5

Suggestions:

- Move the Kanata West lands into Kanata;
- Move most of the former March Township from Kanata to Ward 5 (divide at Old Carp or March/Riddell);
- If areas adjacent to Kanata are to be joined with it, add Stittsville, Bells Corners and Dunrobin;
- Use Urban Growth Boundary as the new boundary between Kanata and Ward 5 (not Old Carp);
- Make Highway 7 the boundary between Ward 5 and Goulbourn;
- The industrial park (on rural services) west of Rothbourne should relate to Stittsville; and
- Leave Ward 5 as is.

5.6 Goulbourn – Ward 6

Suggestions:

- Leave Ward 6 as is;
- Make Highway 7 the boundary between West Carleton and Ward 6;
- The industrial park (on rural services) west of Rothbourne should relate to Stittsville;
- Include area south to Fallowfield as an “area of urban expansion” for Stittsville;
- If appeals to the Official Plan are successful, include the affected lands in any revised Kanata; if the appeals are not successful, the lands should remain with Ward 6;
- If Stittsville is separated, use Black’s Side Road as a boundary;
- Stittsville could be joined with Glen Cairn in Kanata;
- If Stittsville becomes part of Kanata, the cost of services should not go up automatically;
- Stittsville/Corel Centre/Glen Cairn/ Bridlewood could be a new ward;
- Connect the small area inside the Urban Growth Boundary (now in Ward 6) with Bridlewood in Kanata;
- If adjacent areas are to be joined with Kanata, add Stittsville, Bells Corners and Dunrobin;
- Perhaps the rural parts of Bell-South Nepean could be moved into Ward 6 (the area west of Highway 416);
- Expand Ward 6 to include “Kettles” from Rideau (west of Marlborough Forest);
- Combine the rural parts of Ward 6 with Rideau;
- Do not combine Ward 6 and Rideau; and

- Join Ward 6 and Rideau.

5.7 Bay – Ward 7

Suggestions:

- Keep Ward 7 together;
- Ward 7's eastern boundary (Maitland/ Sherbourne) is appropriate; it is also a riding boundary; do not shift it to Woodroffe, since the community is opposed;
- The eastern boundary with Kitchissippi should be Woodroffe;
- Bayshore and Crystal Bay are separate communities;
- Perhaps Bells Corners and all lands inside the Greenbelt should be moved into Ward 7; and
- Move the Greenbelt to Riddell and March Valley into Ward 7.

5.8 Baseline – Ward 8

Suggestions:

- Move Bells Corners into Ward 8;
- Move the Crestview community into Ward 8 from Knoxdale-Merivale; and
- The triangle west of Highway 416 has to stay in Ward 8; it belongs to the hospital across the street.

5.9 Knoxdale-Merivale – Ward 9

Suggestions:

- Move the Crestview community into Baseline from Ward 9;
- Move Merivale Gardens, Grenfell Glen, Pine Glen and Country Place to Ward 9;
- Include the Greenbelt to Fallowfield in Ward 9, make Cedarview the western boundary;
- Move Bells Corners into Bay, Baseline or Ward 9;
- Move a small parcel of Ward 9 near the Rideau into River;
- Add area east of Fisher, south of Baseline, north of Walkley to Ward 9; and
- Move the eastern boundary of Ward 9 to the centre lines of Baseline and Fisher.

5.10 Gloucester-Southgate – Ward 10

Suggestions:

- Divide Ward 10; use Leitrim or Lester as a boundary;

- Perhaps add Manotick to a new ward in Bell-South Nepean;
- Riverside South and Finlay Creek are growing;
- The Ellwood community east of Bank St. should be in Ward 10;
- Ellwood east of Bank should stay in River;
- The railway marshalling yards south of Walkley divide the community;
- Windsor Park should be part of River, it is now divided;
- The Riverside South community should not be divided; surrounding communities should be added to create a new ward;
- Expand the Riverside South community across the River into Bell-South Nepean;
- Riverside South should not be part of Osgoode;
- Carlsbad Springs is divided; it should, perhaps, be moved into Cumberland;
- Osgoode could expand north to include the rural parts of Ward 10;
- The Ward 10 parts of the airport lands could move into River;
- Having the airport in two wards is not a problem;
- Move the small triangle of NCC property east of Highway 417 to Ward 10;
- The eastern boundary of Alta Vista should be Highway 417; and
- The Blossom Park community is isolated inside the Greenbelt.

5.11 Beacon Hill-Cyrville – Ward 11

Suggestions:

- The western boundary of Ward 11 should be the centre line of St. Laurent south to the train tracks or to Innes;
- Pineview Golf Course east of Blair should move from Innes into Ward 11;
- Green's Creek should be southern boundary of Ward 11;
- Move the boundary of Ward 11 with Rideau-Rockcliffe to the centre line of Blair;
- Make La Cité to Bathgate or Montreal the northern boundary of Ward 11;
- Changing the southern boundary of Rideau-Rockcliffe to La Cité does not make sense (the College is not accessible to through traffic).
- The area between Montreal and Ogilvie/ Aviation Parkway/ Bathgate is a community of interest and could be in Rideau-Rockcliffe;
- Do not expand Rideau-Rockcliffe into Ward 11 to Ogilvie;
- The communities of Carson Woods and Carson Grove straddle the boundary between Ward 11 and Rideau-Rockcliffe; the community association is divided;
- Add the National Research Council property south of Montreal into Ward 11; and
- If Ward 11 needs more population, extend it eastward into Orléans to Jeanne d'Arc or Orléans, north of Jeanne d'Arc to the creek; southern boundary to St. Joseph.

5.12 Rideau-Vanier – Ward 12

Suggestions:

- Do not change Vanier and Rockcliffe.

5.13 Rideau-Rockcliffe – Ward 13

Suggestions:

- Normalize the eastern boundary of Ward 13 to follow centre lines;
- The communities of Carson Woods and Carson Grove straddle the boundary between Ward 13 and Beacon Hill-Cyrville; the community association is divided;
- The area between Montreal and Ogilvie/ Aviation Parkway/ Bathgate is a community of interest and could be in Ward 13;
- Do not expand Ward 13 into Beacon Hill-Cyrville to Ogilvie;
- Make La Cité to Bathgate or Montreal the northern boundary of Beacon Hill-Cyrville;
- Changing the southern boundary of Ward 13 to La Cité does not make sense (the College is not accessible to through traffic).

5.14 Somerset – Ward 14

Suggestions:

- Move the area south of the Queensway (The Glebe Annex) into Capital; and
- The centre line of Preston should be the eastern boundary of Kitchissippi, all the way up to the river.

5.15 Kitchissippi – Ward 15

Suggestions:

- The western boundary with Bay should be Woodroffe;
- Bay's eastern boundary (Maitland/ Sherbourne) is appropriate; it is also a riding boundary; do not shift it to Woodroffe, since the community is opposed;
- The area north of Carling, south of Highway 417 should be moved to River;
- The centre line of Preston should be the eastern boundary of Ward 15, all the way up to the river; and
- The area south of Carling, west of Fisher, north of Baseline should be in Ward 15; could also include the Experimental Farm.

5.16 River – Ward 16

Suggestions:

- Ward 16 does not need to be changed;
- Ellwood east of Bank should stay in Ward 16;
- The Ellwood community east of Bank St. should be in Gloucester-Southgate;
- Move a small parcel of Knoxdale-Merivale near the Rideau into Ward 16;
- The area south of Carling, west of Fisher, north of Baseline should be in Kitchissippi; could also include the Experimental Farm;
- Add area east of Fisher, south of Baseline, north of Walkley to Knoxdale-Merivale;
- Capital could absorb Confederation Heights, Riverside Park from Ward 16;
- The Gloucester-Southgate parts of the airport lands could move into Ward 16;
- Having the airport in two wards is not a problem;
- Windsor Park should be part of Ward 16, it is now divided;
- Ward 16 community associations go across the river;
- The area north of Carling, south of Highway 417 should be moved to Ward 16; and
- The community north of Carling in Kitchissippi has nothing in common with that south of Carling in Ward 16.

5.17 Capital – Ward 17

Suggestions:

- Do not move Heron Park out of Ward 17;
- Possibly add Heron Park to Alta Vista;
- The area between the River and Riverside Drive should move into Alta Vista;
- Move the area south of the Queensway (The Glebe Annex) into Ward 17;
- Ward 17 could expand into Alta Vista to Kilborn/Alta Vista; and
- Ward 17 could absorb Confederation Heights, Riverside Park from River.

5.18 Alta Vista – Ward 18

Suggestions:

- Leave Ward 18 as is;
- The area between the River and Riverside Drive should move from Capital into Ward 18;
- Capital could expand into Ward 18 to Kilborn/Alta Vista;
- The western boundary of Beacon Hill-Cyrville should be the centre line of St. Laurent south to the train tracks or to Innes;
- The eastern boundary of Ward 18 should be Highway 417;

- Move the small triangle of NCC property east of Highway 417 to Gloucester-Southgate; and
- Possibly add Heron Park to Ward 18.

5.19 Cumberland – Ward 19

Suggestions:

- Ward 19 seems to work well;
- Ward 19 is not really a rural ward; the suburban population is too large;
- Divide Ward 19; create a new rural ward;
- Add current and future subdivisions from Ward 19 to Orléans;
- Part of Queenswood Heights is in Orléans, while the other part, Innes to Des Épinettes, is in Ward 19; however, it seems to work with two councillors;
- Carlsbad Springs is divided; it should be moved into Ward 19 from Gloucester-Southgate;
- Notre Dame Des Champs is split between Innes and Ward 2; not sure whether this is worth changing;
- Leave Notre Dame Des Champs with Innes;
- Move the southern boundary of Orléans to Innes (if an extra ward is added here, or if Beacon Hill-Cyrville is expanded into Orléans);
- Do not move the area north of Innes into Orléans; and
- Move the boundary between Ward 19 and Orléans to Trim.

5.20 Osgoode – Ward 20

Suggestions:

- Keep Ward 20 as is;
- Ward 20 could include the rural community from Gloucester-Southgate;
- Riverside South should not be part of Ward 20;
- Rideau should not expand into Ward 20; and
- Combine Rideau and Ward 20.

5.21 Rideau – Ward 21

Suggestions:

- Combine Osgoode and Ward 21;
- Ward 21 should not expand into Osgoode;
- Combine Goulbourn and Ward 21;
- Do not combine Goulbourn and Ward 21;
- Combine the rural parts of Goulbourn with Ward 21;
- The southern part of Ward 21 should be part of North Grenville;
- Expand Goulbourn to include “Kettles” from Ward 21 (west of Marlborough Forest);

- Add rural Bell-South Nepean to Ward 21;
- Perhaps add Manotick to a new ward in Bell-South Nepean; and
- Expand Ward 21 north to include all of Manotick.

6. Conclusion

This Report on Public Involvement - Round One demonstrates the extraordinary interest among Ottawa's citizens in the ward boundary review. Many people have been sensitized to the issues through their experience with previous efforts at re-defining the wards. They know the day-to-day difficulties some of their councillors face in carrying out their municipal responsibilities.

In a public involvement process as extensive as this, a wide divergence of comments and suggestions can be expected. This is reflected in the opinions outlined in Section 4 – What We Heard. The divergence is evident in the general comments and in the suggestions for municipal representation and the number of wards. There seems to be an understanding that there are three main communities in the new City of Ottawa, but beyond that people have different ideas on the best approach to local government.

Round one of the public involvement process has generated a wealth of thoughtful suggestions and has highlighted the areas where more discussion is needed to achieve consensus. People living in the rural, suburban and urban parts of Ottawa have exhibited a much greater understanding of each other's issues than may be apparent on the surface. Their high degree of interest and willingness to engage in spirited debate bodes well for the next round of public discourse, when there will be concrete alternatives to evaluate.

7. Next Steps

Based on the Background Report and on this Report on Public Involvement - Round One an Options Report will be prepared with several possible adjustments to Ottawa's ward structure. Following its release in mid-February, the report will be discussed at a series of public meetings all across the City. Taking into account the comments from these meetings, recommendations for revised ward boundaries for the City of Ottawa will go to City Council in late April or May, 2005.