

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Bell | | | |
| 1 | The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada. | Kevin | Noted. |
| 2 | The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost.” | Kevin | Noted. |
| 3 | The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development. | Kevin | Noted. |
| 4 | It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada’s existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure. | Kevin | Noted. |
| 5 | If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development. | Kevin | Noted. |
| Environmental Remediation Unit | | | |
| General | | | |
| 1 | Can the QP/applicant please confirm that they are intending to file an RSC as part of this development? | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| Phase I ESA | | | |
| 1 | Owing to the former RFO and garage at the site, typically the QP would be expected to identify the site as an ‘enhanced investigation property’ as per the definition provided under O.Reg. | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| 2 | Original USTs were reportedly located on the east side of the property before being relocated circa 1956-57. The newer tank area is identified as APEC 2 but the original USTs don’t appear to be captured under any of APEC 1 – APEC 4 which are identified for the site. | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| 3 | Contamination was identified and removed from the offsite sewer trench on Carling Avenue in 1995. Screening along the south wall of the trench shows 16%LEL abutting the site and it is noted that Raven Beck (1992) excavations did not extend north all the way to the property boundary. This would infer that remnant contamination may exist between these two excavated areas and the northern property boundary should therefore be identified as an APEC that would warrant investigation during the Phase II ESA. | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| 4 | The 1992 Raven Beck report is appended to the Phase I ESA. Figure 2 in the Raven Beck report (page 122 of the Phase I ESA pdf) shows an ‘underground fuel oil tank’ existing on the west side of the former shell service station. This tank appears to have been overlooked in the review/evaluation and has not been identified as a PCA/APEC. Please address apparent oversight of this UST. | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| 5 | Other CoCs (namely lead, MTBE) are often associated with older gas station such as this one. Can the QP provide rationale for excluding these parameters as CoCs at the site? | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Phase II ESA | | | |
| 1 | Based on review of the Phase I ESA, there are gaps where onsite PCAs/APECs have not been sufficiently investigated under the Phase II ESA (refer to comments on Phase I ESA above). | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| 2 | Page 2 of report, under Section 1.3 (Current and Proposed Future Uses); as per Schedule E under O.Reg 153, this section needs to state whether the new proposed use would require RSC to be filed. | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| 3 | Page 8 of report, under Section 4.3 (Field Screening Measurements); it states 'A petroleum hydrocarbon odour was noted at BH1 at approximately 2.5 m below the ground surface (mbgs). Obvious staining was observed in some of the soil samples retrieved from BH2 at approximately 2.29 mbgs'. In both cases, the samples corresponding to these depth intervals were not submitted to the laboratory. Why weren't these intervals selected as 'worst-case' for analysis? | Paterson | To be addressed in subsequent submission. |
| Building Code Services | | | |
| 1 | Please be aware that as shown on the drawings submitted for Site Plan Control Approval, the location of the building on-site may require shoring during the construction stage and possibly permanent encroachment consent. If so, please contact The ROW Permit Office (Right Of Way) at 613-580-2424 x16000 to enquire/obtain a temporary and/or permanent encroachment letter as the shoring is to be adjacent to city property. | Figurr | Noted. |
| 2 | Please insure that the shoring details are included in the building permit application. Shoring details between private properties will also be reviewed by Building Code Service Branch at time of building permit application submission and will require permission(s) from the | Figurr | Noted. |
| Solid Waste | | | |
| 1 | For the residential waste and recycling and they will be entitled to city multi residential collection for the 175 units only. The commercial portion will need their own garbage and recycling room; they cannot share the same area. Please confirm the garbage room can accommodate the following: | Figurr | This project will be serviced by private garbage pick-up |
| | Garbage: 5 x 4 yard bins Fiber: 2 x 4 yard bins Glass metal plastic: 1 x 3 yard bin Organics: 3 x 240L carts | Figurr | See above. |
| 2 | Please provide the width of the service doors and the ramp percentage. | Figurr | Please refer to revised floor plans for ramp slope percentage and width of service doors. |
| Parks | | | |
| 1 | The Owner agrees to provide cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication on the subject lands within Ward 16 such value of the land to be determined by the City's Realty Services Branch, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Recreation, Cultural and Facility Services. The Owner further agrees to pay for the cost of the appraisal inclusive of HST. In accordance with the Planning Act and the City of Ottawa Parkland Dedication By-law, a land area of 188 m2 has been calculated for the cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication requirement as follows: | Kevin | Please note that the GFA figures have been updated on the plans. Once built form and massing issues are addressed we will update the parkland dedication calculations in accordance with the formula indicated in this comment. |

| No. | Comment | | | | | Responsibility | Response | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|-----|-------|--|-----|------------|-----|----|---|---|--------------|--|--------------|--|------------|--|--|--|
| | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Proposed Use</th> <th>Number of Dwelling Units</th> <th>Portion of Land Area of Site Being Developed (m²)</th> <th>Cash-in-lieu of Parkland Dedication Rate</th> <th>Parkland Dedication (m²)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Apartments</td> <td>175</td> <td>1,876</td> <td>1 ha (10,000 m²) per 500 dwelling units to a maximum of 10% of the area of the site being developed</td> <td>188</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>93</td> <td>Exempt under Section 14(2)(b) of the Parkland Dedication By-law</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td>1,969</td> <td></td> <td>188</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Proposed Use | Number of Dwelling Units | Portion of Land Area of Site Being Developed (m ²) | Cash-in-lieu of Parkland Dedication Rate | Parkland Dedication (m ²) | Apartments | 175 | 1,876 | 1 ha (10,000 m ²) per 500 dwelling units to a maximum of 10% of the area of the site being developed | 188 | Commercial | N/A | 93 | Exempt under Section 14(2)(b) of the Parkland Dedication By-law | 0 | Total | | 1,969 | | 188 | | | |
| Proposed Use | Number of Dwelling Units | Portion of Land Area of Site Being Developed (m ²) | Cash-in-lieu of Parkland Dedication Rate | Parkland Dedication (m ²) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apartments | 175 | 1,876 | 1 ha (10,000 m ²) per 500 dwelling units to a maximum of 10% of the area of the site being developed | 188 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial | N/A | 93 | Exempt under Section 14(2)(b) of the Parkland Dedication By-law | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 1,969 | | 188 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>The cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication shall be directed 60% towards the Ward 16 cash-in-lieu of parkland reserve (Account 830305) and 40% towards the City-wide cash-in-lieu of parkland reserve (Account 830015).</p> <p>The residential and commercial portions of the land area of the site being developed have been calculated as follows:</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Residential Gross Floor Area Ratio = Residential Gross Floor Area / Total Gross Floor Area x 100 = 15,969 m² / 16,761 m² x 100 = 95.27%</p> <p>Residential Portion of Land Area of Site Being Developed: = Land Area x Residential Gross Floor Area Ratio = 1,969 m² x 95.27% = 1,876 m²</p> <p>Commercial Portion of Land Area of Site Being Developed = Land Area – Residential Portion of Land Area of Site Being Developed = 1,969 m² – 1,876 m² = 93 m²</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Transportation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | It is noted that the proposed building will have a 0m setback following widening of Carling Avenue to its ultimate protected right-of-way. | | | | | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Section 2.2.2 Existing Intersections: For the Carling Avenue and Archibald Street intersection description, note that the Carling Avenue median restricts westbound left turns and northbound left turns. | | | | | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Section 2.2.4 Cycling and Pedestrian Facilities: "Figure 3" is repeated twice at the beginning of this section. | | | | | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|-----|---|----------------|--|
| 4 | Section 2.2.7 Existing Peak Hour Travel Demand (and Sections 7.1, 7.2, 14.2.1, 14.2.2, and 14.2.4): In Tables 2, 15, 16, 20, 21, and 23 please show overall intersection vehicle LOS based on the overall intersection V/C, which is calculated as the weighted average of the V/Cs of the intersection's critical movement(s). A more detailed explanation is found in Section 6.1 of the MMLOS Guidelines. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 5 | Section 2.2.7 Collision Analysis: Correct the second to last sentence of this section, which reads, "The high volumes are this intersection do not". | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 6 | Section 2.3.1 Changes to the Area Transportation Network: The near-continuous bus lanes on Carling Avenue are anticipated to be provided within the next 2-3 years and can therefore be assumed to be in place by the 2028 horizon year (if not 2023). See the following website for the functional plan of the proposed bus lane locations: https://ottawa.ca/en/parking-roads-and-travel/transportation-planning/completed-projects/carling-avenue-transit-priority-measures . Bus lanes on Carling Avenue should be accounted for in the Synchro and MMLOS analysis throughout the rest of the report, including Section 7.2, Section 10, Section 14.2.2, Section 14.2.3, and Section 14.2.4. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 7 | Section 4 Exemption Review: As requested during the Forecasting submission, the spillover parking element (4.2.2) must be included/addressed given that the site does not provide the minimum number of parking spaces as required by the by-law. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 8 | Section 5.1 Trip Generation and Travel Modes: Table 9 incorrectly labels the first row as "Mid-rise Apartments". The land use code (222) and vehicle trip rate correctly corresponds with "High-rise Apartments". | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 9 | Section 5.2 Trip Distribution and Section 5.3 Trip Assignment: Suggest that Table 13 could be expanded to provide additional information. Major access routes to/from the development (Highway 417 via Carling Avenue, Kirkwood Avenue north, Kirkwood Avenue south, etc.) could be listed as additional columns in the table, then the % of traffic to/from the development that is assigned to each these major access routes could then be identified within the cardinal direction rows. This would make it easier to understand the trip assignment in Figure 10. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 10 | Section 8.1 Design for Sustainable Modes: Note that a minimum sidewalk width of 1.8m is required per Section 3.3.2 of the City of Ottawa Accessibility Design Standards. | CGH | Refer to attached revised site plan, the sidewalk width has been increased to 1.8m. |
| 11 | It is not recommended that any vertical circulation elements (ramps or stairs) that are required for the accessibility of building entrances be located within Carling Avenue's protected right-of-way, as is shown in the site plan. These ramps and stairs may have to be removed once Carling Avenue is widened to its full protected width. | CGH | Refer to attached revised site plan. The exterior ramps and stairs have been removed and instead a short ramped area has been provided as allowed by the Integrated Accessibility Act. |
| 12 | Suggest the approximately 7m-long section of planting bed adjacent to the corner site triangle (west corner of the building) between the retail entrance and the Archibald Street sidewalk is removed and replaced with unit pavers. | CGH | Refer to attached revised site plan, the planting bed adjacent to the corner site triangle has been pulled back to align with the edge of the building. |
| 13 | Recommend providing a small amount of bicycle parking at-grade in a convenient location nearby site entrances/exits, for visitors of the commercial/residential land uses. | CGH | Refer to attached revised site plan, four (4) bicycle storage spaces have been provided along Carling avenue. |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| 14 | Section 8.2 Circulation and Access: Provide turning templates to ensure garbage trucks (HSUs) can access the garbage collection area (assumed to be the loading zone shown in the site plan). | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 15 | Section 11.1 Location and Design of Access: a. Please include access design parameters such as access width, clear throat, access grade, etc. b. The proposed access is within 3m of the adjacent property line (819 Archibald Street) and therefore requires an exemption from Section 25 1.p of the Private Approach By-law. | CGH | Acknowledged. Refer to attached revised site plan for dimensions. |
| 16 | Section 12.1 Context for TDM: As noted previously, near-continuous transit lanes per the Carling Avenue Transit Priority Measures project are anticipated within the next 2-3 years and can therefore be assumed to be in place by 2028, if not 2023. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 17 | Section 12.3 TDM Program: Clarify how the on-site bikeshare station is proposed given that Ottawa does not currently have a bikeshare provider | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| Traffic Signal Operations | | | |
| 1 | Pedestrian Volumes in all synchro files have not been corrected since previous submission. As previously noted, FB 2023 AM & PM / FB 2028 AM & PM Files depict existing pedestrian volumes at signalized intersections. Based on projected trip volumes, there would be additional pedestrians walking / using Transit, these volumes should be shown in the Synchro analysis as additional pedestrians / actuations as this could potentially increase intersection delay at the respective intersections. Notably: pedestrians crossing from the site to north side of Carling Avenue to access westbound transit. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 2 | Has the study area been analyzed considering the future Carling Avenue lane arrangement (transit lanes)? Projected volumes should be analyzed using the future lane arrangement with the implementation of transit lanes (reduction in vehicle lanes), as potential queuing on Carling Avenue may ultimately impact the proposed site and lead to site vehicles looking to use neighborhood streets to travel southbound on Merivale Road (via Thames) or westbound on Carling (via Thames, Coldrey, Merivale and Kirkwood). | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 3 | Carling Avenue & West Gate Access (East) – left turn / U-turn traffic volumes shown in the report would reach capacity in 2023 / 2028. With implementation of the future Carling Avenue Transit Lanes, the potential spill back of left turn vehicles could pose concerns to eastbound through movements as there may be a reduction in available gaps in westbound traffic. As such, a protected eastbound left turn may become necessary, but based on the protected left turn analysis provided, the queue lengths could exceed capacity. It would be recommended to look at extending capacity of the eastbound left turn lane, if it is a feasible option. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| 4 | Detection Settings in Synchro files are incorrect: i.e. Carling Avenue and West Gate Access (East) - EBLT Loop is located 14m behind Stopbar and is 1.8m x 7.6min size. WBLT Loop is located 7m behind Stopbar and is 1.8m x 7.6m in size. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| Traffic Signal Design | | | |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | There is existing underground traffic plant/interconnect in the area of proposed construction (northside of site, under the sidewalk, within the ROW). Underground traffic plant must be maintained and protected during construction. | CGH | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| | Before excavating please call O1CALL (1-800-400-2255) for underground locates. | Kevin | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| | The proponent of the project and its contractor is responsible for all the costs associated with reinstatement of the damages to existing underground traffic infrastructure. (i.e. collapse of ducts due to excessive vibration/compactions). | Kevin | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| | The proponent of the project and its contractor are liable for all potential outages and fully responsible for reinstatement of all damages to existing underground traffic infrastructure including all the costs associated with it. | Kevin | Please refer to separate memo prepared by CGH Transportation. |
| Engineering | | | |
| Grading Plan | | | |
| A1 | Identify the new property limits as a result of the road widening and corner sight triangle acquired by the City. | DSEL | Revised engineering materials will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| A2 | Ensure that all street sign locations are clearly shown. Indicate if the street signs are to remain or be relocated. | DSEL | See above. |
| A3 | Identify the existing street hydrant and indicate if it is to remain or be relocated. | DSEL | See above. |
| A4 | Identify all manhole type and top of grate elevations. | DSEL | See above. |
| A5 | The proposed risers and balcony overhang must be located within the property limits. Similarly, the existing portion of the CRW must be removed from the ROW. Please note Carling Avenue is a protected Right-of-Way identified for future development by the City and all landscaping and hard surfaces located within the ROW are subject to removal at the City's discretion. | DSEL | The canopy and balcony projections along Carling Avenue have been removed to respect the ROW requirements. |
| A6 | Provide the entrance elevation and slope at the underground parking garage. | DSEL | Refer to revised architectural plans for slopes. |
| A7 | The existing drainage pattern drained from the low point on Archibald Street, through the subject site's parking lot, and outlet towards Carling Avenue. The new entrance appears to be the lowest point along the street. Provide grades at the edge of asphalt around the proposed inlet catch basins. Please confirm the spill elevation of Archibald Street. | DSEL | Revised engineering materials will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| A8 | Identify areas where heavy duty asphalt is required as per the geotechnical report. | DSEL | See above. |
| A9 | The new sidewalk must match the surrounding sidewalk width. As per SC1.4 the minimum width is 1.8m and maximum slope is 2.0%. | DSEL | Refer to revised site plan. |
| A10 | Provide the width for the accessible parking aisles. The minimum of width is 1.5m and 2% grade as per the Accessibility Design Standards 3.1.3. | DSEL | Refer to architectural site plan for width of accessible parking aisles. |
| A11 | Provide the widths of all walkways and ramps. A minimum width of 1.8m and slope of 2% is permitted for pedestrian routes between the site boundary and facility entrances as per the Accessibility Design Standards 3.3.2, 3.3.3.2. | DSEL | Refer to attached revised site plan, the walkway widths have been dimensioned. Note that the stairs and ramp along Carling Avenue have been removed |
| A12 | Identify a minimum of one accessible entrance. 50% of building entrances must be accessible as Accessibility Design Standards 4.1.1. | DSEL | Refer to attached revised site plan. The building entrances are accessible. |
| A13 | Tactile Walking Surface Indicators (TWSI) are required at all pedestrian intersections as per SC7.2. | DSEL | Refer to attached revised site plan for location of tactile walking surface indicators. |
| Site Servicing Plan | | | |
| A14 | Identify the new property limits as a result of the road widening and corner sight triangle acquired by the City. The water shutoff valve must be located at the new property line. | DSEL | Revised engineering materials will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| A15 | The proposed water service connection on Carling Avenue is strongly discouraged, because it is a high traffic arterial road and located at a highway exit. A redundant water service connection from Archibald Avenue should be explored. Please provide additional information to support the new connection on Carling Avenue. | DSEL | See above. |
| A16 | Provide the watermain clearance from the sewers along Carling Avenue. | DSEL | See above. |
| A17 | The building sanitary service lateral cannot be greater than the existing sanitary main. Please revise. | DSEL | See above. |
| A18 | For concrete sewer mains, maintenance holes shall be installed when the service is greater than 50% of the diameter of the mainline concrete pipe. | DSEL | See above. |
| A19 | Provide the clearance elevation between the sanitary service and the watermain. | DSEL | See above. |
| A20 | Provide a note stating that the relocated catch basins are to be completed as per City of Ottawa Standard S3: Installation of Curb Inlet Type Catch Basin. | DSEL | See above. |
| A21 | Identify the new catch basin leads. | DSEL | See above. |
| A22 | Indicate the separation distance between the catch basin and the storm service lateral. A minimum clearance of 900mm is required for insulation as per City of Ottawa Standard W23: Thermal Insulation of Watermains at Open Structures. | DSEL | See above. |
| A23 | The building foundation drain must be connected independently of the roof drains as per the Sewer Design Guidelines 5.7.1. | DSEL | See above. |
| A24 | Show the existing services to be decommissioned. | DSEL | See above. |
| A25 | Identify the pressure reducing valve on the plan. | DSEL | Refer to architectural floor plans. |
| A26 | Identify the roof scupper locations for the emergency overflow. | DSEL | See above. |
| Erosion Control Plan | | | |
| A27 | Identify the new property limits as a result of the road widening and corner sight triangle acquired by the City. | DSEL | Revised engineering materials will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| A28 | Provide mud mats at the entrance construction entrance. | DSEL | See above. |
| Stormwater Management Plan | | | |
| A29 | Identify the new property limits as a result of the road widening and corner sight triangle acquired by the City. | DSEL | Revised engineering materials will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| Site Servicing and Stormwater Management Report | | | |
| B1 | The design parameters listed in Table 1: Water Supply Design Criteria are residential average daily demand, maximum daily demand, and maximum hourly demand are incorrect. Please revise the discussion and calculations as per the City of Ottawa Water Design Guideline Table 4.1, Table 4.2, and TB ISD 2010-2. | DSEL | Revised engineering materials will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| B2 | As per the City of Ottawa Water Distribution Guidelines 4.2.7 a pressure reducing valve is required for connections in excess of 80 psi (552 kPa). | DSEL | See above. |
| B3 | The sanitary design parameter for commercial developments has been reduced from 5 L/m ² /d to 2.8 L/m ² /d as per the City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guideline TB 2018-01. | DSEL | See above. |
| B4 | Summarize the domestic, commercial, and extraneous flows in the discussion. | DSEL | See above. |
| B5 | Provide calculations used to determine the sizing of the 250mm sanitary service lateral. | DSEL | See above. |
| B6 | The stormwater system in this area is designed for a 2-year event. Please revise the design calculations accordingly. Complete stormwater calculations demonstrating the controlled and uncontrolled release rates. | DSEL | See above. |
| B7 | Please verify the numerical calculations in Appendix D, some of the calculations do not correspond with the parameters shown. | DSEL | See above. |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| B8 | Specify the ICD size and the release rate in the 2-year and 100-year storm events. | DSEL | See above. |
| B9 | Provide calculations used to determine the ICD size and flow rate. | DSEL | See above. |
| B10 | The City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guideline Table 5.1 Ottawa IDF Table: 1967 to 1997 should be used for the intensities. | DSEL | See above. |
| Geotechnical Investigation | | | |
| B11 | Provide limitations of soil conditions for tree restrictions for the proposed development. | Paterson | The subsurface profile encountered during our geotechnical investigation consisted of fill consisting of silty sand with gravel and cobbles over glacial till. The glacial till was observed to comprise of silty sand with gravel, cobbles and boulders followed by limestone bedrock. One borehole (BH 5) located outside of the building's footprint was observed to contain a thin layer of hard to very stiff silty clay. The proposed building will host 2 underground levels. The underside of footing elevation of the proposed footings is expected to be well below the silty clay deposit. Therefore, due to the depth of the proposed footings along with the absence of silty clay below the proposed footings, no tree planting restrictions are required for the subject site, from a geotechnical perspective. We trust that the current submission meets your immediate requirements. |
| Phase II Environmental Site Assessment | | | |
| B12 | The Phase I and Phase II ESAs have been circulated to the Environmental Remediation Unit. Comments above. | | Noted. |
| Additional Comments | | | |
| C1 | On lower right hand corner of all the plans, include City's Application Number D07-12-20-0063 and on lower bottom corner the Plan Number 18182. | All | Noted. Revised Plans have been updated accordingly. |
| C2 | An ECA will be required as per O. Reg. 525/98: Approval Exemptions for stormwater facilities that service more than one parcel of land. | DSEL | Noted. |
| | Subsections 53 (1) and (3) of the Act do not apply to the use, operation, establishment, alteration, extension or replacement of or a change in a storm water management facility that, (a) is designed to service one lot or parcel of land; (b) discharges into a storm sewer that is not a combined sewer; (c) does not service industrial land or a structure located on industrial land; and (d) is not located on industrial land. O. Reg. 525/98, s. 3; O. Reg. 40/15, s. 4. https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/980525 Supporting documents demonstrating the development is on one parcel can be provided to the City for review. For more information: https://www.ontario.ca/page/environmental-compliance-approval | | |
| Forestry, Planning | | | |
| 1 | A permit is required prior to any tree removal on site. Please contact the planner associated with the file or the Planning Forester, Mark Richardson (mark.richardson@ottawa.ca) for information on obtaining the tree permit. | Gino | Noted. |
| 2 | Consider planting trees along the southern boundary – 8 healthy trees will be lost in that area adjacent to a private residence. | Gino | A revised Landscape Plan and TCR will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| 3 | Permission from the adjoining landowner will be required prior to the removal of the co-owned Manitoba maples | Kevin/Gino | Noted. |
| Forestry, Public Works | | | |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| 1 | The applicant is proposing to remove a city owned honeylocust tree that is in good condition and please provide a rationale for removal? From the plans and its location, it appears as though this tree could be retained. | Gino | A revised Landscape Plan and TCR will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| Planning | | | |
| General Comments | | | |
| 1 | It is noted that an application for a minor zoning amendment was submitted where the major application is required. In addition to the zone requirements which may need to be amended to reflect the proposal, an 'apartment dwelling, high-rise' is also contemplated as an added use for the site. The current AM10 zone permits up to an 'apartment, mid-rise' (between 4 and 9 storeys) only. | Fotenn | As discussed, the proposed building is not an 'apartment dwelling, high-rise', but dwelling units in a mixed use building. As such, the proposed use is permitted under the current zoning and a minor zoning by-law amendment is appropriate. |
| 2 | From the review of the Survey and draft Site Plan, it appears that the property is subject to an easement in favour of Hydro Ottawa over Part 1 on 4R-15037 registered as LT1245001. It appears that the proposed building will be located on top of this easement. Please confirm the nature of the easement and Hydro's written agreement to develop over their easement. | Fotenn | We have contacted Hydro Ottawa regarding the easement and will continue to work with them to release/relocate the easement through the Site Plan Control process. |
| 3 | Please provide the calculations to confirm if the proposed zoning by-law amendment will exceed the development threshold set out in the City's Section 37 Guidelines. | Fotenn | These calculations will be prepared once the built form and massing approach has been confirmed. |
| 4 | Staff have concerns with the proposed height requested. Among policies within the Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings (Guideline 1.13), Policy 2.2.2 of the Westgate Secondary Plan requires that development within the Westgate-Carling Transition Area protect the low-rise residential context located south of this area. The built form as well as urban design both require improvements to meet this intent of an appropriate transition. To this end, please provide a transition analysis: | Fotenn | Please refer to the enclosed Planning Rationale addendum for a detailed rationale of the proposed built form. |
| 5 | Zone amendment application has been placed on hold until the site plan is closer to approval. A compilation of all requested amendments as a result of the ultimate site plan will be required. | Fotenn | Noted. |
| 6 | Please advise if any of the rents will be below \$1,442 in order to determine if OP policy 2.5.2-affordable housing criteria is met | Kevin | The rents cannot be confirmed at this time. |
| 7 | Please indicate snow storage areas on the site and landscaping plans. If they will not be provided, confirm that snow will be removed after each storm event and a condition will be included in the agreement to this effect. | Kevin | Snow will be removed after each storm event. |
| 8 | Corner sight triangle and road widening to be conveyed to the City at time of site plan agreement registration. A 4R plan will be required. | Fotenn | Noted. A 3x3 corner sight triangle is proposed, in addition to the protected Right of Way dedication. |
| 9 | 9. Balconies can not be closer than 1m from any lot line (Section 65 of Zoning By-law). Also, please outline how permission of the building portion over the corner site triangle is to be addressed. Please also refer to Guideline 2.29 from the Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings. | Fotenn | Refer to attached revised floor plans. The balconies and projections over the property line at Carling Avenue have been removed. Balconies are provided within the building footprint at this location. |
| 10 | Please clarify amount of commercial space (729 m2 in planning rationale (pg.6), 792 m2 elsewhere in rationale and shown on site plan, loading space calculation on site plan indicates between 2000-4999 m2). | | Commercial space provided is 788m ² . |
| 11 | 11. Please indicate site lighting. A site lighting certificate will be required prior to site plan approval. Consider the illumination guidelines in the Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings. | | Noted; this will be addressed through a subsequent submission. |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Site Plan | | | |
| 1 | Provide the building heights in areas as indicated in Section 185 10 j, not only building height for uses | Figurr | Refer to revised Site Plan. |
| 2 | Please update zoning table: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front yard setback provided is 0m (measured from property line after road widening). • Residential parking calculations exempt the first 12 units, reflect in calculations | Figurr | Refer to revised Site Plan. |
| 3 | Provide some outdoor bicycle parking, in a highly visible area and covered, if possible. This is required for both customers of the commercial uses as well as being convenient for visitors of the residential units. Please refer to Section 111. Note that where four or more bicycle parking spaces are provided in a common parking area, each bicycle parking space must contain a parking rack that is securely anchored to the ground and attached to a heavy base such as concrete. | Figurr | Refer to revised site plan, four (4) bicycle parking spaces have been provided along Carling Avenue. |
| 4 | Please dimension sidewalk widths, interface at the intersection should not be abrupt. Planting bed should not extend beyond the corner of the building along Archibald in order to provide access to entrance. | Figurr | Refer to revised site plan for width of sidewalks. The planting bed along Archibald has been revised to stop at the corner of the building. |
| 5 | Will a subsurface melting device be provided for the exposed ramp? | Figurr | The ramp to the parking garage below is located within the extents of the building envelope. |
| 6 | Please dimension loading space(s). This area should also be defined by a curb, to direct vehicles exiting the parking garage to the driving aisle, rather than potentially through the loading area | Figurr | Refer to revised Site Plan. |
| 7 | Unclear how this [East] corner of the site, between the building and rear property line will be defined (curbing, retaining wall, existing fencing?) | Figurr | There is a continuous concrete curb at the south of the property and a concrete retaining wall at the east of the property defining the extent of the parking lot. |
| 8 | Section 107 (1)(a)(ii) requires the driveway at the surface to be 6.7m | Figurr | We request that zoning relief be provided to permit a 6 m double drive aisle leading to a parking garage. |
| 9 | Dimension landscaped buffer between property line and first barrier free parking space. | Figurr | Refer to revised Site Plan. We request zoning relief to permit a 1.5 metre landscaped buffer between the proposed 8-space parking lot and the street. The proposed right-of-way improvements will augment the landscape buffer, so a total buffer of 2.9 metres is provided. The relief will facilitate inclusion of a barrier-free parking space, exceeding the minimum requirements. A total of 8 commercial (public) parking spaces are proposed; therefore, Part C of the Traffic and Parking By-law would require 0 spaces reserved for persons with disabilities. |
| 10 | Appropriate signage is required to indicate barrier free parking. Please indicate signage location(s). | Figurr | Refer to revised Site Plan. |
| Parking Plans, P1 and P2 | | | |
| 1 | Provide dimension of parking spaces, see Section 106 of Zoning By-law | Figurr | Refer to revised parking plans. |
| 2 | Indicate visitor parking spaces and location of signage. | Figurr | Refer to revised parking plans. |
| 3 | Dimension aisle widths in P1. | Figurr | Refer to revised parking plans. |
| 4 | Consider fencing rather than a solid wall around the locker and bicycle storage areas, to increase visibility and safety. The bike storage area should incorporate good surveillance opportunities into its design and proper access controls to ensure the safety of users and security of the bikes. Without proper security measures taken into consideration incidents of theft and vandalism may arise. Consider a proper enclosure with access controls to those with bikes only. | Figurr | Noted. |
| 5 | Provide dimensions for bicycle parking spaces. | Figurr | A bicycle storage solution will be used in the parking garages. |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| 6 | Ensure sufficient lighting is present in designated parking spaces to increase surveillance opportunities and user safety. | Figurr | Noted. |
| 7 | To reduce trespassing concerns to the underground parking entrance, ensure the time lapse on garage doors are kept to a minimum. Ideally after a vehicle has entered or exited the garage, doors should promptly close. | Figurr | Noted. |
| 8 | Elevator lobby in underground parking should be designed with optimal surveillance opportunities by using windows and lighting. This will increase sense of safety to users and improve sightlines. | Figurr | Noted. |
| 9 | Consider the use of CCTV cameras around elevator lobbies, storage room area, underground parking entrance, building entrances, bike storage areas, inset exit by loading area. | Figurr | Noted. |
| 10 | If garbage room will be accessible by tenants, consider windows for visibility and safety, if fencing of this space is not an option. | Figurr | Noted. |
| Landscaping Plan | | | |
| 1 | Please provide details of fence with abutting property on Archibald (indicated on Site Plan as to be replaced). | Gino | A revised Landscape Plan and TCR will be provided through a subsequent submission, once built form and massing approaches have been confirmed. |
| 2 | As mentioned above, please remove the landscaping which extends beyond the corner of the building along Archibald at Carling. | Gino | Refer to response to Site Plan comment 4 above. |
| Floor Plans and Elevations | | | |
| 1 | Indicate floor areas of indoor amenity areas. | Figurr | Refer to revised floor plans for areas. |
| 2 | Does the Building Code allow for any windows of the first five floors along the east elevation? If so, please add. If not, consider use of different material/pattern to avoid a blank wall. Redevelopment date of adjacent site is unknown and this elevation may be visible for some time. | Figurr | The OBC does not allow for windows at the east elevation on floors 1 to 5 due to limiting distance requirements. |
| Public Comments | | | |
| 1 | Comments from the Carlington Community Association attached. [In summary: - Concern with impact of spillover parking over medium-term - Concern that the proposed height does not meet transition provisions.] | Fotenn | With respect to parking, we are providing visitor parking at the required rate. Visitor parking is the most likely to create challenges with spill-over in the community. With respect to built form, we agree that transition to the Thames neighbourhood is critical. The enclosed Planning Rationale Addendum demonstrates how that transition is achieved, similar to existing and approved buildings along Carling Avenue. |
| 2 | Concern with respect to reduction in parking and would result in overflow parking on Thames Street, impacting street cleaning and snow removal | Fotenn | See above. |
| 3 | The proposed 24 storey building does not provide a transition between Westgate and the Thames neighbourhood. | Fotenn | Please refer to the enclosed Planning Rationale addendum for a detailed rationale of the proposed built form. |
| 4 | Concerned with overflow lighting, particularly from bright LED lighting | Fotenn | Site lighting will be designed to meet the City's requirements; to be addressed in more detail through a subsequent submission. |
| URBAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (Responses by Figurr) | | | |
| Summary | | | |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|------------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | The Panel recognizes the importance of this site and the need for change in the area, however, is concerned with the proposed height of the building, given the size of the site, and the lack of transition to the adjacent neighbourhood. | Figurr | As per the attached additional drawings (Figurr – Angular Plane Diagram, and Figurr – A301 Schematic Section, we feel the transition is appropriate. The three immediate properties south of this site (819,821 Archibald) and the site south of that – which is part of 1320 Carling Ave are either now abandoned and/or already for sale and being marketed as a potential development land assembly opportunity. It is very likely that these properties will be developed into a larger multiunit developments. 835 Archibald would therefore be the first real low-rise house and neighbourhood fabric at the Thames St and Archibald intersection. The additional Figurr drawings indicate the likely development that would happen and how the transition would take place in the lead up to the proposed development of this application. This would also be more in keeping with the depth of the AM10 zones off of Carling Avenue in this area. Based on these section diagrams, the height of this proposal remains within the requirements of the angular plane in determining appropriate transitions. |
| | The Panel appreciates the various setbacks but stressed the importance of base-middle-top approach to design and recommends a stronger podium expression. The Panel also expressed concerns about the use of dark materials and the use of the selected bright orange colour. | | Noted, the design team has adjusted the massing and aesthetic to better accentuate the podium. This includes providing a clearer line between podium and tower as well as increasing further the tower setback along the south-east face. With regards to colour selections, the design team has decreased the number of “darker” panels. We are confident that the dark panels in the project will perform as expected. The use of the orange panel has also been reduced (including at the ground level) however we are very happy with the contemporary aesthetic which gives this building a strong design aesthetic. |
| Height and Transition | | | |
| | The Panel felt strongly that the height and mass of the proposal is over-scaled for this site and lacks transition to the adjacent neighbourhood. Acquiring additional property may help to improve the proposal. | | As per UDRP comment (bullet point 1), we disagree and feel the height is appropriate for the site as further indicated by additional diagrams. As addressed in the Planning Rationale Addendum, the height and mass of the proposal responds to and enhances the context of existing and approved built form along the Carling Street axis. Transition to the low-rise neighbourhood abutting Thames Street is provided. As noted in the Addendum, the Official Plan permits mid-rise building heights for the properties south of the subject property, fronting Archibald. |
| | From a long-term perspective, the Panel is not confident that the proposed development will contribute to the sense of scale and community that the City wants to create along Carling Avenue. | | Again, we strongly disagree and is made clear not only as indicated by the additional diagrams, but also by the already approved high-rise developments across the street along Carling, immediately to the west across Archibald and by the existing high-rise 2 properties over to the East. This is also supported by the various planning policies as identified in the Planning Rationale by the Urban Planning firm Fotenn. |
| | Surface parking should be enclosed in a one or two storey podium which would create a better transition to the neighbourhood. | | This does not make sense and would place a building wall immediately along the south property line. The surface parking is also for visitors for the commercial spaces and it is well known in the retail industry that consumers will not visit any small retail store if access to parking feels cumbersome or not immediately visible and apparent. Retail tenants understand this and would likely never lease a space if they felt that access to parking for their customers is not apparent. |
| Built Form | | | |

| No. | Comment | Responsibility | Response |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| | The Panel recommends establishing stronger street relationship and emphasizing the podium with a vocabulary that is distinct from the tower. | | Noted, as indicated we have reworked the ground plane experience by clearly defining the podium and by reworking the materiality along the ground floor façade along Archibald. The ground floor façade is now a combination of a light colour masonry and high clear curtainwall. The podium cladding then transitions to a darker masonry. The tower now appears more distinct with a lighter coloured panel finish. There is also a layer of landscaping transition between the sidewalk and the building face. |
| | Better transitioning should be introduced on Archibald St., where there is a very tight sidewalk, and the proposed tower is at 24 storeys without a step back. The design should incorporate a wider set back with soft landscaping and trees. The tower should step back another 3m above that so that you can achieve that scale on Archibald. | | Noted, however, to provide a better tower separation transition with the property to east, it was determined (and also requested by the City's Urban design architect) to move the tower as close to Archibald as possible. As per the last comment we feel the updated and proposed iteration better addresses the human scale by better defining the human scale. We set back levels 2-5 from the ground floor massing, at the south-east corner of the building, by an additional 1.7m to provide a much better grade experience. |
| | One Panel member suggested, to improve the transitioning, acquiring additional property to the south may assist with providing an angular plane transition. | | Noted, however even if the properties are becoming available, there is no guarantee that our ownership team would be the successful purchaser. It is our position that in any case the potential available land assembly would eventually be developed into a multi-unit low/mid rise development and will become the medium transition between the low rise fabric and this property; as is indicated in the additional diagrams and with what is actually going to happen with the already approved developments immediately to the west. |
| | The idea of viewing the podium and the tower as a single L-shaped element is a noble concept; however, the type of precision with metal panel is very difficult to achieve unless a metal plate material is used, which is very expensive. It is very difficult to wrap the frame, that this design relies upon. | | Noted, we have reworked the massing and this L-shaped element, however we are also very confident in our design abilities to make these details work as we have done throughout our design portfolio. |
| | The ground floor appears under scaled compared to the rest of the building. | | The ground floor is approximately 5.2 metres tall, substantially taller than the typical 4.5 metre height for a commercial ground floor. |
| | Consider wrapping the amenity along the roof so a second exit from the roof terrace can still be achieved and the entire roof area can become amenity space. | | Acknowledged. |
| Architectural Expression and Materials | | | |
| | The Panel cautions the use of the metal panel, as it can be problematic in different climatic conditions. | Figurr | Acknowledged, however we are confident in our selection of quality cladding products as with all architects, we are also responsible for the viability of the products that we select and specify for our projects. |
| | The colour palette of the building is dark and heavy. It should reflect and create a more neighbourhood feel. Consider a residential scale module like brick. | Figurr | Acknowledged, we have reworked the cladding and composition to better reduce the "heaviness". |
| | The corner unit on the northwest side, will have late afternoon sun exposure that should be embraced as an opportunity in the design. Explore wrapping the corner with glazing | Figurr | Acknowledged, we have reworked the cladding and composition to better express the corner. |