



Prepared for Concorde

Prepared by Fotenn Planning + Design
396 Cooper Street, Suite 300
Ottawa, ON K2P 2H7

October 2024

© Fotenn

2506 Innes Road

Response to Deficiencies
Site Plan Control Application
October 23, 2024

The information contained in this document produced by Fotenn is solely for the use of the Client identified above for the purpose for which it has been prepared and Fotenn undertakes no duty to or accepts any responsibility to

RESPONSE TO DEFICIENCIES LIST

2506 Innes Road - Site Plan Control Application

October 23, 2024

Lucy Ramirez
Planner

Development Review East
 Planning, Real Estate and Economic Development
 110 Laurier Ave West | 4th Floor | Ottawa, ON | K1P 1J1
 City of Ottawa

RE: Consolidated Response to Deficiency Review Comments
2506 Innes Road - Site Plan Control Application

Dear Ms. Ramirez,

On behalf of the property owner, Concorde Development, please accept the enclosed consolidated response to the deficiencies list for proposed Site Plan Control Application for lands municipality known as 2506 Innes Road, in the City of Ottawa.

Below is a consolidated table that provides responses to each of the deficiency comments that were provided by the City of Ottawa. As part of this resubmission package, an updated set of submission documents was also provided.

Comments:	Response
Engineering	
Grading Plan	
Deficiency #1	See the revised Grading Plan in submission package now including five metres of topographic details outside of the property line.
Deficiency #2	Grading Plan updated to address these concerns. Amenity Area is now more easily accessible.
Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment	
Deficiency #3	See Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment is re-submitted submission package.
Site Servicing and Stormwater Management Report	
Deficiency #4	Floor areas in the FUS calculations now match that in the Architecture plans. To be conservative the ground and second floor balconies were included in the FUS calculations.
Pre-Development and Post-Development Drainage Plans	
Deficiency #5	There appears to be an existing curb along the east property line preventing the neighbouring property from draining onto the subject property. The 1.5 m landscape buffer sheet flowing ± 0.7 L/s (± 20 mL/m) during the 100-year event over the retaining wall should not be viewed as a waterfall or safety concern.
Deficiency #6	Noted and revised.
Planning	
Site Plan & Key Plan	

Deficiency #17	All required information added to the site plan and elevations.
Elevations	
Deficiency #18	Existing grade added.
Deficiency #19	Overall height of the building now provided.
Zoning Confirmation Report	
Deficiency #20	The Zoning Confirmation Report has been revised.
Urban Design	
Deficiency #21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Response to pre-app comments no longer mandatory and as the design has changed substantially, please read the submitted Urban Design brief for a design rationale. b. Alternative plans included in the Urban Design Brief. c. Included within the Arch Set and Urban Design Brief d. No cross-sections were created for this architectural package. e. Included within the revised Urban Design Brief.
Landscape Plan	
Deficiency #22	Required information added.
Planning Forestry	
Deficiency #23	Discussions on tree removal are ongoing neighbouring property owner.
Deficiency #24	Tree replacement is now proposed on the landscape plan.
Deficiency #25	<p>The direction from the OP is informative to our approach, However, it is standard to understand should as encouraged, and shall as mandatory. This deficiency may be better represented as a comment on the application.</p> <p>With the being said, we have adjusted the site plan to allow the preservation of existing trees wherever feasible.</p> <p>Proposed trees are added where feasible, taking into account servicing and soil volume restrictions.</p> <p>Canopy coverage has been increased to 11.6%.</p>