

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1

April 6, 2018

Ann O'Connor, MCIP, RPP

Planner Development Review- Central

Planning Infrastructure and Economic Development Department

City of Ottawa

Via Email: ann.o'connor@ottawa.ca

**RE: 386 Richmond Road
Response to Technical Circulation Comments
Site Plan Control Application**

Dear Ms. O'Connor,

Please find below a coordinated response to the Community Association and Public comments issued to Fotenn on January 24, 2018. Please note that the numbering in this response letter corresponds with the original numbering of the City's technical circulation comments and that this document is being submitted separately than the remainder of the technical circulation package.

Westboro Community Association Comments

1. Is there a sun shadow study? Given the height of the structure, we are concerned with the potential effects on the level of sun on Richmond. Currently, at least one side of Richmond is in sun at any given time of day during the cold winter months. We would not like to see both sides in shadow-- in winter, or at any time of the year!

Noted, a sunshadow study has been included in the resubmission package.

2. Will the expanse of glass on the retail component reduce interest at ground level? It is difficult to tell from the renderings. The Community Association supports an animated street front, with plenty of distractions to encourage pedestrians to linger and visit our shops and restaurants.

The project owner is also a retailer who will use the expanse of glass to showcase their products, providing the sought after animation to the street.

3. Are there any options for alternative external cladding? This is also difficult to tell from the renderings, but there appears to be a good deal of glass and metal. We are concerned with glint in neighbouring residential areas, as well as any potential threat to birds. Can nonreflective surfaces be considered? That might be more in keeping with the "village feel"- there is already plenty of metal happening at MEC. There also appears to be plenty of metal happening on the structure that is proposed immediately to the rear of the building-is that a two-storey metal wall? There is an emerging graffiti problem in Westboro. This wall may make too attractive a target.

During selection of metal material the overall reflectivity will be taken into consideration, as a glossy finish is not the intention of this design. A graffiti deterrent solutions can be added to the selected materials at the ground level which allows paints to be simply wiped away.

4. Has an assessment been done of the light and noise that the proposed building will generate for residents to the north and south? The Community Association is familiar with the nature of complaints that have arisen in Westboro neighbourhoods subsequent to intensification along Richmond, Byron, Roosevelt, Churchill, and areas bordering Scott. Generally, complaints relate to noise and light generated by heating and cooling systems,

commercial signage that crops up at upper levels, and the level of ambient light during the evening hours. We encourage the developer to explore creative solutions to these recurring problems.

At the time site plan was submitted the mechanical design had not been developed sufficiently for noise considerations. Once the mechanical systems have been designated and locations of the equipment identified, an acoustic review of the equipment and impact on surroundings would be conducted by a qualified acoustic consultant.

5. Can the traffic impact assessment be extended to the residential areas north and south of the proposed structure, especially Roosevelt, Ravenhill, Golden, Cole, Dominion, Berkeley and others. Circling and cut through traffic has increased greatly in these neighbourhoods in the past five years as density has increased at an enormous pace. There may be no parking specified in this application; however, there will be an increased traffic burden to provide services and transportation to tenants regardless.

Given this development is expected to generation zero vehicle trips, expanding the study area to evaluate the cut-through traffic within the neighbourhood is not appropriate for this site and its related Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA). However, it is recognized that there is significant traffic growth within this area which can and likely does contribute to higher traffic volumes along local roadways. As part of the City's TIA Guidelines, the Transportation Impact Assessments are required to evaluate the impact of the subject developments on local roadways. For this site there is no impact, however, other developments within the area, which are higher traffic generators, have studied the increases in traffic growth and cut-through traffic on local roadways within this community. The City is aware of certain cut-through routes in the neighbourhood and has implemented some traffic calming measures on some of these routes.

6. What will be the path of egress for service vehicles? Richmond is specified as the service area, with no apparent loading from Danforth. However, it is not clear how Richmond will accommodate the sheer volume of garbage trucks, deliveries, maintenance vehicles, moving vans, cabs, and service vehicles associated with a development of this size. We suggest there be consideration of the burden that the development will place on Danforth, regardless of whether access was intended for Danforth. Danforth is already congested with service vehicles and private cars, all circling in search of parking. Even with access from Richmond, it is conceivable that vehicles destined for this development will join others in circling Danforth, Byron and Richmond while awaiting a spot in the designated area on Richmond.

Access to this site is limited to Richmond Road.

7. Can local infrastructure support this development? During intensification such as is proposed in this application, we urge the city to consider sewer, stormwater, and road surface conditions in this older neighbourhood. Streets to the north of Richmond (Berkeley, Tay, Dominion, Roosevelt) already encounter severe summer flooding and winter ice conditions, and those to the south (Roosevelt, Ravenhill, Cole, Byron dead-end) are virtually disintegrating under the number of road cuts associated with infill.

Little to no car trips are associated as part of this development, along with little to no road cuts required.

8. Will the owner undertake a hazardous materials assessment prior to demolition of the existing building? The Community Association is currently awaiting a reply to a letter sent to the Ministry in October inquiring what provincial protocol is for protecting the environment and ensuring the safety of nearby residents during demolition. Given the large number of older buildings that have come down in our community in the past five years, neighbours have approached the Community Association with concerns about health implications. We are encouraging all developers to be proactive in ensuring these inspections are done prior to demolition and remediation undertaken where necessary.

Noted.

Other Public Comments

1. Parking: There is concern that no parking is proposed. There are not enough parking places available now in the area and this proposal will aggravate the situation.

Noted.

Due to the site's proximity to a proposed transit station, along with the goals and ideals of the Richmond Road Traditional Mainstreet, parking is not anticipated to be needed for the site.

2. Height: There is opposition to the six storey building. There is concern that such a tall building is out of place with the rest of Richmond Road between Churchill and Roosevelt.

Noted.

The height of the building is within the as-of-right of the zoning by-law and the Richmond Road Secondary Plan/CDP.

We trust that this addresses all outstanding comments and the development can move forward to approval. Please feel free to contact myself with any additional comments or questions at Coyle@fotenn.com or 613.730.5709 ext. 225 or Matt McElligott at McElligott@fotenn.com or 613.730.5709 ext. 232.

Regards,



Emilie Coyle, M.PL
Planner
Fotenn Consultants Inc.