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CLIMATE CHANGE BACKGROUND (OTTAWA CONTEXT)

Climate change is a global phenomenon that implicates governments of all orders. While climate change is global in its reach, its impacts are felt hardest at a local level. Cities like Ottawa have the greatest access to means of change. Despite this, we are failing to keep up with the ever-growing threat of a changing climate.

Currently, the city of Ottawa has recognized a need to reduce community emissions by 68% by 2030, and 100% by 2050.1 In 2018, Ottawa’s community emissions were approximately 6000 kilotons CO2e.2 This means the city needs to reduce its emissions by 4080 kilotons of CO2e in 10 years.

Looking at Ottawa’s biggest emitters, it is clear that two main sources are responsible for the majority: buildings (45%) and transportation (44%).3 Within these sectors, two of the highest sources for emissions are residential housing and on-road transportation.4 If Ottawa has any hopes of meeting its anticipated emissions goals, it will need to seriously reconsider the way the city currently approaches transportation and residential housing.

The emissions that stem from transportation and housing are closely linked. Largely due to a phenomenon known as urban sprawl, the way cities are built has led to a massive spike in emissions coming from both sectors. Urban sprawl describes low-density residential building that continuously expands outwards. This style of growth has led to thousands of additional kilometres of roads and more spread-out communities. This, in turn, has evolved into a car-dependent system where most people living beyond the urban centre need a vehicle to travel for their most basic necessities such as commuting to work and accessing groceries, parks, and pharmacies. To make matters worse, the emissions stemming from single-family households (typically the result of sprawl) are far worse than those coming from multi-unit dwellings.5

It comes as no surprise that the 2020 report from the National Capital Commission (NCC) and the City of Ottawa demonstrated that at our current rate, 2030 will see temperature increases of 1.8°C, snowfall decreases of 10%, and almost a tripling of very hot days above 30°C.7 These changes are expected to have direct implications on health and safety, water services, transportation and infrastructure, and livability.8
WHERE WE ARE TODAY

In the spring of 2019, the city of Ottawa declared a climate emergency. This declaration led to a series of climate goals which would greatly define the output of policy for the coming years.

Currently, this city is in the process of developing a new Official Plan for the next 25-year period. This revision comes along with the revision of three topic-focused Master Plans (the Infrastructure Master Plan, Transportation Master Plan, and the Greenspace Master Plan). Some of the core goals outlined by the Climate Change Master Plan were to “apply a climate lens to the new Official Plan and its supporting documents”, explore options for green infrastructure, and encourage private actions through incentives.\(^9\)

The Climate Change Master Plan stated that the first five years (2020-2025) would be critical years for the city to set itself on the right track.

Meanwhile, the city was put to the test early on in 2020 when it was faced with a vote to expand the urban boundary in the city’s Official Plan. The vote resulted in a 1650-hectare expansion of the city’s urban boundary. For many, this meant that the first environmental test for the city was a failure. An expanded boundary meant more destruction of Greenfield, more roads and cars, and inefficient development that results in greater emissions.

The motion to expand the boundary passed even though one of the preliminary policy directions, set by the city itself, is to:

"Ensure policies support evolution of the built environment into walkable, 15-minute neighbourhoods through building dense, complete, compact, well-connected communities. This includes a diverse mix of land uses that reduce and disincentivizes the need for a private vehicle and makes it more feasible to live car light or car free."\(^{10}\)

In the summer of 2020, as the city is preparing its recovery plan from the COVID-19 pandemic, people across the city are calling for a green and just recovery. 15-minute neighbourhoods have become a large part of the conversation.

The concept of a 15-minute neighbourhood is an achievable tool for the city to tackle climate change on many fronts. Most significantly, 15-minute neighbourhoods have the potential to reduce building and transportation emissions (the city's two biggest emitters) while also promoting greener and better living for all city residents.

The city is prepared to take serious action on climate change and plans to do so within the next 5 years, as they develop some of the city's most important policy documents. Ecology Ottawa has reached out to community representatives and associations to help define what we think a 15-minute community would look like in Ottawa. This document is designed to share our thoughts on the viability of 15-minute neighbourhoods so that we can assist in making the city’s goals a reality. Overall, we hope it may lead to better communities for all.
To fight back against the threat of climate change, and to promote the development of a better city for all, Ecology Ottawa has begun a 15-minute neighbourhood campaign. The concept of a 15-minute neighbourhood, which means an individual can reach basic amenities (including a grocery store, pharmacy, park, transit stop/station, and café) within a 15 minute walk of their home is a winning idea that will make life better, healthier, more affordable, and greener for all.

15-minute communities are still an uncommon sight in Ottawa, but with the political will and knowledge to make change, they could quickly become the focal point of the city’s environmental and developmental goals. To get there, we will need to promote 15-minute neighbourhoods across the city increasing density and mixed-use development, while decreasing car dependency. With these three steps as a framework, Ecology Ottawa believes that Ottawa can become the green capital of Canada.

"Promote 15-minute neighbourhoods across the city by increasing density and mixed-use development, while decreasing car dependency"

Throughout the next 2 to 3 years, Ottawa is embarking on the monumental task of re-writing its Official Plan, including the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), the Infrastructure Master Plan (IMP), and the Greenspace Master Plan (GMP). In addition, there is an ongoing R4 zoning review and the possibility of a city-wide zoning review in the future. With these circumstances in mind, this document will describe some of the steps and barriers that we will face in the fight to stop climate change and build a better city.
The first step to building a better and more environmentally friendly city is to explore options that increase density. More specifically, to increase density in a smart and intentional way.

Historically, development has existed on two polar ends of the density spectrum. On one end, cities have been building low-density single-family households which take up vast patches of land. On the other, tall and very dense buildings, with small unit sizes, have been built in city centres.

This type of piecemeal intensification has led to increases in municipal service and infrastructure costs, housing affordability issues, longer commute times, and more greenhouse gas emissions. Similar issues are being faced in the Toronto region, where this type of expansion has added pressure to local agriculture, the preservation of the green belt, local ecosystems, and drinking water systems.

WHERE DO WE LOOK FOR DENSITY?

The R4 zoning review, currently being conducted by the City of Ottawa, is a great first step in encouraging gentle density in Ottawa. The Environmental Commissioner of Canada noted in their 2019 report that “removing barriers to medium density housing is noted as a key action needed to reduce sprawl and associated carbon emissions in the province”. That said, the city cannot stop with the zoning review. Historically, municipalities aiming to improve their communities tackled the issue with multiple tools, using a set of incentives and disincentives. In other words, encouraging builders and people to seek mid-sized dwellings while also deterring them from low-density building.
Townships across the country (and internationally) have been taking many steps in this direction. Caledon, Ontario has recently implemented a green development discount where developers can receive large fee discounts of up to 27.5% for building greener. Portland, Oregon uses a sliding scale that awards size bonuses (allowing the building to be slightly larger) based on each added home. An additional bonus is offered if one or more of the homes are offered below market price. Density bonus programs, not unlike the one that currently exists for Ontario, can also be of great use. Builders will be allowed to build more densely than is typically permitted for that zone in exchange for providing a public good like affordable housing or a shared park. Some cities have used graduated density zones (GDZ) which encourages building single homes on smaller lots while the large lots are reserved for multi-unit dwellings.

“By creating building and zoning policies that support distributed density and also require that new construction meet ambitious energy efficiency targets, municipalities have a unique opportunity to achieve broader climate benefits through intensification.”

**WHAT’S THE BEST WAY TO INTENSIFY?**

Approaching the issue at a neighbourhood-level will help make 15-minute communities more feasible. Each neighbourhood throughout the city has a different set of needs. Moreover, some neighbourhoods in Ottawa are much closer to being 15-minute neighbourhoods than others. Because of these differences in capacity, it is important that intensification targets are developed at a neighbourhood-level. Unfortunately, city-wide targets do not allow areas that are ready for high-level intensification to meet their potential. Neighbourhood-level targets ensure that the city is reaching its highest intensity levels without putting a burden on unprepared neighbourhoods.

Healthy intensification cannot be done if the city continues to look at density exclusively in the context of transit zones. All too often, municipalities enforce strict density targets in transit areas and unintentionally leave their surrounding neighbourhoods behind. Ottawa will need to commit to expanding its intensification strategy beyond transit areas. This is particularly important when considering the cities emission targets. To meet a city-wide emissions reduction strategy, we need to ensure intensification is implemented everywhere possible. The city has ambitious goals that cannot be met by transit corridors alone.

Luckily, many existing communities have the potential for low and mid-scale retrofitting that would make them more walkable, transit-connected, and environmentally friendly. The most economical and effective way to make this happen is by introducing medium and gentle density. Toronto has begun plans for a city-wide project called TransformTO which includes targets to make all new buildings near-zero emissions by 2030 and to provide retrofitting incentives on existing buildings so that they may become 40% more efficient by 2050. A similar plan in Ottawa could mean that all new buildings in the expansion zone be built into walkable neighbourhoods, while the existing infrastructure is retrofitted to achieve near-zero-emissions.
WHAT’S STOPPING US?

Currently, several barriers are preventing communities from becoming more walkable. The majority exist in outdated bylaws which favour an older form of low-density building. Another barrier that exists is the presence of false perceptions. One often hears that the reason so much low-density housing exists is because there’s a demand for it (in other words – people want sprawl).

Unfortunately, current biases that work in favour of low-density building has made the cost of living in walkable and complete neighbourhoods unobtainable. City bylaws and regulations are the main proponents of these biases. Starting with the proliferation of free-to-use highways, and ending with subsidized spending on servicing sprawled areas and reducing developer costs and charges, there are many ways cities continue to encourage intensification.

One Ottawa-specific example is the existence of the 30% threshold for single-detached dwellings in Ottawa. Right now, bylaws make it so that 30% of all newly built dwellings in the city are single detached. This pre-determined rule guarantees that single-detached housing gets built regardless of actual demand. The recent threshold change from 45 to 30 per cent was done to allow more density and to reflect the lowering demand for single-detached housing.22 The city also acknowledged that reducing the minimum is good for housing affordability and the environment.23 That said, eliminating the minimum all together would ensure that Ottawa can reach its highest ecological potential. The development market would continue to build single-detached housing to suit demand but would not be forced to build more than is required. In all, this ensures the city’s needs are met without unnecessary affordability and environmental consequences.

"In the approximately 200 square kilometres of Toronto that is zoned exclusively for single-detached dwellings, adding one duplex per hectare could create enough new housing to accommodate 45,000 residents."24

Of course, many of these biases still exist and need to be assessed. Some city by-laws that were once necessary for development no longer suit the needs of the city today. With the growing threat of climate change, we and our cities need to take unprecedented action, and ask ourselves how our decisions hurt the city we live in and what conditions permit these damaging decisions.
WHY ELIMINATING R1 ZONING MAY BE THE ANSWER

Perhaps the largest barrier in building greener, liveable and dense communities is restrictive residential zoning policies. In Ottawa, there are large sections of land zoned exclusively for the building of single-detached dwellings (R1). Historically, these R1 exclusive zones have led to higher housing costs and significant environmental damage. On average, single-detached dwellings consume 54% more energy for heating and 26% more for cooling than multi-family units. In fact, doubling population density can lead to a “reduction in CO2 emissions from household travel and residential energy consumption by 48% and 35%, respectively”.

Of course, eliminating single-detached housing is not a realistic expectation. Instead, other alternatives like upzoning should be considered to increase density. This change could happen on many levels. In 2019, Seattle began allowing up to two Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) per home lot. They also eliminated tedious barriers such as parking minimums, occupancy requirements, and design restrictions to increase feasibility of implementation. Accessory dwelling units (being additional dwellings either attached to the main dwelling or the property) are a great way to boost density without much effort from the city. They also give families opportunity to add another line of income, grow, or share under-utilized spaces.

In that same year, Oregon became a major trailblazer in re-zoning policy as it passed a state-wide law to require cities with a population over 25,000 to allow triplexes and fourplexes in all traditionally single-detached neighbourhoods. Minneapolis passed a similar law for duplexes and triplexes.

Due to Ottawa’s cumulative-style zoning structure, this type of approach would essentially convert many R1 zones into R2 or R3. In other words, the city could allow the building of duplexes, triplexes, or fourplexes for all R1 zones. The impacts caused by this change would be a gradual shift over time. Approving a blanket up-zoning strategy would reduce chances of targeted gentrification and increase housing affordability, all while making neighbourhoods more walkable, environmentally friendly, and active.
THE MANY BENEFITS OF MIXED-USE DEVELOPING

There are many benefits in creating vibrant, mixed-use communities. Aside from providing more jobs and increased ease of access, mixed-use developing is cost-effective, profitable for the city and local business, non-intrusive of Greenfield spaces, reduces emissions, and leads to positive health outcomes.³¹

As a whole, mixed-use developing is at the heart of 15-minute communities and is the main reason people across North America are saying they would trade-in a single-detached home with a lawn for a walkable community.³² ³³ A report by four Medical Officers of Health in the Greater Toronto Hamilton area stated that mixed-use development was a key aspect in supporting “complete communities, active transportation and associated positive health outcomes”.³⁴

Most importantly, mixed-use development uses significantly less space. Delaware found that compact building used 20 to 45 per cent less land and increased quality of life.³⁵ Most often, mixed-use development is revered for its cost-effective and economically stimulating nature. With all this in mind, Ottawa should integrate grocery stores, schools, local retail, live-work housing, parks, civic spaces and universally designed amenities into all areas of our city including in and around residential zones.

While mixed-use building is on the rise, having zoning and by-law policies in place that deter developers from this style of development can be the difference between a liveable neighbourhood and an undesirable one.³⁷

The city’s strategy towards mixed-use building must also incentivise developers to come to residential areas. This is because mixed-use building is meant to help boost livability for residents while also helping the environment.

THE DANGER OF STRIP MALLS

Strip malls are a familiar sight throughout many neighbourhoods in Ottawa. While once a commonly visited style of development, strip malls have become an outdated feature of sprawling cities. Strip malls have been identified
as a by-product of harmful municipal bylaws like single-use zoning, minimum parking requirements, and car-focused setback regulations.38

These conditions result in strip malls that are not built to last, and instead deteriorate or become abandoned within decades.39 Additionally, they encourage the use of automobiles, reduce neighbourhood walkability and livability, and further add to the sprawling nature of our city. Big box stores and strip malls both occupy acres of valuable land with their excessive size and parking lots. These types of buildings are designed to siphon money from a town, they produce less tax money than a mixed-use development, and they are often rewarded with subsidies and investments from the government.40

In the last decade, many cities have taken to re-designing their strip malls and making them productive uses of land once again.

“Transforming big-box stores, strip malls and shopping centres into mixed-use communities with a range of housing typologies, densities and scales can add housing and employment in neighbourhoods with good access to transit and other services.”41

Examples include Mississauga’s Reimagining Mall Project, where the city has been reviewing a large-scale redesign of five major strip malls and their surrounding locations. The focus of the project is to “ensure that future intensification in these areas is done in a way that fosters healthy, mixed-use communities. The idea being that you can live, work, play and raise a family all within your own ‘complete community’”.42 The project planning phase took only 2 years and will see these areas become community nodes in the near future. The city intends to increase density numbers in these areas which will help support the local growth while also reducing the city’s environmental impact.43
Other examples include:

- **Toronto’s Don Mills Shops** which combine low-rise retail and mid and high rise residential and office space. This area also acts as a social gathering space which brings in the outdoors.\(^{45}\)
- **Ottawa’s Elmvale Acres** which took an old shopping centre and integrated it into the surrounding community and transit station. Elmvale Acres is now a planned walkable and liveable neighbourhood with a mix of low, medium, and high-rise buildings.\(^{46}\)
- **Etobicoke’s Humbertown** redevelopment took an old concrete plaza and transformed it into a green, mixed-use space for residents, workers, and socializing.\(^{47}\)
- **Brampton’s Shoppers World** redevelopment which is set to become a new urban core for the city and has been designed as a “vibrant, transit-supportive, human-scaled and walkable destination where people can live, work, play and shop”.\(^{48}\)

Stopping these harmful strip mall developments and retrofitting outdated locations would lead to more walkable and liveable communities across the city that generate more profit and don’t have excessive negative effects on our environment. Strip-malls are just one of the many areas cities should re-evaluate when it comes to the value of mixed-use development. Ottawa has seen increases in mixed-use infrastructure in recent decades, but there is still a strong lack of its spread into the suburbs and many ways it can improve.
LESS CAR DEPENDENCY

At the heart of all sprawl issues lies this single major barrier – car dependency. In Ottawa, car emissions are one of the largest sources of air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions. This problem is, in part, due to the massive commute times that people must endure daily.

For many, on one end of these commutes is a sprawled-out neighbourhood of single-detached homes. Because we rely on cars so much, these homes are a driving-distance away from the most basic amenities like grocery stores, parks, pharmacies, and transit stations.

These stores are separated by massive parking lots, designed to fit hundreds of cars from the surrounding neighbourhoods. Greenspaces, agricultural land, and ecosystems have all been destroyed to make room for these roads, box stores, and parking lots. This growing dependence on vehicles over the years has taken its toll on the environment. In a 2019 report, the provincial government identified sprawl as a major enabler of emissions.50

All the impractical living and destruction doesn’t even come at the cost of convenience. In Ottawa, the average commute is nearly an hour and a half each day.51 Considering that commuting in a car is ranked as people’s least favourite regular activity52 we need to ask ourselves who we’re really helping when we continue to allow unwalkable neighbourhoods to develop.

Household emissions can increase by approximately 4 times for people who live outside the core – mostly due to car use.54

STEPPING OUT OF THE VEHICLE

The fastest way to mitigate this growing issue is to stop feeding it. New communities must be built without an over-reliance on cars. In practice, this means communities are being built and retrofitted with mixed-use development and ready access to active and public transportation.

While a vibrant mixed-use community can eliminate the need for local car use, people will still need to reach other locales. An extensive public and active transportation network is vital. Not only will it make for a healthier lifestyle for those living in the area, but it will also provide them with all the freedoms associated with personal modes of transportation. Eliminating the use of a vehicle can mean savings up to $11,000 a year.55 What the city can expect is cleaner air, healthier residents, and increased chances of meeting the goals set out by the city’s Climate Change Master Plan and Official Plan policy directions.
“Neighbourhood design and the provision of transit can have a substantial impact on emissions of air pollutants by influencing vehicle use, transit use and active modes of transportation.”

THE PRECARIOUS CASE OF PARKING MINIMUMS

One of the most basic yet impactful results of car dependency are parking minimums. Minimum parking requirements seriously impact the walkability of neighbourhoods as they promote lots that separate infrastructure and take away from a community’s character. Generally, the cost of building and maintaining these lots is passed down from the developer to the resident, making housing more expensive. These requirements can also be a costly burden for small, local entrepreneurs.

Banning parking minimums has been done in cities around the world. Examples include Halifax, Buffalo, and Mexico City. In most cases, street parking is enough to maintain parking needs for residents.

To start, the change would only apply to new developments meaning that changes would be gradual and would be implemented in such a way that doesn’t shock the current system. Additionally, it’s been found that the development industry regulates parking effectively on its own. Every neighbourhood, and every development within a neighbourhood, is designed to satisfy the needs of a community. In a world where no parking minimums exist, developers will create parking only when they recognize the necessity for the neighbourhood. If a developer wants to include parking to make their apartment building, more livable they can do so without over-building. All the while, the removal of minimums can even lead to the repurposing and redeveloping of older infrastructure, making the city more livable and innovative, if it extended to existing lots.

THE ROAD DIET

Another up-and-coming policy change that has grabbed the attention of cities around the world is road diets. Road diets work by reducing multi-lane roadways to single-lane while adding new space for pedestrians, public transportation and active transportation. This has the added benefit of calming traffic. Ottawa has already
begun planning streets of this style surrounding the newly planned LRT stations. They are a cost-effective strategy for building safe, liveable, and green neighbourhoods.

### The benefits of road diets: 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Safer streets</th>
<th>Some studies have found that converting a 4 lane into a 2 lane with a common turning lane in the middle can reduce crashes by as much as 47%.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase in active transportation</td>
<td>With a design that has intentional features to keep active travellers safe, accidents can be significantly reduced. Considering that safety is the number one reason people chose not to bike, these convenient changes could lead to more people walking and biking. In turn, neighbourhoods become healthier and more environmentally friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Better livability</td>
<td>Creates neighbourhoods that are better for pedestrians to work, play, and explore local business. In part due to improved convenience and appearance, these streets become focal points in neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase multi-modal use</td>
<td>Along with active transportation increases, road diets often lead to conditions that favour public transportation networks. Overall, the city could expect to see increases in all sustainable modal uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Following the money

In order to see many of the changes discussed in this document come into fruition, budgetary reallocations and evaluations will also need to happen. Currently, many of the city’s fiscal commitments favor car-centric expansion and spend too little on greener forms of transportation.

For example, between 2018 and 2022 the city has planned to spend $28 million on stand-alone active transportation projects ($7 million a year).65 Meanwhile, one 3 year, 3.3km road widening project in Barrhaven is costing the city $113 million ($38 million a year).66 This represents an investment difference of $31 million a year – and that’s only for a single road project.

In the city’s first round of consultations on the new Transportation Master Plan (published April 2020), city residents listed transit expansion, active transportation, and reduced traffic as top issues. 75% of the respondents believe the city needs to take steps towards addressing climate change and reducing GHG emissions.67

By investing more money into public transportation and active transportation, the city would be tackling climate issues while also reducing car dependency – therefore reducing traffic congestion. This style of positive incentivising is extremely important because expanding roads does not reduce traffic.68 In two cases – one in San Francisco and one in Seoul – highways carrying over 100,000 daily drivers were removed and traffic did not worsen while environmental conditions improved.69
REDEFINING SUSTAINABILITY

Other small changes that make a big difference include changing the way the city defines sustainability. In the past decade, our understanding of sustainability and environmental issues has expanded exponentially. Despite this growth in knowledge, much of our policy and definitions have stayed the same and have become outdated.

When it comes to transport, modal share is one of the best ways to monitor and develop sustainable travel. Right now, the city’s 2031 target for sustainable mode share is 50%. The city includes cycling, walking, transit, and ‘automobile passenger’ as a sustainable form of travel. Despite the low targets set out, the city’s transportation networks are still struggling to keep up. Sustainable travel in Ottawa accounts for 38% of trips.

The inclusion of ‘automobile passenger’ as a sustainable form of travel is yet another outdated indicator that only inflates our perception of sustainability. Without the passenger, Ottawa’s sustainability share drops to 32%. The Government of Canada counts sustainable mode share as active transportation, walking, and public transportation. This should be the same for the city of Ottawa where 47,845 people are pairing-up to drive to work each day.

With more 15-minute neighbourhoods and increased investment in transit and active transportation networks, the city can expect increases in the use of sustainable mode share. If the city hopes to achieve its goal of net-zero emissions, it will need to update and increase its sustainable mode share target (walking, cycling and transit). For example, a 75% sustainable mode share target could get 171,986 people out of cars. This could, in turn, lead to an emissions reduction as high as 619 kilotons of GHG emissions per year – 24% of the entire transportation sector emissions and 32% of all on-road emissions.

Keeping in mind that this single change could result in a one-third shift in on-road emissions is an encouraging sign. One large shift or many small shifts can lead to massive changes that go a long way in aiding our environment. Politically, this brings the city closer to the goals that city council has set-out. Car dependency has been a growing threat for many decades as entire cities have been built around roads and highways. The ideas highlighted in this section instead propose cities that are built around people and the communities the live in.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2031 Target (City)</th>
<th>Actual (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sustainable Travel</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sustainable Travel</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*where sustainable travel does not include ‘automobile passenger’

---

1 Numbers based on 2013 Transportation Master Plan, 2017 and 2018 Community and Corporate GHG inventories, and Statistics Canada 2016 census data. The calculation assumes that the average person emits 3.6 tonnes of GHG emission per year through transportation (TMP 2013), and calculates what a shift to 25% of total driving commuters (2016 census) could imply for emissions loss for the transportation sector and on-road emissions (GHG Inventories).
CONCLUSION

Despite the fact that modern development tendencies have drastically worsened environmental conditions, the knowledge and will to make change is present. 15-minute communities resonates with many because it brings us back to our roots and creates a more enjoyable lifestyle without hurting the planet. The concept makes life cheaper, happier, healthier, and more cost effective for all. If in the process of making our communities a better place, we can also fight the greatest threat that exists today then the city has an obligation to do so.

At Ecology Ottawa, we find the best ways to make this image into a reality is to tackle density, mixed-use development, and car dependency at once. If done right, 15-minute neighbourhoods can be introduced gradually all across Ottawa. But it is important that it is done right. This change requires long term commitment from the city that is backed by policy and budgetary commitment. All too often good changes like these are only half-heartedly implemented and lead to more harm than good. We believe the evidence shows that real good change may occur if the will to implement it is present amongst city councillors and staff.

With the ongoing policy re-evaluation of the OP and corresponding MPs, now is the time for this change. We all have an opportunity to make 15-minute neighbourhoods, and the many great changes that come with them, a reality for Ottawa in the next 25 years.
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