

17-1528-MER

December 12, 2018

Mr. Steve Belan, MCIP, RPP
Planner
Development Review, Suburban Services East
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development
City of Ottawa
110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th Floor
Ottawa, ON K2P 1J1

**Re: Blue Sea Village Mer Bleue
2159 Mer Bleue Road, Ottawa
Applications for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Bylaw Amendment &
Plan of Subdivision, D01-01-17-0026, D02-02-17-0128, D07-16-17-0034**

Dear Mr. Belan:

We are in receipt of comments that have been provided to us through various means. Attached please find the following as our resubmission for the above noted development applications for the above noted project;

- 2 copies of the Servicing Options Report, Rev. 3, December 2018,
- 2 copies of the Environmental Impact Statement, Rev. 2, December 11, 2018,
- 3 copies of the Draft Plan of Subdivision Rev. 1, dated December 5, 2018,
- Response chart from DSEL dated December 12, 2018,
- Response letter from Rhuland and Associates, dated October 10, 2018,
- Response letter from D.J. Halpenny & Associates, dated October 15, 2018,
- Electronic copies of the report and letters.

The following test in **red** indicates how each comment has been addressed:

Technical Agencies:

The Ottawa Catholic School Board – no comments **Acknowledged**

South Nation Conservation Authority: (see comments attached) **Master studies for the Mer Bleue CDP are prepared and being reviewed by the City, the detail design of our site will be consistent with those reports, once approved**

Hydro One: (see comments attached) Note that the review of the grading and drainage by Hydro One is a long process and should be initiated as soon as possible. **Acknowledged, the minimum setbacks for buildings from HydroOne infrastructure will be respected with a more detailed review available when structures (ie buildings and parking lots) are proposed as part of the site plan control applications for relevant blocks along the corridor**

MMM (Bell Canada) **Acknowledged**

1. The Owner shall indicate in the Agreement, in words satisfactory to Bell Canada, that it will grant to Bell Canada any easements that may be required, which may include a blanket easement, for communication/telecommunications infrastructure. In the event of any conflict with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities or easements.
2. We hereby advise the Developer to contact Bell Canada during detailed design to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.
3. As you may be aware, Bell Canada is Ontario's principal telecommunications infrastructure provider, developing and maintaining an essential public service. It is incumbent upon the Municipality and the Developer to ensure that the development is serviced with communication/telecommunication infrastructure. In fact, the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement requires the development of coordinated, efficient and cost effective infrastructure, including telecommunications systems (Section 1.6.1).
4. The Developer is hereby advised that prior to commencing any work, the Developer must confirm that sufficient wire-line communication/telecommunication infrastructure is available. In the event that such infrastructure is unavailable, the Developer shall be required to pay for the connection to and/or extension of the existing communication/telecommunication infrastructure.
5. If the Developer elects not to pay for the above mentions connection, then the Developer will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the municipality that sufficient alternative communication/telecommunication will be provide to enable, at a minimum, the effective deliver of communication/telecommunication services for emergency management services (i.e, 911 Emergency service).
6. MMM (a WSP company) operates Bell Canada's development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. Please note, however, that all responses to circulation and other request, such as requests for clearance, come directly from Bell Canada and not from MMM. MMM is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses.

Canada Post **Acknowledged**

1. Canada post will provide mail delivery service to the subdivision through centralized Community Mail Boxes (CMBs) and Lock Box Assembly's (LBAs)
2. The CMBs location will be determined at the time of the preliminary CUP Plan
3. If the development includes plans for (a) multi-unit buildings(s) with a common indoor entrance, the developer must supply, install and maintain the mail delivery equipment with parcels compartments within these buildings to Canada Post's specifications (LBA).
4. Please provide Canada Post with excavation date for the first foundation/first phase as well as the date development work is scheduled to begin.
5. Finally, please provide the expected date(s) for the CMB(s).
6. For additional requirement for the developer: https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mr/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf

Enbridge **Acknowledged**

1. The applicant shall contact Enbridge Gas Distribution's Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea60@enbridge.com for service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping (including, but not limited to: tree planting, silva cells, and/or soil trenches) and /or asphalt paving.
2. If the gas main needs to be relocated as a result of changes in the alignment or grade of the future road allowances or for temporary gas pipe installations pertaining to phase construction, all costs are the

responsibility of the applicant.

3. In the event that easements(s) are required to service this development, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas Distribution at no cost. The inhibiting order will not be lifted until the application has met all of Enbridge Gas Distribution's requirements.
4. The applicant will grade all road allowances to as close to final elevation as possible, provide necessary field survey information all approved municipal road cross sections, identifying all utility locations prior to the installation of the gas piping.

Zayo – has no existing plant in the area indicated in your submission. No markup and no objection.

Rogers Communications **Acknowledged**

Rogers has no comment or concerns, please apply standard subdivision conditions:

1. That the owner shall transfer such new easements and maintenance agreements as are deemed necessary by Roger Communications Canada Inc. to service this subdivision , to our satisfaction and that of the appropriate authority and at no cost to us. The owner is also to ensure that these easement documents are registered on title immediately following registration of the final plan, and the affected agencies duly notified.
2. That the application be required, in the Subdivision Agreement, to coordinate the preparation of an overall utility distribution plan. The plan would be showing the locations (shared or otherwise) and the installation timing and phasing of all required utilities (on-ground, below ground) through liaison with the appropriate electrical, gas, water, telephone and cablevision authority. This includes on-site drainage facilities. Such location plan being to the satisfaction of all affected authorities.
3. That the owner agrees with Rogers Communications Canada Inc. to arrange for pay the cost of the relocation of any existing services which is made necessary because of this subdivision, to the satisfaction of the authority having jurisdiction.

City Departments

City Urban Design

Plan of Subdivision

Comments:

1. Please provide a 6-metre block that will allow for a connection from the public street to the hydro corridor to allow for future public cycling and pedestrian connections within the corridor. **This has been provided in the requested location, see revised Draft Plan of Subdivision**
2. Please provide an additional street connection to the north and walkway block to the south mid-way along street 1. The current block length of 300 m + is too long. **There is no technical requirement for such a public road to the north (see response from Traffic Consultants) and a single block at the easterly end of the temporary cul-du-sac is sufficient in our view to provide this connection. When individual blocks along the corridor are advanced, we are confident that the City will ask for connections from those blocks to the corridor which should suffice.**
3. Additional consideration and thought needs to be given toward the public realm. Items such as street design, pedestrian connectivity and park/open space all need to be thoroughly considered. A more detailed analysis of the public realm and public amenities should be undertaken. **This will be done as part of the final design for the proposed public road with comments from and approval by various City Departments, not to be done prior to draft approval**

City Forestry

- 1) A permit is required prior to any tree removal. **Acknowledged**
- 2) The TCR identifies some areas of tree retention but they are not clearly shown on the plan as 'to be retained'. The TCR needs to identify and confirm tree retention. Compare the proposed tree retention to areas to the grading plan, site servicing plan etc. to ensure retention is possible.
- 3) Please show tree protection fencing location on Map 2. **See response from Rhuland & Associates Ltd.**
- 4) Do all the trees need to be removed at this time if there is no specific plan to develop the various blocks? **Same as 3)**
- 5) Once landscape plan is no longer in concept form we would like an opportunity to review. **At final design stage**

City Environmental Planning

Zoning by-law amendment: **Acknowledged**

- There are no environmental constraints identified in Schedule K of the Official Plan
- There are no natural heritage system overlay features identified in schedule L1 of the Official Plan
- The subject property is designated as Urban Employment Area in Schedule B of the Official Plan

EIS: **See revised EIS dated December 11, 2018**

- Property owner information is missing from the report
- One site visit was conducted on October 31, 2017- this timing is late in the season for vegetation as the optimal inventory period is Mid-May to Mid-September for description of vegetation communities and also not an appropriate time to survey for breeding birds
- Raptor nests should be surveyed for in April
- There are grassland bird observations (bobolink, eastern meadowlark and barn swallow) in the vicinity of the subject site and a breeding bird survey following MNRF's bobolink/eastern meadowlark survey protocol should be carried out during the appropriate time of year
- The report only identifies the dates and weather conditions of the site visit, further information is required including specific time of the survey, duration/level of effort, purpose of site visit and methodology used
- A description of the proposed project including site preparation, construction, landscaping and intended use of the property once the construction work is completed and site plans of the proposed development are missing in the report
- Agency correspondence is not included in the report

City Engineering

A. List of Report(s):

Servicing Options Report, dated December 2017 **See revised report dated December 11, 2018**

1. The Blacksheep Development is not in the approved catchment area of the Avalon West SWMP, and due to peak operating level challenges in the SWM Pond, this alternative is deemed not to be an option.
2. Previous master drainage planning in the Bilberry Creek watershed has accounted for the Blacksheep Development area contributing urban drainage to it, and is accordingly the outlet that is to be used going forward. Due to persistent erosion issues in Bilberry Creek, there is an expectation that opportunities for LIDs will be examined and recommended/documented within the Blacksheep development area at the detailed design stage for runoff volume reduction during frequent rainfall-runoff events.

3. Section 1.2 should refer to Subdivision approval and not Site Plan. Revise
4. Section 4.3 Option 1 requires a City Block through the adjacent block to reach Vanguard. Option 2 requires City infrastructure through the LRT and the Hydro Corridor and this would not be acceptable to the City.
5. 5.2: Should be 70 L/s/ha for residential, 50 L/s/ha for non-residential and 100 L/s/ha for roadways. Info
6. 5.2. Option 1 requires a City block to be provided through the adjacent lands for a Storm Sewer in order to be acceptable to the City.
7. 5.2 Option 2; there is no capacity in the storm sewer system in Trigatoria Cres. There is no acceptable sewer capacity or routing via the Hydro corridor or LRT properties and therefore is not acceptable as an option.
8. Section 5.4 will not work unless the City has a City Block through the other lands for ownership of the infrastructure. A City Block will be required if through other properties.
9. 5.5, Option 2 is not acceptable to the City due to routing and capacity.

B. Water Resources Comments:

Water:

1. The application is located within the EUC Mixed-use Centre CDP and MSS update (see attached). Please confirm if any trunk watermain (i.e. sizes 300 mm or larger) are planned to be located within the subject site. Also, key water servicing details (i.e. number of connections and locations) must comply with the EUC MSS update. Revise.
2. A second watermain connection is required to service this development since the number of residential units exceed 50 (i.e. the 185 room retirement room alone exceeds the criterion). The EUC MSS update will identify the second feed (i.e. from Trigatoria Crescent or from the extension of the Vanguard Road watermain). Revise.
3. Specify the required fire demand for this application with supporting calculations provided in Appendix B.
4. The applicant should request boundary conditions from the City to confirm available pressures under high pressure, peak hour and maximum day plus fire conditions. I do not see boundary condition for the subject site in Appendix B.

Wastewater:

1. The EUC MSS Update will provide the preferred sanitary outlet for this site.
2. The design parameters used to compute sanitary flows for the subject site can be reduced with the release of Technical Bulletin ISTB-2018-01.
3. The existing 375 mm sanitary sewer west of the Vanguard Drive and Lanthier Road intersection is privately owned.
4. The monitored parameters used to assess capacity on Trigatoria Crescent and Chinian Street can be reduced with the release of Technical Bulletin ISTB-2018-01.

C.

Geotechnical Investigation, dated November 22, 2017

C.1 No comments

Please consider these comments in combination with comments you receive from other technical

groups, agencies and the public.

City Transportation

The Vanguard Extension Environmental Assessment has not been completed and Council will determine the approved alignment early next year. **Acknowledged**

City Policy The proponent has agreed to withdraw a request for residential uses on the subject property at this time

The subject lands are designated as Urban Employment Area by Official Plan Amendment 180 (OPA 180) and are under appeal. The in-force land use designations are largely Employment Area with a small area on the southwest corner being Mixed-Use Centre on Schedule B Urban Policy Plan to the Official Plan. The Employment Area designation in the Official Plan corresponds to an Employment area as defined by the Provincial Policy Statement(PPS), 2014. The extent of the Mixed-Use Centre designation on the subject lands are shown on Schedule E12 to OPA 180.

The proposed residential uses are not permitted in the Employment Area designation (OP, Section 3.6.5, Policy 2) or the Employment area definition in the PPS, 2014. The proposed scale of the recreational, health and fitness uses can not be considered ancillary uses and are therefore not permitted in the Employment Area designation (OP, Section 3.6.5, Policy 2) or the Employment area definition in the PPS, 2014. The proposed residential and recreational, health and fitness uses are non-employment uses and adding them to the Employment Area designation, being an Employment area defined by the PPS, 2014, is a conversion of Employment lands.

The 2014 PPS provides direction through policy 1.3.2 that the conversion of Employment lands can be considered through a comprehensive review. Nothing has been submitted to support the applications as a comprehensive review. The applications therefore does not meet the policy directions provided in the 2014 PPS regarding when a conversion can be considered and as such does not conform with the PPS.

OPA 180 was a comprehensive review that considered the conversion of Employment lands. The Employment land needs of the City was comprehensively reviewed through the report "Ottawa Employment Land Review: Final Report, 2036 Employment Projections Update", prepared by Hemson Consulting, dated November 2016. The South Orleans Business Park, which the subject lands are a part of, were specifically considered through this review and a conversion on the west side of the business park was recommended. A conversion request to Mixed-Use Centre was considered on the northerly adjacent parcel through the staff report "Assessments of Candidate Conversion Areas and Conversion Requests" dated November 2016. The subject lands, under separate ownership at the time, were also considered for conversion to create a contiguous Mixed-Use Centre designation. The conversion request and the subject lands were recommended to be retained as Employment lands as they are key to the viability of the remaining Employment lands east of Mer Bleue Road in terms of contiguous lands and total vacant supply. Further a Mixed-Use Centre is not required to meet the population and household projections in the long term, nor is this designation required to create transit supportive employment opportunities at the Bus Rapid Transit Station. Transit supportive employment opportunities have already been provided for through OPA 180, Section 3.6.5, Policy 12 requiring a minimum of 200 jobs per hectare within 400m of the planned rapid transit station.

Official Plan Section 2.2.2, Policy 30 requires that the conversion of Employment lands to non-employment uses only be considered at the time of a comprehensive review and that applications

received between comprehensive reviews will be considered premature unless City Council directs that a comprehensive review be initiated. Council has not provided for such direction post OPA 180.

The 2014 PPS provides direction on what circumstances warrant a conversion of Employment lands through policy 1.3.2, which states only where:

1. it has been demonstrated that the land is not required for employment purposes over the long term and,
2. that there is a need for the conversion.

The Official Plan in Section 2.2.2., Policy 30 require the same two tests above. Further, in assessing these tests, Policy 31 provides additional city-wide, subdivision and site-specific criteria.

The Planning Rationale prepared by Holzman Consultants dated December 15, 2017 does not address the two primary conversion tests in PPS Policy 1.3.2 nor does it address the Official Plan conversion criteria in Section 2.2.2. Policy 31. No assessment has been provided in relation to these conversion requirements.

Exhibit 'H' in the Planning Rationale could be clearer that the intent is to show distance to the Mixed-Use Centre designation. The shading of the 'outer ring' could provide the incorrect impression that the Mixed-Use Centre designation covers more of the subject lands than it should. No scale, notation or legend has been provided to indicate what the magenta ring is meant to convey.

As the applications are not a comprehensive review it does not have the ability to convert the subject lands to non-employment uses. Further, the applications as submitted do not meet the tests of the PPS or the Official Plan for the conversion to non-employment uses.

We trust that you will review this material and deem the submission adequate for the purpose of initiating the formal processing of these applications.

If you have any questions or require clarification on any matters, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Bill Holzman

William S. Holzman, MCIP, RPP
President
Holzman Consultants Inc.

Attach

c.c. 2534189 Ontario Ltd.

1528/applicationsubmissionletterDec23-2017.doc