	PREPARED BY	TO DO ITEMS		COMPLETED
Planning & Urban Design				
Site Plan				
1. Please ensure all drive aisles meet zoning by-law requirements (6.7m not 6.5m). *(CA Response) Drive aisles have been revised on Site Plan to 6.7m.*	CA			
2. Please ensure that all sidewalks/internal walkways on both the site plan and landscape plan match. *(CA Response) Drawings have been coordinated.*	CA			
3. The surface parking surrounding the proposed amenity area should be removed or minimized to the greatest extent possible as this detracts from the area being a focal point within the development. *(CA Response) Surface parking has been reduced.*	CA			
4. Create larger grade related terraces for the ground floor units. *(CA Response) This is not feasible. Ground floor terraces are not at grade.*	CA			
5. Provide direct connections from the internal sidewalks to the at grade units. *(CA Response) This is not feasible. Ground floor terraces are not at grade.*	CA			
6. Are two access ramps to the underground garage required? If not, consideration should be given to removing one of these ramps.	CA			

(CA Response) Second ramp has been relocated from courtyard area to the back of the Phase 4. No other locations were feasible.				
7. Car-sharing spaces would be a beneficial addition to the project and reduce parking demand. The contact for the company is Wilson Wood at WWood@communauto.ca *(CA Response) Recommended to Client.*	CA/NLG			
8. Show correct property line – why is the Cedarow turning circle excluded from the property? *(CA Response) The turning circle has been modified to allow access to Welling's Private.*	CA			
9. Remove the parking notation in the Amenity Area. *(CA Response) Notation has been removed.*	CA			
10. Remove all the Parts and easements that clutter up the plan. Put on a separate plan if required. *(CA Response) Plans have been uncluttered.*	CA			
11. Remove Unit Breakdown chart (we are not approving that); simply list number of units per floor. *(CA Response) Total number of units per floor are indicated. Breakdown is shown for coordination with engineers.*	CA			
12. In the Zoning Chart, remove the variance column, and note the variance in the height section. *(CA Response) Zoning Chart has been revised.*	CA			
13. Use extra space in the chart to show parking calculation: x units at 1.2 spaces/unit. Add commercial floor space and rate used. *(CA Response) Parking Calculations have been modified based on rates for retirement and commercial units as shown in the Zoning Chart on drawing SP-01.*	CA/NLG	Calculation is based on a seniors residence		

14. On Project Information Chart, use correct project name of Wellings Phases 2-4 not 2-3 *(CA Response) Project Information Chart has been revised.*		CA		
15. In Title Block, use "Wellings of Stittsville Phase 2" and add correct address (20 Cedarow Court) immediately below that in a larger bolder font. Use this consistent format for ALL PLANS. *(CA Response) Titleblock has been updated on all plans.*		CA		
16. Related to above, application was submitted for **16 and** 20 Cedarow Court. If this is correct, update address on all materials. *(CA Response)*		CA	We will be using 20 Cedarow Court for this site. We will have a Wellings private address. Angela will speak with addressing at City of Ottawa.	
17. Ensure ALL PLANS are coordinated and consistent. There are discrepancies between the Site Plan and engineering plans. *(CA Response) Drawings have been coordinated.*		CA/STANTEC		
Elevation drawings				
1. Materials legend appears to be incomplete. *(CA Response) Material legend has been updated.*		CA		
2. Coloured renderings would assist in staff's review. *(CA Response) Renderings have been*		CA/NLG		

included in the package.				
The application is subject to formal review by the Urban Design Review Panel. Please note that additional comments may be provided in conjunction with this review. *(CA Response) Submission was made to UDRP in September 2020.*		CA/NLG	Submission September 17th, 2020	
Engineering				
A. List of Drawings:				
Notes and Legend Plan, Drawing No. NL-1, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated 19.09.05, revision 1, dated 20.05.22.		**STANTEC**		
A1. Identify that backflow preventors are to be provided as per S14, S14.1, S14.2.		**STANTEC**		
A2. In addition to daily sediment control inspections, indicate that inspections are to be done following all rainfall events.		**STANTEC**		
Site Servicing Plan, Drawing No. EX-1, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated 19.09.05, revision 1, dated 20.05.22.		**STANTEC**		
A3.Show the location of the benchmark on the plan.		**STANTEC**		
Site Servicing Plan, Drawing No. SSP-1, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated 19.09.05, revision 1, dated 20.05.22.				

A4. Coordination should be made with the mechanical plans to show the internal layout of the surface catch basins drainage system to the storage chambers.		**STANTEC**		
A5. The surface catch basins above the parking garage are designed to capture the 100-year flow to the storage chambers. Please demonstrate by conducting an inlet capture analysis to show that proposed surface area drains are capable of collecting stormwater runoff during a 100-year storm event to the storage chambers without ponding		**STANTEC**		
A6. There is a private hydrant shown on the servicing plan that is not mentioned in the report. Is a private hydrant being proposed here?		**STANTEC**		
A7. Identify the sanitary sewer main material in Hazeldean Road on the servicing plan.		**STANTEC**		
A8. Identify separation between sanitary servicing excavation/reinstatement and the City's 762mm backbone watermain on the plan. Construction methods for sanitary service installation should be discussed in the report and precaution should be taken with respect to excavation and reinstatement in this area to avoid damage to the watermain. The report should discuss construction methods and precautions to be taken (i.e. hydrovac excavation, vibration monitoring, etc.). Upon receipt of the updated report and servicing plan, the City's Water group will be circulated for comment.		**STANTEC**		
A9. Identify that the sanitary connection is to be as per City Std S11.		**STANTEC**		
A10. Internal garage drains should be connected to the sanitary rather than the storm. Provide a note on the servicing plan.		**STANTEC**		
A11. Water data cards will need to be completed in order to appropriately size the water meters.		**STANTEC**		

A12. Show the location of the Siamese connection(s) on plan.		**STANTEC**		
A13. The subdrain at the southwest of the site connects to a catch basin in Cedarow Court. Was the Cedarow system designed to receive this flow from within the subject site?		**STANTEC**		
A14. Indicate roof drain locations and the emergency rooftop scupper locations for each building on the plan as well as on the grading plan. Obtain such information from the mechanical engineer. Shall not spill over any public areas (sidewalks, entrances, etc.) and not negatively impact the ROW.		**STANTEC**		
A15. Please label for each building the number of stories, GFA, the number of residential units and commercial GFA on the engineering plans as taken from the latest Site Plan for information purposes.		**STANTEC**		
Grading Plan, Drawing No. GP-1, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated 19.09.05, revision 1, dated 20.05.22.		**STANTEC**		
A16. Emergency overland flow route shall not flow onto neighbouring property. Continue to denote the overland flow route all the way to its outlet and ensure it does not cross the neighbouring property.		**STANTEC**		
A17. Based on the grades shown, it seems as though a portion of the Cedarow Court roadway may flow onto the site, however, the report and Storm Drainage Plan identify otherwise. All external flows should be considered in the SWM analysis, otherwise ensure that the grades along the property line on the grading plan do not allow for external flows to enter.		**STANTEC**		
A18.There seems to be a proposed grade of 104.53 offsite within the Cedarow Court roadway. Ensure that		**STANTEC**		

grading modifications are only taking place within site boundaries.				
A19. As per the City of Ottawa's Slope Stability Guidelines for Development Applications in the City of Ottawa, Section 5.8, any retaining walls on site that exceed 1.0m in height must be designed by a qualified professional engineer. It must be indicated in an engineering report or memo that the retaining wall has been designed with a factor of safety against global instability of at least 1.5. This design will be needed for SPA.		**STANTEC**		
A20. Note that the retaining wall is to be a minimum of 0.15 metres from the adjacent property line.		**STANTEC**		
A21. Identify the interim grades and drainage patterns for areas onsite where future phase 4 will be. Is this area to follow existing drainage patterns until Phase 4 construction?		**STANTEC**		
A22. Any slopes in landscaped areas in excess of 7% shall be terraced to a maximum of 3:1.		**STANTEC**		
A23. Ensure that the area surrounding the retaining wall is graded in such a way that any runoff does not flow over the wall onto the adjacent property.		**STANTEC**		
A24. There is a proposed grade of 104.34 on the pathway to the west of the proposed Phase 4 building. This seems to be higher than adjacent property line grades. Ensure runoff in this area will be contained within the property.		**STANTEC**		
A25. Indicate the proposed slope of the ramps to below grade parking on the grading plan. Ramp shall be in accordance with the Private Approach By- law 2003-447, shall not exceed 12%. Ensure the ramp entrances have enough vertical clearance freeboard from any potential ponding or overland flow to ensure that there is no risk of stormwater spilling down in the parking garage		**STANTEC**		

area. *(CA Response) The ramps are designed at 15% slope with transition slope at top and bottom at 7.5%.*				
A26. If height of the retaining wall used for the parking ramp exceeds 1 metre in height, ensure that it is also designed by an appropriate P.Eng.		**STANTEC**		
A27. The grading plan should identify locations where a permissible grade raise restriction of 2-metres is in effect as per recommendations made in the geotechnical assessment.		**STANTEC**		
Erosion Control Plan and Detail Sheet, Drawing No. EC/DS-1, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated 19.09.05, revision 1, dated 20.05.22.		**STANTEC**		
A28. Please provide a note on the plan indicating that the contractor is responsible to keep the roads free and clean from mud or debris.		**STANTEC**		
A29. Please provide a note on the plan that states that the sediment and erosion control measures may be modified in the field at the discretion of the City of Ottawa Site Inspector or Conservation Authority.		**STANTEC**		
A30. Mud mat location and catch basin protection symbols seem to be incorrectly labelled in the legend.		**STANTEC**		
Storm Drainage Plan, Drawing No. SD-1, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated 19.09.05, revision 1, dated 20.05.22.		**STANTEC**		
A31.Include the SWM summary tables from the report on this plan.		**STANTEC**		
Sanitary Drainage Plan, Drawing No. SA-1, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated 19.09.05, revision 1, dated 20.05.22.		**STANTEC**		

A32. Please include discussion in the body of the Servicing Report defining how this plan is in keeping with the KWMSS and provide any relevant excerpts.		**STANTEC**		
B. List of Reports:				
Servicing and Stormwater Management Brief – Wellings of Stittsville Phase 2, prepared by Stantec, Project No. 160401511, dated May 20, 2020.				
WATER				
B1. Discuss how redundancy will be provided for each building so as to avoid the creation of a vulnerable service area (VSA) as per the City's Water Distribution Guidelines Section 4.3.1. It is assumed that internal plumbing will be looped through all three buildings, however this should be discussed.		**STANTEC**		
B2. The report should discuss how the site's fire-flow requirements can be met by surrounding fire hydrants within 150 metres of the site as per Appendix I in Tech Bulletin ISTB-2018-02.		**STANTEC**		
B3. Based on the hydraulic analysis the maximum pressure exceeds 80psi. Include a note on the engineering plans indicating that a pressure check at the completion of construction is required to determine if pressure control is required.		**STANTEC**		
B4. The watermain in Wellings Private appears to be privately owned. Please confirm ownership.		**STANTEC**		
B5. In addition to the discussion provided in the report related to the available primary hydrant located within 45m of the FDC and 90m from the entrance to the building(s) as per OBC requirements, please provide		**STANTEC**		

discussion in the report regarding the location of the Siamese connections for each building.				
B6. The report should discuss the private hydrant being proposed as shown on the servicing plan.		**STANTEC**		
SANITARY				
B7. Please include relevant excerpts from the KWMSS to demonstrate that the development proposal is in keeping with these high-level studies. This report shall be stand-alone document.		**STANTEC**		

STORM				
B8. Confirm that the Cedarow Court storm sewer was designed to handle the flows that currently flow onto the subject property as described in the first paragraph of Section 5.2.1. This ties into the Servicing Plan comment related to subdrain flows from within the property being sent to the Cedarow catch basin.	**STANTEC**			
B9. It shall be documented how flows will be conveyed within the internal stormwater system and details need to be provided not to the discretion of the mechanical engineer at later date. This information is necessary for SPA. Include any relevant design information and technical information with respect to the design of the stormwater conveyance system to be used as part of the SWM proposal in the body of the report, within the Appendix and on the plans as this information has not been provided. Include technical information for all control products in the Appendix and include the pipes forming the entire conveyance system on the storm	**STANTEC**			

design sheet even though they are internal to the garage.				
B10. Any controlled roof discharge should discharge downstream of the storage chambers and flow restriction.	**STANTEC**			
B11. A rational method comparison to the modelling results should be provided in the report for SWM review and comparison purposes.	**STANTEC**			
B12. Where is MH 26 as listed in the storm design sheet for the Poole Creek outlet? It is not seen on the servicing plan. Further, the design sheet seems to indicate pipes between MH 26 – 24 are flowing above 100% capacity. Please discuss.	**STANTEC**			
B13. Section 5.2.1 makes mention of the storm outlet having been designed and constructed as part of phase1 and was sized to convey flows from both sites. Provide relevant excerpts from the previous Novatech report to justify this and confirm that flows leaving the subject site agree with flows accounted for in the Novatech report.	**STANTEC**			
B14. Due to the nature of the stormwater design (i.e. conveyance of 100-year flows through the internal plumbing without surface ponding during this event), please provide stormwater modelling files with the next submission so that a review can be done by the City's SWM Modelling group.	**STANTEC**			
B15. Section 5.3.4.2 of the report indicates that the perimeter foundation drains are to be disconnected from the storm sewer and pumped to the surface. Where is the proposed discharge location?	**STANTEC**			
B16. Section 5.3.4.2 of the report also indicates that the two ramp drains are to be pumped to the storage tanks. Like the foundation drains, the ramp drains should not be hydraulically connected to the underground storage tank.	**STANTEC**			

OTHER				
B17. The type of ownership and potential lot parceling (i,e. one ownership, condominium, severing) of the proposed development needs to be determined and discussed in the report as it affects how this development is to be serviced. Only one (1) sanitary service and two (2) water services are warranted (as the site is currently proposed) if the site is intended to operate under one ownership and remain as single parcel post- development. Include discussion of ownership from the owner in the report to support the servicing proposal present to the City.	**STANTEC**			
B18. As indicated in the pre-consultation meeting notes, please provide correspondence from the conservation authority in the appendix of the report.	**STANTEC**			
Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Mixed-Use Development Wellings of Stittsville – Phase 2, prepared by Paterson Group Inc., Report No. PG4772-1, dated March 7, 2019.	**PATTERSON**			
B19. Paterson Group shall submit a memo to the City of Ottawa signing off on the Grading Plan prepared by Stantec to verify that the grading is acceptable from a geotechnical perspective and the proposal is in conformance with the permissible grade raise restrictions, recommendations and statements of the latest Geotechnical Investigation.	**PATTERSON**			
B20. A deep excavation and dewatering operations have the potential to cause damages to the neighboring adjacent buildings/ City infrastructure. Document that construction activities (excavation, dewatering, vibrations associated with construction, etc.) will not	**PATTERSON**			

have an impact on any adjacent buildings and infrastructure.				
B21. Investigate the effect of short-term and long-term lowering of the groundwater level and the impact on the adjacent lands and existing neighboring structures. The impact of groundwater lowering on adjacent properties needs to be discussed and investigated to ensure there will be no short term and long-term damages associated with lowering the groundwater in this area.	**PATTERSON**			
B22. Due to the consideration of blasting as part of the excavation processes, a pre-blast survey and report are required and will be part of the conditions of SPA. Monitoring of all sewers and watermains, will be required coupled with pre and post CCTV sewer surveys. Document the monitoring requirements in the report.	**PATTERSON**			
B23. The site plan identifies locations where 6-storeys are proposed. For *Section*	**PATTERSON**			
2.0 – Proposed Development, revise and ensure the geotechnical discussion and recommendations are valid based on the proposed development.	**PATTERSON**			
B24. The report should be speaking in more detail to impacts on neighbouring properties with respect to foundation shoring, groundwater lowering, etc, now that more detailed plans for the proposed underground parking area are available	**PATTERSON**			
B25. The report identifies a permissible grade raise restriction of 2m for areas where settlement sensitive structures are founded over the silty clay deposit. These areas need to be defined for coordination with the site grading plan.	**PATTERSON**			
B26. Please provide discussion on the measured groundwater level readings in relation to the proposed underside of footing for the proposed buildings. If the foundation is in the proximity of the groundwater table	**PATTERSON**			

elevation, consideration should be made for a watertight foundation.				
B27. More detailed recommendations with respect to slope stability shall be made now that more detailed plans are available.	**PATTERSON**			
B28. Update the drawings within the Appendix to reflect the latest site plan.	**PATTERSON**			
B29. The Geotechnical Investigation shall discuss the suitability of stormwater storage chambers being implemented as well as geotechnical requirements as they relate to the proposed chambers (i.e. frost protection, separation from bedrock/the high ground water table, slope stability, etc.).	**PATTERSON**			
C. Additional Comments				
A1. Please provide a letter from a Professional Electrical Engineer stating that the site lighting has been designed with sharp cut-off fixtures such that minimal light spillage will occur on adjoining properties (maximum 0.5 fc). The location of the fixtures, as well as height, fixture type, make, model and part number must be shown on the site plan or site servicing plan.				
A2. Update the lower right-hand corner of all drawings to include the file number D07-12-19-0189 and Plan number 18190. *(CA Response) File number and Plan number have been added to the drawings.*				
A3. As it has been proposed to use rooftop storage to meet the stormwater management objectives please provide a memo signed and sealed from a professional engineer confirming that the roof system will be designed in accordance with the requirements of clause 7.4.10.4 of the 2012 Ontario Building code.				
A4. Please ensure that Kevin Heiss				

(Kevin.Heiss@ottawa.ca) at the City of Ottawa is advised once details and location of fire route(s) have been reviewed and confirmed via City of Ottawa Emergency Services. Please CC the project manager (Jessica.valic@ottawa.ca) and the file lead (Kathy.Rygus@ottawa.ca) on this correspondence. *(CA Response) Acknowledged.*				
A5. Please elaborate on the construction details and timeline of tunnel construction shown at the northeastern edge of the property. Works related to this application must be within the property boundaries. *(CA Response) Tunnel is shown for reference purposes and will be constructed concurrent with Phase 2. An agreement between the landowners will be in place for the purpose of the tunnel*				
A6. Note that the review for this Site Plan Control application is for Phase 2 only and any approvals received as part of this application do not pertain to future phases of development (i.e. greyed out areas on the plans). *(CA Response) The intent for the application is the entire site including Phase 2, 3 and 4. The entire site is Wellings of Stittsville Phase 2. There will be 3 phases within this development.*				
A7. The Site Plan submitted (SP-100, Chmiel Architects revision 5, dated 20- 05-19) does not match any of the engineering plans reviewed. Ensure coordination between all plans. *(CA Response) Drawings have been coordinated.*				
Please feel free to contact Jessica Valic, Infrastructure Project Manager, Jessica.valic@ottawa.ca if you have any follow-up				

questions.				
Transportation and Noise				
Updated TIA is being reviewed. Comments to follow.				
Environmental Planner				
If this property is part of the Kanata West EA, the Poole Creek corridor is the greater of the 5 metres from top of bank, 30 metres from normal highwater mark and/or the geotechnical hazard. However, it is not part of Kanata West, so the setback is 15 metres from top of bank or 30 metres from normal highwater mark and/or the geotechnical hazard, which ever is greater. The top of bank here was mapped with the Conservation Authority when the previous application was approved on 20 Cedarow Court. The location of the setback must be indicated on a plan. The previous site plan dedicated some of the Poole Creek Corridor to the City but some of the setback was retained in private ownership. The portion of the privately-owned setback is still considered a no- touch area from a site alteration perspective and will need naturalized planting. *(CA Response) The location of the setbacks has been indicated on the plans. We will be looking for an offset at the location of the parking ramp access.*	CA			
At this point, the site plan indicates some significant development and site alteration within the setback to Poole Creek and cannot be approved until the set back is reflected in the site design. The setback to Poole				

Creek was established by the Carp River Watershed Subwatershed Study. More comments are below.				
Environmental Impact Statement		Pinchin will respond		
1. Section 2.2 of EIS states "*The Site is not recognized as a part of the Natural Heritage System as indicated in Schedules L2 and L3 of the Official Plan; however, Poole Creek, which is adjacent to the Site within the Study Area, is a part of the City's Natural Heritage System."* -The EIS will need to demonstrate that the Natural Heritage System does not in fact include part of the lands on the development site adjacent to the watercourse corridor. Not all of the Poole Creek Corridor is owned by the City. Given the scale of Schedule L2 and L3, it is not possible to draw definitive lines on a site plan without the support of an EIS.		Pinchin report to follow		
2. Section 4.3 - The adjacent Poole Creek does have species at risk including the American Eel.				
3. Section 4.5 - Significant Valley, please indicate the limit of the significant valley and include this in the section.				
4. Significant Valley - 15 m top of bank setback vs 30 m adjacency (see OP), must demonstrate no negative impact. In addition to the Geotechnical aspects of the hazard lands, the assessment of negative impact also needs to assess the ecological impact of the proposed development. The EIS must determine how the development will impact the ecology of the significant valley				
5. Section 5 - The EIS indicates: "*As an ecological offset, an area of 0.06 hectare exceeding the*				

impacted area located in the northwest corner of the Site will be designated as a recommended restoration area." Based on the figure, the impacted area is underestimated since the EIS only assumes the structure or buildings are impacting the natural area and does not account for the conversion to sod/lawn, grading and other amenities within the 15 m from top of bank setback. The ecological offset area is also forested and currently appears to be part of the natural feature. This limits the ecological offset if it is already serving a function. The Landscape plan and TCR indicate that the offset area is a tree retention area, suggesting it currently has an ecological function. Revise the EIS to include the areas disturbed within the 15 m as per above.				
6. A new butternut survey and a new BHA needs to be completed for this site as the previous one was completed in 2010 and 2009.				
7. New compensation plantings for butternut may not be accepted on City property. There may be better alternatives.				
Site Plan				
1. The site plan must indicate the setback from the Poole Creek. The setback is 30 metres from normal highwater mark or 15 metres from top of bank (for this part Poole Creek, the top of bank is determined to be the top of the valley). As per the Official Plan, the setback is a no-touch area and must be labelled as such.	CA			

(CA Response) The location of the setbacks have been indicated on the plans. We will be looking for an offset at the location of the parking ramp access.				
2. The development within the 15-metre setback must be removed outside of the setback, including lawn/sod, grading and pathways. A part of the pathway is proposed to be on City-owned property: please remove this segment and move it onto the development site. *(CA Response) The development within 15-meter setback has been removed outside of the setback. However, portion of the driveway leading to the underground parking is shown within the Poole Creek regulation limit. We will be looking for an offset at the location of the parking ramp access.*	CA			
Landscape Plan				
1. Comments noted above on the 15-metre setback must be addressed.	RL			
2. The tree protection area must be all forested land within the watercourse setback.	RL			
3. The tree protection fence should be designed to address the need for wildlife (turtle) fencing identified in the EIS.	RL			
Tree Conservation Plan				
1. The tree protection should also all forested land				

within the watercourse setback.				
Grading Plan				
1. The tree protection and wildlife protection measures must be indicated on the grading plan.	CA/STANTEC			
2. No change of grade on City property or within the Poole Creek setback is permitted. Please indicate the watercourse setback on the grading plan and change grading to accommodate this restriction.	Stantec			
Please contact Matthew Hayley at Matthew.hayley@ottawa.ca if you have any questions.				
Planning Forester				
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.	GOLDER			
Parks				
Cash-in-lieu of parkland equivalent to 10% of the appraised value of the property the day before Site Plan Control Approval is applicable. There is also a $565 appraisal fee.	NLG			
Surveys and Mapping				
Please submit a PDF of the Topographic Survey	AOV			

Building Code Services				
1. Please contact our Fire Services Branch for confirmation of loading for a Fire Access Route located on a parking garage roof deck. Acknowledged				
2. The maximum distance a fire hydrant is permitted to be from the building's fire department connection is 45 metres, and shall be along an unobstructed path of travel, as per Article 3.2.5.16. via 3.2.5.5., of the Ontario Building Code. Unfortunately, BCSB was unable to identify the location of the fire department connection, in order to verify the design as being O.B.C. compliant in this regard. Acknowledge				
3. 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. Acknowledged				
4. Please ensure 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 neighboring property(s) owners if any portion of the shoring is located on the neighboring property. Acknowledged				
Waste Services				
1. This location will get city multi residential service for the residential units only. The retail stores will need to have their own garbage room and seek private service. *(CA Response) Acknowledged.*	CA			
2. Please provide the locations of the garbage rooms including the dimensions and details on the door to access the room. *(CA Response) Garbage Rooms have been shown on the floor plans. Note that number of units have changed. Phase 2&3 – 284 and Phase 4 – 200 units shown. Double door shown on plans 2x915x2135. Garbage requirements will be coordinated with the service provider.*				

The 220-unit building will require the following:				
• Garbage: 6 x 4-yard bins				
• Fiber:2 x 4-yard bins				
• Glass metal plastic: 1 x 4-yard bin				
• Organics: 5 x 240L carts				
The 194-unit will require the following:				
• Garbage:5 x 4-yard bins				
• Fiber: 2 x 4-yard bins				
• Glass metal plastic: 1 x 3-yard bin				
• Organics: 4 x 240L cart				
Accessibility Advisory Committee				
1. The developer is to be commended on the provision of a variety of accessible suites in the proposal. *(CA Response) Acknowledged.*	CA/NLG			
2. In the 6-storey 220-unit building, 40 units (18.2%) are designated barrier-free, which is excellent. *(CA Response) Phase 2&3, 284-unit building – 52 barrier-free units, Phase 4, 200-unit building – 30 barrier-free units.*	CA/NLG	TO BE REVIEWED		
3. However, ensure the barrier-free units comply with City of Ottawa Accessible Design Standards and the CSA B651 Accessible Design for the Built Environment – Residential. Specifically, clearances at doors ensure 600mm push and 300mm pull clearances are provided. Washrooms and kitchens have counter tops at accessible heights. Access to outdoor balcony space is accessible, thresholds, door clearances, turn around, etc. *(CA Response) Acknowledged. Access to outdoor balcony space will not be barrier-free.*				

4. Note suites at grid M19 and M7 are mislabeled as 2-bedroom plus den, should be 1 bedroom plus den. *(CA Response) Suite's labelling has been updated.*				
5. Ensure a comparable number of parking spaces are provided meeting the City of Ottawa standards for accessible parking spaces. *(CA Response) Acknowledged. Barrier-free parking spaces have been shown on the plans and zoning chart.*				
6. Ensure access to public amenity space on 6th floor terraces; ie., thresholds, door clearances. *(CA Response) Acknowledged. Barrier-free access will be provided.*	CA			
7. Given the percentage of accessible units, recommend that all units be visit-able; for example, unit entry doors should have accessible width and clearances. *(CA Response) Acknowledged.*	CA			
8. Given the number of barrier-free units per floor (8), consider "areas of refuge" at exit stairs complete with emergency call buttons. *(CA Response) 1600mm MIN barrier-free path of travel is provided at the corridors as per OBC. This is not a site plan requirement.*	CA			
9. Phase 4 – the 5-storey building does not appear to have any accessible units. Please confirm. *(CA Response) Accessible units have been added. Phase 4, 200-unit building – 30 barrier-free units.*	CA			
Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority				
The staff of Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) has reviewed the above noted application for concerns related to natural heritage and natural hazards for the subject property and surrounding lands. The				

scope of the natural heritage review includes wetlands, watercourses and significant valleylands, while the focus of the natural hazards review includes flood plain, unstable slopes and unstable soils.				
The following comments are offered for your consideration:				
Summary of Proposal				
The site plan control application is to construction two 6-storey buildings, including a mixed-use building with ground floor retail uses and 220 apartment units on the upper floors and an apartment building with 194 apartment units. The property is currently zoned Arterial Mainstreet Subzone 9 Exception Zone (AM9[475]) and will include a mix of underground and surface parking. North of the development a recreational path connecting to the neighbouring properties to the east and west is proposed.				
Property Overview				
The 2.2-hectare property is located at the easterly limit of Cedarow Court and has 124 metres of frontage on Hazeldean Road. The northwest portion of the site abuts Poole Creek, which has associated flooding and erosion hazards. The Poole Creek corridor is regulated by the MVCA under Ontario Regulation 153/06. The site is currently vacant and treed along the Poole Creek corridor, which is considered significant valleylands due to the steep slopes and their extended length. The Poole Creek corridor also has associated meadow -marsh wetland habitat.				
Natural Heritage				

MVCA has been circulated the following in support of the development:				
• "Environmental Impact Study, 20 Cedarow Court, Ottawa, Ontario." . Pinchin will prepare amendment				
• "Landscape Plan" by Levstek Consultant Landscaping Architects, August 27, 2021.				
As shown in the Landscape Plan (May 2020) MVCA's regulation limit is north of the proposed buildings, but the proposed recreational path crosses the regulation limit in two places. The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) describes that an area of 0.013 hectare of				
encroachment will occur within the 15 metre buffer from the top of stable slope. The report proposed compensation of 0.06 hectares of ecological offset area in the northwest corner of the site, as shown in Appendix A, Figure 3 of the EIS. MVCA concurs with the conclusions of the EIS, which states that with diligent implementation of the recommended mitigation and enhancement measures, no additional adverse negative impacts to the ecology integrity of the site will result from the proposed development.				
However, MVCA requests clarification regarding the following:				
i. Please provide the details for the proposed top of bank buffer zone restoration area outlined in Appendix A, Figure 3.				
ii. Please clarify where the 8 new Butternut trees will be planted. The Landscape Plan by Levstek Consultants (2020) does not list Butternut Trees in their plant list nor does it include the details shown in the Proposed Butternut Transplant Locations drawing SK-L3 (DALA, June 2011) in				

Appendix F.				
MVCA recommends that the following additional best management practices be implemented to mitigate the impacts of the site development.				
a. Construction equipment will remain within the areas of active construction and will not cross the sediment control measures. Acknowledged	NLG			
b. Following construction, bare soils will be re-seeded to reduce surface erosion. Acknowledged	NLG			
c. Erosion and sediment control measures will be in place for the duration of construction and until the site is revegetated. Erosion and sediment control measures should be maintained in good condition for the duration of construction. These measures should be removed at the completion of construction once the site has stabilized. Follow MTO OPSD standards for appropriate control methods and designs. Acknowledged	STANTEC/NLG			
d. Disturbed areas should be replanted with locally grown native species. Use of invasive non-native plant material should be discouraged. Acknowledged	NLG/RL			
Natural Hazards				
The northwest portion of the subject property is adjacent to the Poole Creek corridor and is within the 1:100-year regulatory flood plain. The hazard with the greatest extent on the subject property is the stable slope erosion hazard, as identified on the enclosed map. The Conservation Authority regulates an additional 15	CA			

metres from the stable slope erosion hazard, under Ontario Regulation 153/06, which requires any development, site alteration or grading works within the regulated area receive prior written approval from the MVCA. *(CA Response) Please refer to the revised drawings package. We will be looking for an offset at the location of the parking ramp access at Phase 4. Note that this ramp has been relocated from courtyard area to the back of the Phase 4 (as noted in the Planning & Urban Design comment #6 above). No other locations were feasible.*				
The proposed buildings will be located outside of the regulatory limit. However, the proposed recreational path will be located within the regulatory limit but outside of the stable slope erosion hazard. As outlined above, compensation for the encroachment of the path within the regulatory limit has been provided. Construction of the path and any associated grading works will require written permission from MVCA prior to undertaking works Acknowledged	NLG			
Stormwater Management				
MVCA engineering staff has reviewed the following report:				
• "Servicing and Stormwater Management Brief – Wellings of Stittsville Phase 2, 20 Cedarow Court" by Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec). Updated attached.	Stantec response			
In pre-development conditions, the site is pervious and sheet drains towards Poole Creek. Some drainage from adjacent properties is directed through the site but will be redirected to the Cedarow Court storm sewer and was not included in the pre-development calculations.	STANTEC			
Post development, discharge will be conveyed to the	STANTEC			

existing outlet to Poole Creek that was installed as a part of the development of the adjacent property to the east. Runoff from the site is proposed to be captured via catch basins and roof drains, with the roof designed to capture and store stormwater. The catch basins will be connected to an underground storage unit of eight storage tanks. A Stormceptor unit will provide 80 % total suspended solid removal.				
The MVCA offers the following comments for your consideration:				
iii. Please provide the calculations for Table 5: Site Peak Discharge Rates in Appendix C.	STANTEC			
iv. Please explain how the total release rate is restricted to the pre- development rate for the 100-year event for all controlled and uncontrolled drainage areas.	STANTEC			
v. Please include a conceptual explanation on how the attenuation is achieved on site to restrict the flow to predevelopment conditions.	STANTEC			
vi. The City of Ottawa should confirm the existing storm sewer system on Cedarow Court can handle the flows that will be redirected to them from the adjacent properties.	STANTEC			
vii. Please confirm that the existing outlet to Poole Creek has been designed to	STANTEC			

convey the outflows from Phase 2 and 3 and reference the documentation associated with the existing outlet in Section 2.0 Background of the report.				
viii. i. Poole Creek is a cool watercourse. Please ensure that the additional flow from the development site will not have any adverse impact on the aquatic habitat in Poole Creek.	STANTEC			
ix. This site is located in a low groundwater recharge area. Please allow for a minimum of 73 mm of infiltration per year as recommended by the Carp River Watershed Study report. Please address the potential to use low impact development techniques.	STANTEC			
Conclusion				
MVCA recommends that the above noted comments be addressed prior to proceeding with approvals.				
.				
Please contact Erica Ogden, eogden@mvc.on.ca with any questions.				
Hydro Ottawa				
1. The Owner is advised that there are medium voltage overhead lines along Hazeldean Road.	NLG/LAURIN			
a. Should any activity, such as tree trimming or working on the sides of a building, be anticipated within three meters (3m) of Hydro Ottawa's				

overhead lines, contact Hydro Ottawa to discuss arrangements before any activity is undertaken. In line with the Ministry of Labour's Occupational Health & Safety Act, only a Hydro Ottawa employee or Hydro Ottawa approved contractor can work in proximity of these lines. Acknowledged				
b. The Owner is advised that permanent structures located within the "restricted zone" surrounding overhead lines are prohibited. This zone is defined by Hydro Ottawa's standard OLS0002 "Overhead High Voltage Clearances to Adjacent Building", which can be found at https://hydroottawa.com/accounts-services/accounts/contractors-developers/clearances. This standard complies with the requirements of the Ministry of Labour's Occupational Health & Safety Act, the Ontario Building Code, and the Ontario Electrical Safety Code. Permanent structures include buildings, signs (even lit signs when open for maintenance), antennas, pools, and fences. *(CA Response) Acknowledged.*				
2. The Owner is advised that there is medium voltage underground infrastructure along Wellings Private and Cedarow Court.				
a. Prior to the commencement of any excavation, the Owner shall arrange for an underground cable locate by contacting Ontario One Call at 1-800-400-2255, not less than seven				

(7) working days prior to excavating. There shall be no mechanical excavation within one and a half meters (1.5m) of any Hydro Ottawa underground plant unless the exact position of plant is determined by hand digging methods. The Owner shall contact Hydro Ottawa and expose existing duct banks and/or cable chambers. Hydro Ottawa will have the existing duct bank and manholes inspected to record existing condition. Once piling and shoring is completed, Hydro Ottawa will re-inspect the underground plant for any damages. The Owner shall inform Hydro Ottawa of any acute shock construction process or rubblization to be used during construction and apply Hydro Ottawa's work procedure UDS0022 "Protecting Electrical Distribution Plant & Support Structures from Vibrations Caused by Construction Activity" which can be found at **https://hydroottawa.com/accounts-services/accounts/contractors-developers/commercial-design-specifications** Acknowledged				
b. The Owner shall not use steel curb and sidewalk form support pins in the vicinity of Hydro Ottawa underground plant for electrical safety. Acknowledged				
c. If the change in grade is more than three tenths of a meter (0.3m) in the vicinity of proposed or existing electric utility equipment. Hydro Ottawa requests to be consulted to				

prevent damages to its equipment.Acknowledged				
3. The Owner shall ensure that any landscaping or surface finishing does not encroach into existing or proposed Hydro Ottawa overhead or underground assets or easement. When proposing to plant trees in proximity of existing power lines, the Owner shall refer to Hydro Ottawa's free publication "Tree Planting Advice" which can be found at https://hydroottawa.com/outages-safety/safety-home/outside-home/planting-trees. The shrub or tree location and expected growth must be considered. If any Hydro Ottawa related activity requires the trimming, cutting or removal of vegetation, or removal of other landscaping or surface finishing, the activity and the re-instatement shall be at the owner's expense.Acknowledged				
4. The Owner shall enter an Installation and Service agreement with Hydro Ottawa. Acknowledged				
5. The Owner shall convey, at their cost, all required easements as determined by Hydro Ottawa.Acknowledged				
6. The Owner is to contact Hydro Ottawa if the electrical servicing of the site is to change in location or in size. A load summary will be needed for the technical evaluation.Acknowledged				
7. The Owner has the obligation to ensure that power quality problems, either steady state or transient, do not arise on the distribution system per Hydro Ottawa's				

Conditions of Service Section 2.3.2 “Power Quality.” If a power quality problem arises on the distribution system that originates from the Owner's property, the Owner shall be responsible for rectification to Hydro Ottawa's satisfaction. Acknowledged				
8. The Owner shall be responsible for servicing the buildings within the property. Only one service entrance per property shall be permitted. Acknowledged				
9. Hydro Ottawa requires to be pre-consulted before approving any proposed reduction to the City of Ottawa three meter (3m) minimum standard setback prior to designing the electrical servicing, as it may affect the electrical servicing design timeline for installation and cost. This includes any proposed overhang encroachment into the three meter (3m) setback space Acknowledged				
10. The Owner shall be responsible for all costs for feasible relocations, protection or encasement of any existing Hydro Ottawa plant. Acknowledged				
11. The Owner is advised that Hydro Ottawa does not provide servicing through rear lanes. Acknowledged				
12. The Owner is advised that there is limited capacity to service the proposed development at this time. The Owner may be responsible for a Capital Contribution payment(s) towards a distribution system expansion if the proposed development requires electrical servicing greater than can be provided by the existing distribution system in the vicinity, either in capacity or in extension limit. This amount shall be in accordance with Hydro Ottawa's Contributed Capital Policy and Conditions of				

Service. Acknowledged				
13. The Owner shall comply with Hydro Ottawa's Conditions of Service and thus should be consulted for the servicing terms. The document, including referenced standards, guidelines and drawings, may be found at https://hydroottawa.com/about-us/policies/conditions-service. The Owner should consult Hydro Ottawa prior to commencing engineering designs to ensure compliance with these documents. Acknowledged				
14. Hydro Ottawa reserves the right to raise conditions throughout the development of this proposal should the revisions contain non-conformances with, for example, Hydro Ottawa's Conditions of Service or Standards. To ensure the best outcome, Hydro Ottawa welcomes an early discussion on the proposal. Acknowledged				
15. Hydro Ottawa requests to be included in all future circulations concerning this proposal. Acknowledged				
For more information on electrical servicing, the following link outlines Hydro Ottawa's services for Commercial, Overhead and Underground, and Residential projects, together with contact information for Hydro Ottawa representatives. Acknowledged				
https://hydroottawa.com/accounts-services/accounts/contractors- developers/distribution-system-design				
Bell Canada				

We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval:				
"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. Acknowledged				
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." Acknowledged				
The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication and telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.				
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.				
If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.				
To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations.				

We note that WSP operates Bell Canada's development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. However, **all responses to circulations and requests for information, such as requests for clearance, will come directly from Bell Canada, and not from WSP.** WSP is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses. Acknowledged				
Should you have any questions, please contact Meaghan Palynchuk: planninganddevelopment@bell.ca				