

Response to Comments

3845 Cambrian Road

1

March 14, 2025

Ms. Siobhan Kelly

Planner II, Development Review – South
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department
City of Ottawa
110 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Via Email: siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca

**RE: Response to Comments
3845 Cambrian Road
Site Plan Control (D07-12-23-0058)**

Dear Ms. Kelly,

Please find below a coordinated response to the City's second round of technical circulation comments issued on November 14th, 2023. As part of the resubmission package, the following revised documents will be provided in addition to this letter:

- / Site Plan prepared by Turner Fleischer, dated March 3, 2025;
- / Phasing, Building Elevations, and Details prepared by Turner Fleischer, dated April 23, 2024;
- / Site Servicing & Stormwater Management Report prepared by Parsons, dated March 13, 2025;
- / Civil Engineering Plans prepared by Parsons, dated March 13, 2025;
- / Landscape Plan prepared by Ron Koudys Landscape Architecture, dated March 13, 2025; and,
- / Transportation Impact Assessment: Strategy Report prepared by CGH Transportation, dated October 26, 2023.

Engineering

Geotechnical Investigation

1.1. Please provide an updated report with recommendations based the proposed grading and servicing plan including underground storage tanks, foundation design and drainage, tree planting in clay soils, potential soil liquefaction and soil potential for corrosion.

Response: Updated report from Dec 2023 incorporating changes to site plan are provided. Based on the latest revisions, changes are minor in nature and do not affect overall recommendations. We have addressed soil liquefaction and corrosion.

1.2. Please provide additional discussion towards the seasonal high groundwater table elevation.

Response: TIL will conduct updated groundwater monitoring during the common seasonal high period of April to June.

1.3. Please provide an update if preloading of the site has been completed since 2018 as per the report foundation recommendations or if pile foundations are proposed.

Response: No preloading or ground improvement work has been conducted at the site.

Site Servicing Plan

1.4. Please update to note a District Metering Area Chamber (DMA)

Response: Updated.

1.5. The proposed 250mm storm pipe appears to be within the City ROW which is not acceptable. Please revise or confirm property lines.

Response: Updated.

Grading Plan

1.8. Coordination between property owners is required. The proposed grades do not match the approved subdivision Grading Plan, Project #19-1089, Prepared by DSEL, Revision 18, Dated 23-03-23. Please coordinate with Matt Wingate from DSEL: Mwingate@dssel.ca and provide correspondence upon resubmission.

Response: Already coordinated.

1.9. Grades along South and West property line to be confirmed with neighbouring property owner.

Response: South: resolved; adjacent owner to the west: owner mentioned that no preliminary grading is available yet, proposed grading will tie-in to existing in interim conditions.

1.10. Please provide existing/proposed elevations at the property line corners. Please note

Response: Updated.

1.11. The plan view drawing must also show the maximum ponding elevation based on the emergency spill contour line in the case of a blocked CB or surcharged outlet.

Response: Updated.

Transportation

Transportation Impact Assessment

2.1. Since the adjacent property is identified for a school site, consider adding a sidewalk along the Cambrian Road frontage to provide a safe pedestrian connection. It is understood that a sidewalk and bike lane is ultimately planned for Cambrian Road. However, there is no timeline for the works and a safe pedestrian connection should be provided.

Response: The access along Cambrian Road is located adjacent to the property line and in close proximity to the future school site allowing future connectivity if needed. No timeline exists for this site, nor a concept to tie into.

During this interim condition, the sidewalk would be an approximate 3m stub off the main drive aisle and set back from Cambrian Road by more than 16 metres. It is not anticipated that this would be used, but if so, would not be an expected crossing for auto or truck drivers entering the site. Based on this, it is not recommended to be included.

2.2. Consider moving the second access on Greenbank Road further south to reduce conflicts with the proposed bus stop location on Greenbank Road. Moving the access further south will also meet the corner clearance.

Response: In general, the locating the access to the south would split the parking lot for the grocery store and possibly introduce pedestrian conflicts crossing, or at the front door if located close to the building. The GRSTWE bus stop placement was based on preliminary transit input to allow 2 buses to queue at this stop. This appears to be unlikely for local service to require this condition, and shifting the stop closer to the intersection reduces walking distance and allows buses to transition to the median lanes earlier. Options were provided by the GRSTWE team as acceptable options to modify the bus stop location and one of those was selected and coordinated with recent design iterations.

2.3. Provide an interim site plan and ultimate site plan (i.e., Greenbank Road realignment, right-in/right-out accesses etc.).

Response: Site plan drawing A001.2 illustrates the phasing, interim conditions, and final conditions

Greenbank Design Team

3.1. The development assumes that the City's GRSWTE project will provide all transportation improvements (i.e., sidewalk, cycle track, turn lane extension, etc.) needed and that the Cambrian Design will be adjusted by the GRSWTE team (1st Review Comment # 2.7 & 3.3).

Response: The proposed site has been designed to match the grading provided by the GRSWTE project team and the existing conditions do not allow the site to advance any of the works included along the frontages.

3.2. While the proposed southbound access off Greenbank Road was revised to improve conflicts the design remains to be less than ideal (1st Review Comment #3.2).

Response: Options were provided by the GRSTWE team as acceptable options to modify the bus stop location and one of those was selected and coordinated with recent design iterations. The bus stop illustrated is the layout included in the materials released as part of the public consultation for Re-Aligned Greenbank Road.

3.2.1. Proximity of access to upstream intersection is sub-standard.

Response: Noted. This has been documented within the TIA report.

3.2.2. Proposed right-in/right-out access competes with platform and accessibility features.

3.2.3. The proposed bus stop is shown does not meet accessibility requirements.

Response: Options were provided by the GRSTWE team as acceptable options to modify the bus stop location and one of those was selected and coordinated with recent design iterations. The bus stop illustrated is the layout included in the materials released as part of the public consultation for Re-Aligned Greenbank Road.

3.3. Retail access doors on the north face of Building B do not have a direct access to Cambrian Road. Consider providing connections to the city sidewalk as an ultimate condition.

Response: Acknowledged. It has been considered but we have a sidewalk connection at the northwest corner of the site connecting into Building B.

3.4. The proposed storm outlet pipe for the ditch in the north-eastern portion of the property appears to cross the bus shelter pad easement. Interim requirement/expectations may need to be captured in the site plan conditions (i.e., removal as part of the GRSTWE project).

Response: Updated.

Planning

- 4.1. Staff recognize and appreciate the increased setback and the façade improvements to Building A. Staff has no concerns with the proposed minor variance and recommend including a brief explanation in the planning rationale (i.e., the site will function as a corner lot once the City opens Greenbank Road etc.).

Response: Noted, a planning rationale will be provided as part of the Minor Variance application to address the merits of the requested variance(s).

- 4.2. Thank you for updating the site plan, planning rationale and zoning compliance table as per the 1st Review Comment Letter.

Response: Noted.

- 4.3. Staff agree that the Table 113B regulations apply to a loading space required by the Zoning By-law. The TIA submitted in support of the application included truck turning movements for the loading space.

Response: Noted; loading space to be formalized as part of Minor Variance application. Truck turning templates have been provided in the updated TIA.

- 4.4. Building on comment #4.8 in the 1st Review Comment Letter, please provide a site plan showing the current/interim condition and a separate site plan showing the ultimate condition (i.e., two right-in/right-out accesses on Cambrian Road and Greenbank Road). The site plan showing the current/interim condition will be stamped with the site plan control approval. This site plan should include a curb and/or hammer head for the second access and a notation (i.e., future access on Greenbank Road).

Response: Site plan drawing A001.2 illustrates the phasing, interim conditions, and final conditions.

- 4.5. Reconsider the location of the proposed patio given. The intent of staff's suggestion to include a patio was to screen parking along Cambrian Road.

Response: Intent of patio location is to provide more activity at corner of Cambrian and future Greenbank. Patio further to the west along Cambrian would be located alongside refuse collection area.

- 4.6. Did the consultant team explore moving the second access on Greenbank Road further south in front of Building A (See screenshot below)? This appears to work with the stormwater management design and would address outstanding Transportation & GRSTWE comments.

Response: In general, the locating the access to the south would split the parking lot for the grocery store and possibly introduce pedestrian conflicts crossing, or at the front door if located close to the building. The GRSTWE bus stop placement was based on preliminary transit input to allow 2 buses to queue at this stop. This appears to be unlikely for local service to require this condition, and shifting the stop closer to the intersection reduces walking distance and allows buses to transition to the median lanes earlier. Options were provided by the GRSTWE team as acceptable options to modify the bus stop location and one of those was selected and coordinated with recent design iterations.

Urban Design

- 5.1. Staff appreciate the façade improvements to Building A. Is it possible to incorporate transparent glazing on the Greenbank Road elevation near the building entrance?

Response: Latest elevations provided include a series of façade upgrades facing future Greenbank Road. The food store operations have reviewed and noted that clear glazing can potentially negatively impact the product.

5.2. Provide a clear pedestrian connection from Cambrian Road through the site. Refer to the screenshots below as examples:

Response: North-south pathway connection provided. Refer to Site Plan drawing A001

5.3. Provide landscape screening in the following areas highlighted in yellow.

Response: The Landscape Plan has been updated to include plantings in these areas.

5.4. Provide fence details for the waste area adjacent to Building B & Cambrian Road.

Response: Addressed.

5.5. Generally appreciate the overall design aesthetic for the project.

Response: Noted.

5.6. Animation along Greenbank and Cambrian Road is needed. Consider providing windows (yellow) display windows (red) instead of areas for decals as shown below. Please consider extending the black awning to the Greenbank façade for continuity. Further to the comment above, explore the potential for further glazing and principle access' along Cambrian and Greenbank for Building B.

Response: Refer to comment 5.1

Planning Forestry

Landscape Plan

6.1. The Plant Materials Table still lists salt-intolerant tree species. Review the species list and substitute as requested.

Response: This has been reviewed. A number of plant materials were changed, however plants are selected based on long term sustainability and comparable sites of this type.

6.2. Thank you for calculating the soil volumes. Some of the proposed trees do not meet the minimum soil volume requirements listed in the table below. Revise accordingly.

Response: Has been reviewed. A number of trees were changed, however trees are selected based on long term sustainability and comparable sites of this type.

Parks & Facilities Planning

7.1. Staff still consider the current Site Plan Control application as having satisfied the parkland dedication requirements as per Section 11(1) of the Parkland Dedication By-law. Please note that if the proposed land use changes as the application proceeds, staff will re-evaluate the parkland dedication requirement accordingly.

Response: Noted.

Documents have been provided in a digital format. Physical copies can be provided upon request. Should you have any questions regarding the submission, please contact the undersigned at saunders@fotenn.com or church@fotenn.com.

Sincerely,



Evan Saunders, M.Pl
Planner



Nico Church, MCIP RPP
Senior Planner