



# Heritage Impact Assessment

**New Campus Development for  
The Ottawa Hospital  
Phase 4: Main Hospital Project  
Ottawa, Ontario**

**January 12th, 2026  
(Issued for SPC Resubmission)**

**Prepared by WSP Canada Inc.**

**Version Number and Date**

Version 01, 2026/01/12

**Table of Contents**

Version Number and Date ..... 1

Table of Contents ..... 1

1.0 Introduction..... 3

2.0 Response to City of Ottawa Comments ..... 4

3.0 Responses to NCC Heritage Comments..... 9

4.0 Conclusion..... 16

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

Signatures

Heritage

Prepared by



Kanika Kaushal, M.Arch., B.Arch., CAHP, APT, MRAIC  
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist  
WSP Canada Inc.

2026-01-08

Approved<sup>1</sup> by (must be reviewed for technical accuracy prior to approval)



Henry Cary, Ph.D., CAHP, RPA  
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist  
WSP E&I Canada Ltd.

2026-01-08

WSP Canada Inc. prepared this report solely for the use of the intended recipient, The Ottawa Hospital, in accordance with the professional services agreement. The intended recipient is solely responsible for the disclosure of any information contained in this report. The content and opinions contained in the present report are based on the observations and/or information available to WSP Canada Inc. at the time of preparation. If a third party makes use of, relies on, or makes decisions in accordance with this report, said third party is solely responsible for such use, reliance or decisions. WSP Canada Inc. does not accept responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions taken by said third party based on this report. This limitations statement is considered an integral part of this report.

The original of this digital file will be conserved by WSP Canada Inc. for a period of not less than 10 years. As the digital file transmitted to the intended recipient is no longer under the control of WSP Canada Inc., its integrity cannot be assured. As such, WSP Canada Inc. does not guarantee any modifications made to this digital file subsequent to its transmission to the intended recipient.

---

<sup>1</sup> Approval of this document is an administrative function indicating readiness for release and does not impart legal liability on to the Approver for any technical content contained herein. Technical accuracy and fit-for-purpose of this content is obtained through the review process. The Approver shall ensure the applicable review process has occurred prior to signing the document.

## **1.0 Introduction**

The following memorandum provides responses to NCC and Ottawa staff comments pertaining Cultural Heritage as included in Section 2 and Section 3 of this memo. This supplements the requested information from Staff with regards to the Heritage Impact Assessment Report (formerly Cultural Heritage Impact Statement) which has been submitted as follows:

1. Original Submission: Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, Golder, 2021-May-08 (Phase 1 Site Plan Control - Master D-7-12-21-005 & Holding Zone D07-07-21-007 Applications)
2. Addendum 01: Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, Golder, 2021-July-22 (Phase 1 Master Site Plan/ Lifting of Holding Zone, Phase 2 Parking Garage)
3. Addendum 01 (Revised): Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, Golder, 2021-November-16 (Phase 1 Site Plan Control and FLUDA)
4. Addendum 02: Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, WSP-Golder, 2022-November-10 (Hospital & CUP Phase of Development Phases 3 & 4)
5. Addendum 02 (Revised): Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, WSP, 2023-April-14 (Hospital & CUP Phase of Development Phases 3 & 4)

The responses are based on the following input documents:

1. City of Ottawa Comments: 2025-02-10
2. NCC Comments: 2025-06-25
3. DevCO 65DD Submission Documents: 2025-06-05
4. AHJ Presentations:
  - a) Initial DevCO Meeting: 2024-06-25
  - b) DevCO Developed Design Meeting 02: 2024-12-05
  - c) DevCO Plantings and Trees Meeting: 2024-12-12
  - d) DevCO ACPDR Presentation: 2025-03-20
  - e) DevCO Developed Design Meeting 03: 2025-05-08

**2.0 Response to City of Ottawa Comments**

City of Ottawa comments were received on February 10, 2025. These comments were provided based on the ACPDR Readiness set provided in December 2024. Within the comment section, a request was provided from the Urban Design Department to provide an addendum to the HIA that addresses the following four (4) points. DevCo responses are provided below:

1. City of Ottawa Question: Speak to how the proposed exterior expression of the building as whole has evolved and what opportunities/options were explored to mitigate the size of the buildings and its impact on views through the exterior of the building.
  - a. DevCo Response: Noted. The 65% DD submission drawings provide details on the proposed exterior expression of the building. Please see further details included in response to Staff comment 5.15 in Table 1 below.
2. City of Ottawa Question: Include further analysis of the impacts of the south façade, given its relationship with the Central Experimental Farm
  - a. DevCo Response: Please see response to comment 5.15a in table 1 below.
3. City of Ottawa Question: Recognizing that the south façade is not intended to be viewed/accessed by the public, the treatment of the south façade could be further refined given its proximity to the core of the farm.
  - a. DevCo Response: Please see response to comment 5.15b in table 1 below.
4. City of Ottawa Question: This façade appears to be quite massive. The choice of colour and material palette could help in breaking up the mass and improving sensitivity/compatibility with the farm. Consider extending the treatment from other elevations to the south as well.
  - a. DevCo Response: Please see response to comment 5.15c in the table 1 below.

In addition to the four (4) points above, the City provided the following additional comments:

*Table 1: Response to City Urban Design Comments 2025-02-10*

City of Ottawa – Urban Design Comments		
Item Number	Question	2025-07-15 DevCO Response
5.01	The SPC revision submission should include an addendum to the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, now known as a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared as part of the Master Site Plan. This addendum should comply with the City's Terms of Reference for HIAs. Heritage Planning staff will be looking to ensure that the comments provided on the previous HIA submission (December 2022) were considered in the addendum.	The final draft of the Heritage Impact Assessment Addendum will incorporate this comment.
5.02	The HIA should specifically address issues related to this	The HIA addendum references the May 13, 2025 DevCo Design Progression#3 and the 65% DD Submission (May 5, 2025) for the Ottawa Hospital New Campus Development.

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

	project phase and revisions made since the approval. The HIA may be considered jointly by both the City and the NCC/Parks Canada in their reviews.	
5.15	The HIA should speak to how the proposed exterior expression of the building as whole has evolved and what opportunities/options were explored to mitigate the size of the buildings and its impact on views through the exterior of the building. South façade :	The expression of the building as a whole has evolved from a composition made up of large segments of angled, white aluminum panels and vision windows with a prominent mechanical floor band of louvres to a softer fading expression in porcelain panels and glass that transitions from a more opaque expression at the perimeter to a more translucent expression at the centre hinges.
5.15 a.	The HIA should include further analysis of the impacts of the south façade, given its relationship with the Central Experimental Farm	<p>The proposed south façade of the new hospital demonstrates compatibility with the heritage buildings at the CEF through several key design strategies:</p> <p><b>Respect for Historic Context:</b> The proposed south façade is contemporary in design yet applies features and landscaping that are compatible with the heritage character of the CEF.</p> <p><b>Compatibility:</b></p> <p><b>Material and Colour Palette:</b> The use of neutral tones such as shades of gray, and beige tones in the south façade reflects the muted hues commonly found in the CEF's heritage buildings, which feature stone, brick and stucco finishes. This allows the new hospital building to blend into the surrounding context without visually overpowering the heritage architecture. This concern for compatibility is featured in the facade, cedar pattern, and the warm materiality of the south entrance and emergency corridor.</p> <p><b>Scale and Massing:</b> The south façade is articulated into sections of varying heights, which reduces the visual bulk of the building and creates a rhythm that can recede into the landscape rather than dominate it.</p> <p><b>Landscaping Continuity:</b> The inclusion of predominantly native tree species and green space in front of the building mirrors the agricultural landscape character of the CEF, reinforcing a sense of visual and environmental continuity with the CEF.</p> <p>The hospital entrance is framed by a ceremonial landscape inspired by regenerative indigenous plantings. The emergency garage is fully underground, preserving the visual integrity of the landscape and enhancing instinctive wayfinding and calming views to the surrounding sites. The hospital development acknowledges the dual role of the CEF as a public space and research hub by preserving green space and enhancing public access, particularly along Prince of Wales Drive and offering research opportunities as part of the proposed hospital design program.</p>
5.15 b.	Recognizing that the south façade is not intended to be viewed/accessed by the public, the treatment of the south façade could be further refined given its	<p>The south façade is a more minimal, functional expression of the Clinical programs of the podium. The warm cedar pattern frit is used at the Emergency Corridor at grade level and the functionality of the surgical corridor is expressed at Level 3.</p> <p>The South Façade is visible from public areas of adjacent sites within the Central Experimental Farm; however, it is two storeys below adjacent grades and largely screened by the grading and shelter beds of planting at the perimeter of the site. The public do not have access to areas at</p>

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

	<p>proximity to the core of the farm.</p>	<p>grade on the south of the site, which are reserved for ambulances, police and staff only. The south and east entrances are staff-only.</p> <p>The use of neutral tones such as shades of gray, and beige tones in the south façade reflects the muted hues commonly found in the CEF's heritage buildings, which feature stone, brick and stucco finishes. This allows the new hospital building to blend into the surrounding context without visually overpowering the heritage architecture. This concern for compatibility is featured in the facade, cedar pattern, and the warm materiality of the south entrance and emergency corridor.</p>  <p>Proposed South Façade - View from Road E</p>
<p>5.15 c.</p>	<p>This façade appears to be quite massive. The choice of colour and material palette could help in breaking up the mass and improving sensitivity/compatibility with the farm. Consider extending the treatment from other elevations to the south as well.</p>	<p>The mass is broken up with the expression of Tower A coming down to grade and with the volumetric expressions of the emergency stairs and MDRD elevator. These separate volumes of the south façade help to reduce the scale of this large, clinical area of the program.</p>
<p>5.16</p>	<p>Heritage staff will be looking for further updates related to any non-traditional mitigation strategies that have/are being considered:</p> <p>Views from patient beds to the surrounding landscape</p> <p>Landscaping planting/species choices</p>	<p>Views from patient rooms to the surrounding landscape will include views to the CEF as well as the new proposed main entrance courtyard. No significant views are impacted, thus no mitigation is required.</p> <p>To discuss: a clarification is needed to understand how this is a mitigation or impacts heritage.</p> <p>The dominant species of the mixed forest along the southern stretches of the Ottawa River are Maples, White Pine, Red Pine, Eastern White Cedar, Tamarack, White Spruce, Red Oak, Basswood, Ash, Poplar, Yellow Birch, and White Birch. Along the northern stretches of the Rideau Canal, coniferous trees dominate, including Jack Pine, Black Spruce, White Spruce, Balsam Fir, Trembling Aspen, White Birch, and Balsam Poplar. Taking advantage of these species, incorporating ornamental and</p>

	<p>Interpretation/commemoration</p>	<p>rare/endangered species (i.e., Butternut – <i>Juglans cinerea</i>) into the Site, provides opportunities to study how these species interact with urban matrixes over a long period of time and their potential for further landscape use throughout the City of Ottawa.</p> <p>The following commemorative strategies are recommended:  <b>Commemorative Courtyard / Sculpture Garden &amp; Healing Garden</b>          Opportunity to reflect the CEF's agrarian heritage and create a contemplative space for patients and visitors while reinforcing the site's identity.          Incorporate native plantings, interpretive panels in collaboration with AAFC of the Friends of the Farm.</p> <p>The center landscape is an open lawn space, flanked by two stately groves of evergreen trees that are pruned high to allow filtered views through the trunks. A rich, layered understory grows in height towards the emergency entrance and exit ramps, softening and screening their length. In the distance, the hospital entrance is clearly defined by a line of columnar deciduous trees and flagpoles, working in concert with the architectural façade and signage to encourage instinctive wayfinding.</p> <p>To the west flank of the approach garden, the Indigenous Healing Garden is an important node of the overall campus landscape. Not only is it carefully designed to capture key Indigenous principles, but this crafted, natural, tactile garden is an idyllic moment of reflection, recovery and repose in the campus.</p> <p>The lightwell will be a dedicated space to acknowledge Algonquin peoples and Algonquin land as well Indigenous peoples living in Ottawa and region and the many treaty and non-treaty lands in the TOH service region, which includes Mohawks of Akwesasne, the Baffin region of Nunavut. The space will include an art installation representing the three recognized Indigenous groups (First Nation, Inuit and Métis) as well as living plants, rock, and (rain) water.</p> <p><b>Light Well as location of Land Acknowledgment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is at the heart of the site</li> <li>• Highly visible from Main Entrance and adjacent corridors on multiple levels</li> <li>• Opportunity for Land Acknowledgment to be spatial and exposed to the elements: land, sky, sun, shadow, rain and snow</li> </ul>  <p>Proposed Landscape Site Plan illustrating the healing Garden and the Light well</p>
--	-------------------------------------	--

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

		 <p>View at the Healing Garden  Further details are available in the NCD Indigenous Peoples Advisory Circle (July 17, 2025) presentation.</p>
5.27	South border near Maple Drive/CUP and Parking area	
5.27 a.	a. This edge may benefit from additional mitigation/screening, given that it is the closest to the core of the farm. The next iteration of the HIA should include a comment on the proposed landscape screening on the west and south borders and any impacts on adjacent farm buildings like the Tropical Greenhouse.	<p>Noted. Please refer to Landscape Drawing – Overall Tree Planting Plan L08-100 for reference. The proposed planting along the southwest borders of the OH include retention of selective existing trees, street trees species, parking lot trees (representative columnar species and broad species), woodland deciduous trees.</p> <p>The final HIA will assess impacts, if any, on adjacent farm buildings.</p>
5.27 b.	b. Please provide views from Maple Drive/ the CUP as it will be helpful to understand impacts on/relationship with the farm at the southern edge.	Please refer to views included in secondary renderings (Drawing Ab0-020), high-res images for any can be provided.
16	Heritage Planning staff will provide comments with the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) addendum is prepared.	Noted.
17	The heritage comments from the DevCo Presentation Feedback dated January 10, 2025, should be addressed in the next submission	<p>Noted. The future revised HIA addendum will address comments from the DevCo Presentation Feedback dated January 10, 2025.</p> <p>Responses are included in items 5.15, 5.15a-c and 5.16 above.</p>

**3.0 Responses to NCC Heritage Comments**

The latest received NCC Heritage Comments provided at the time of this technical memorandum are dated 2025-05-02. The following table outlines the responses to the outstanding comments for the Main Hospital (DevCo).

NCC – HIA Comments 2025-05-02		
Item Number	Question	2025-07-15 DevCO Response
<b>14_19127064-4000-TM01-RevA_10Nov22 TOH CHIS Add2</b>		
14.1	Page 7, Line 2 (NCC – Heritage, HT) Further, it is noted that the "use of compatible building materials is not necessary" - I would disagree with that, further to the point made above. Materiality/colour palette does offer potential to achieve greater or lesser compatibility with the character of the CEF and could be a proposed mitigation.	Noted. (July 2025) Material and Colour Palette: The use of neutral tones such as shades of gray and beige tones in the south facade reflects the muted hues commonly found in the CEF's heritage buildings that feature stone, brick and stucco finishes. and allows the new hospital building to blend into the surroundings without visually overpowering the heritage architecture. This is featured in the façade, cedar pattern and the warm materiality of the south entrance, and the emergency corridor. This has been captured in the 65% DD Design drawings related to the exterior design of the main Hospital Building.
14.10	Page 13, (NCC – Heritage, HT)  In the section on Landscape Treatments, could the selection of species consider horticultural varieties developed by the CEF?	Noted (July 2025)  The inclusion of dominantly native tree species and green space in front of the building mirrors the agricultural and landscaped character of the CEF, reinforcing a sense of visual and environmental continuity. This has been captured in the 65% DD Design drawings updates related to the landscaping of the main Hospital Building. (July 2025)
14.11	Page 13, (NCC – Heritage, HT) In the section on Site Lighting, could their also be consideration of how landscape lighting fixtures may complement the character of the context? Are the proposed lamppost illustrated in drawing E-101F selected to be compatible with the landscape / adjacent lighting? Also, are there other measures to mitigate impacts of interior lighting (such as window blinds)?	Noted (July 2025)  This has been captured in the 65% DD Design drawings updates related to the landscape lighting fixtures of the main Hospital Building. Input required from the Design and Landscape team.  The light poles have been designed and selected to complement the character of the context – they demonstrate a minimal, modern design. Please see graphics below for reference.
		

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

		 
14.12	<p>Page 13, (NCC – Heritage, HT)          Under 4.2 Proposed Mitigation Measures, are bollards the best solution to protecting the South Azimuth building? Perhaps other options could also be included?</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025)          This will be reviewed in another phase of New Campus Development as they are outside of the limit of work of the Main Hospital.</p>
14.26 R3	<p>CHIS Add#2, Page 8 (NCC – Heritage Program, HT)          In the chart under Analysis of Impact – Alterations, there is discussion about the retaining walls on Roads D and E and their minimal impact. The proposed precast modular gravity wall should be better understood in terms of its impact. The renderings provided are insufficient. There</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025)          The design is in keeping with the design aesthetic chosen for the Campus (Stone Strong – Chiseled Granite) as confirmed with the Advance Works Approvals. The retaining wall is within Hospital Leased Lands. The federal stakeholders NCC and AAFC were consulted and reviewed the proposed Stone Wall System in November 2024 and confirmed (per email received from NCC dated November 1, 2024) that the lower heights, placement of the bike storage building, addition of vegetation, and the setbacks do assist to mitigate the impact on views to and from Prince of Wales Drive and the CEF. It was therefore recommended that TOH proceed with the Stone Strong Chiseled Granite System.</p>

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

	<p>should be a note about how the design/materiality of the wall and fence could be compatible with the landscape of the CEF.</p> <p>There is also discussion here about the impacts to views of the works along Prince of Wales - mitigation measures should include exploring options which are minimizing tree removals (which is under way).</p> <p>Also, this section will need to take into account the comments of the FHBRO.</p>	
14.27 R3	<p>CHIS Add#2, Page 10 (NCC – Heritage Program, HT)</p> <p>In the chart under Analysis of Impact – Shadows, it states that there is no impact, even though impacts are identified to the Dominion Observatory Complex. Are there impacts to the legibility of the building exterior or to the sundial on site designed by astronomer Otto Klotz? Could mitigation measures be considered?</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025).</p> <p>The Sun Shadow study included demonstrates that there is no shadowing from the Main Hospital on the sundial. Please refer to drawing 11.0-2 for reference,</p>
14.28 R3	<p>CHIS Add#2, Page 10 (NCC – Heritage Program, HT)</p> <p>In the chart under Analysis of Impact – Isolation – recommend removing the word “reversible” from the Summary of Impact column given that they are also deemed “permanent”</p>	<p>Noted. (July 2025).</p> <p>Wording will be revised as appropriate.</p>
14.29 R3	<p>CHIS Add#2, Page 15 (NCC – Heritage Program, HT)</p> <p>In the Landscape Treatments section, add reference to considering the advice of the FHBRO with respect to the landscape treatments</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025).</p> <p>The proposed development will recognize, preserve and enhance the 1886 ‘designed’ landscape of the CEF and its Romantic, Picturesque and agrarian landscape. The hospital is located near the Central Core and will continue the landscape approach of the Central Core area by maintaining the pastoral elements of fields, wooded buffers, and a diversity of trees and shrubbery to define its boundaries and provide areas of nature for respite.</p> <p>The main entrance plaza includes a mix of Shady Woodland (Zone 1), Woodland Edge (Zone 2), screening shrubs (Zone 3), open Woodland mix (Zone 4), Aspen understory (Zone 5) and Bird understory (Zone 6), Road A will be flanked by Street planting with species that respect local ecology.</p> <p>Consideration of previously received feedback regarding ‘edible and medicinal Arctic plants’ recommended at previous Inner Circle meeting was also taken into account. The following were included as part of the proposed landscaping plan:</p>

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evergreens</li> <li>• Trees that provide medicines, sap</li> <li>• Maples</li> <li>• Shrubs that grow in Nunavut</li> <li>• Cedars are healing, but also very flammable</li> <li>• Sweetgrass</li> <li>• Labrador tea</li> <li>• Crowberry, Strawberry, Blueberry, Saskatoon Berries</li> </ul> <p>For further details please refer to drawing L00-003 and NCD Indigenous Peoples Advisory Circle (July 17, 2025) presentation.</p>
14.30 R3	CHIS Add#2, Modeled Views (NCC – Heritage Program, HT) Views 1 and 2 from Prince of Wales Drive assume retention of mature trees - confirm	Noted (July 2025). Renderings have been updated as part of the May 2025 – 65% DD submission. Please refer to views included in secondary renderings for views from Prince of Wales (Drawing Ab0-020), high-res images for any can be provided.
14.31 R3	CHIS Add#2, Modeled Views (NCC – Heritage Program, HT) Views 5, 8, 9 and 11 will be of particular interest in DD for consideration of colour/material options for the hospital	Noted (July 2025). Please refer to Renderings that have been updated as part of the May 2025 – 65% DD submission, (Drawing Ab0-020), high-res images for any can be provided.
14.32 R3	CHIS Add#2, Modeled Views (NCC – Heritage Program, HT) Views 18 and 19 are insufficient to assess the impact of the materiality of the retaining wall and fence on the cultural landscape of the CEF	Noted (July 2025). The materiality of the retaining wall and fence are not part of the Main Hospital scope and are included in Advanced Works.
<b>14a_CA0038206.3095_ OH CUP - CHIS Aug 9 2024 Submission</b>		
14.33 R6 CUP	Table 1, Page 14 (NCC – Heritage, HT) I recommend including the treatment of the termination of Birch Drive in the column discussing alterations to the cultural landscape of the CEF	Noted (July 2025). The Landscape Drawings package is available as part of the 65% DD submission. The existing asphalt area of Birch Drive is to be demolished and planted with woodland understory and woodland coniferous trees as well as an understory planting of screening shrubs.
14.34 R6 CUP	Table 1, Page 14 (NCC – Heritage, HT) I recommend changing the characterization of the isolation of the Dominion Observatory from the CEF from a “minor, reversible” impact, to “moderate, irreversible	Noted (July 2025). The impact is reversible because there is no direct impact through destruction or alteration to the Observatory, and - like the Sir John Carling Building- the TOH could be demolished in the future with no physical or material change to the Observatory; therefore, addition of the TOH represents a reversible impact. This isolation impact will be reassessed and may be revised to ‘moderate, reversible’ depending on the results of the analysis. (July 2025)
14.35 R6 CUP	Table 1, Page 15 (NCC – Heritage, HT) In the chart under Analysis of Impact – Shadows, it states that there is no	Noted (July 2025). Please refer to Sun-Shadow Study (Drawing 11.0-2). No impacts due to shadows are found to the to the legibility of the building exterior or to the sundial on site designed by astronomer Otto Klotz.

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

	<p>impact, even though impacts are identified to the Dominion Observatory Complex. Are there impacts to the legibility of the building exterior or to the sundial on site designed by astronomer Otto Klotz? Could mitigation measures be considered?</p>	<p>This shadow impact will be reassessed and revised as necessary. (July 2025)</p>
14.36 R6 CUP	<p>6.1.2, Page 19 (NCC – Heritage, HT)  The discussion of the approach to the landscape in this section would benefit from additional analysis regarding the history and landscape of the CEF. It should be noted that the original plan for the CEF divided the landscape into three key zones (1) Central Core of function, scientific and administrative buildings, (2) the Arboretum, ornamental gardens and experimental hedges, and (3) the Experimental fields and plots. This foundational landscape plan is still intact and should inform the approach to landscape design. It would be important to reference the CIS and the National Historic Site Management Plan and how they are being addressed in terms of landscape integration.</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025).  Reference to the CIS and NHSC MP will be added in section 6.1.2 as part of the final HIA Addendum.</p>
14.38 R6 CUP	<p>6.1.2, Page 19 (NCC – Heritage, HT)  Please note the recommendations for landscape integration by the Federal Heritage Review Office and how these are being addressed.</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025).  FHRO's specific recommendations pertaining to the Main Hospital will be included and addressed in Section 6.1.2., Table 3.</p>
14.39 R6 CUP	<p>6.1.2, Page 19 (NCC – Heritage, HT)  Include a discussion of species used in shelterbelts and hedgerows at the Central Experimental Farm and the importance of the design in integrating with the historic landscape of the Farm. Note that this approach was recommended by the Federal Heritage Review Office.</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025).  Please refer to Landscape Design drawings that provide list of species used in shelterbelts, the center landscape open lawn space and the indigenous healing garden. This is Open woodland mix, birch understory, screening shrubs – these understory planting types and lists of species, refer also to tree planting plans.</p>
14.40 R6 CUP	<p>Attachment 3 – Sun Shadow Studies (NCC – Heritage, HT)  The images do not show the potentially impacted heritage buildings, so it is difficult to assess the impacts of the shadows.</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025).  Please refer to the revised Sun-Shadow Study (Drawing 11.0-2). (July 2025)</p>
14.41 R6 CUP	<p>6.1.2, Page 19 (NCC FLUDA, JT)</p>	<p>Noted (July 2025).</p>

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

	Per Heather's comment above, would be helpful to have more context. How do we get from the first point to the third point? The third point lists a number of species, how was this list developed? Does it call back to historic landscape plans?	Clarification required. What is referenced by "first point to third point?"
14.42 R6 CUP	Attachment 3 – Sun Shadow Studies (NCC FLUDA, JT) Further to Heather's comment above, times of day are not identified either.	Noted (July 2025). The most recent shadow studies include time period of the day. Please refer to the revised Sun-Shadow Study (Drawing 11.0-2). (July 2025).
14.44 R7 CUP	Figure 7, Page 11 (HP, HT) Does the perforated screen on the perimeter of the stacks minimize visual impacts?	Noted (July 2025). Comment related to CUP Design.
14.45 R7 CUP	Impact assessment table, page 19 (HP, HT) Further to Nicole's comment above, for the assessment of impacts on views from the adjacent buildings in the CEF, etc., the stating the CUP is below grade is insufficient. What about the impact of the parked cars on the CUP and the other protrusions (stair tower, louvers) on views? It is also noted that these views are not identified in the Heritage Character Statements of specific buildings, but it is important to state that they contribute to the overall cultural landscape of the CEF.	Noted (July 2025). Comment related to CUP Design.
14.46 R7 CUP	6.1.1, page 22 (HP, HT) More detail is required on how the proposed design is intended to be compatible with the historic place. To say that the CUP design is contemporary is not enough to address Standard 11. This section should address the visual impact of parking and other protrusions on the CUP. This section explains the need for the new location of the louvers but does not address a design strategy to mitigate this.	Noted (July 2025). Comment related to CUP Design.
14.47 R7 CUP	Table 1, page 20, FLUDA (JT) The mitigation measure for impact to land use change should provide more information, referring to the plans is	Noted (July 2025). Comment related to CUP Design.

**HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM 05 MEMO**  
**New Campus Development for The Ottawa Hospital**  
**Phase 4: Main Hospital**

	not enough. At minimum a reference to section 6.1.2. to direct the reader to more information would be helpful.	
--	---	--

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

In summary, this memo serves as a technical memorandum to document how the project team is addressing heritage-related feedback in preparation for the next submission. The response matrix includes:

- Detailed Responses: Each comment is addressed in a tabular format, with responses indicating how the concerns will be incorporated into the revised HIA addendum.
- Reference to Design Submissions: The addendum will reference the May 13, 2025 DevCo Design Progression #3 and the 65% Design Development (DD) Submission from May 5, 2025.

The future HIA addendum may be reviewed jointly by the City and NCC/Parks Canada.

WSP Canada Inc trusts that the above information and design is complete and satisfactory. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

---

Kanika Kaushal, M.Arch., B.Arch., CAHP, APT, MRAIC  
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist  
WSP Canada Inc.  
Burlington, Ontario  
Email: Kanika.Kaushal@wsp.com