

PAQUETTE PLANNING ASSOCIATES LTD.
URBAN PLANNING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

July 25, 2023

City of Ottawa
Planning and Infrastructure
110 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 1J1

Attention: Mr. John Bernier
Development Services Department

Re: Zoning By-law Amendment D02-02-21-0008 and Site Plan Control D07-12-21-0015
120 Den Hagg Drive
Phase 1

Dear Mr. Bernier:

Please accept this fourth submission for site plan approval for the above referenced project as a follow up to your circulation comments received on March 6 and 16, 2023. To this end, attached are the following documents for your information:

- pdf of the revised Site Plan (Revision L) dated July 19, 2023 prepared by Neuf Architects;
- email from David Hook of IBI dated April 24, 2023 regarding concrete pad and bench.
- city standard drawing for “Concrete Bench Pad Adjacent to Sidewalk”

Address: 56 Hutchison Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1Y 4A3
Phone: 613-722-7217 Email: paquetteplanning@sympatico.ca

Circulation Comments and Responses

Received March 6, 2023

Planning Comments:

1. The eastern sidewalk along Den Haag is in disrepair with some grading issues noted. Please include the repair in the scope of works.

Response: Noted. Sidewalk to be added to scope of work for 120 Den Haag. Existing sidewalk to be removed and replaced in existing location based of city's standard details.


Urban Design Comments:

2. This application was reviewed by the UDRP in April 2022. The application should provide a written response to UDRP recommendations to clarify which UDRP recommendations have been taken into considerations in the latest iteration of the design.

Response: See UDRP comments and responses included in later section of this letter.

3. On the floor plans, a. A new triangular exterior space is now introduced next to the main entrance of the building. This new design appears to be out of place for the proposal (see below in the attached image)

Response: Triangular exterior entrance has been revised orthogonal. See screen shot below...



b. Please explain the function of the at-grade balcony at the corner.

Response: Terrace at ground floor is continuity of amenity co-working space allowing direct access an enclosed exterior area.

4. On the landscape plan, please consider re-arranging soft landscape vs hard surface at the south-west corner of the building outside of the hydro room . Minimize hard surface, and if possible, connect the hard surface with entrance to the garage and use soft landscaping to screen the hydro room doors (also see attached image below).

Response: Hydro Ottawa requires direct access to hydro vault. Current path allows for access and additional clearance pathway (1100mm) for exiting.

Transportation Engineering

5. Leboutillier Avenue is a boundary street, therefore, assess the MMLOS in Table 10.
• New clarifying note: Local roads are not automatically complete streets and they are not exempt from MMLOS analysis.

Response: Leboutillier Avenue is a local road that safely accommodates all modes of travel thus fulfils the criteria of a Complete Street. The low traffic speeds (due to short block lengths and tight 90-degree bend) ensure that this roadway is safe and comfortable for cyclists while the sidewalk is buffered from the roadway by parked vehicles creating a safe and comfortable environment for pedestrians.

6. Since Samuel-Genest Catholic College Secondary School is within 300m of site, Table 10 should reflect the higher required MMLOS targets.

Response: The site is more than 300m from the school (measured from the centroid of the school building) and the site is over 750m walking distance from the school. As such, the MMLOS targets associated with a school are not appropriate for this location.

7. The civil plans include the following note on the Montreal Road frontage: “concrete pad and bench to be removed and disposed offsite”. Confirm this is the preference of Transit Services. Consider relocating rather than entirely removing. Also consult with Transit Services on the preferred location of the bus shelter pad.

Response: Noted, Existing concrete are to be removed and new concrete pad provided. Transit Services stated. See attached email from David Hook of IBI dated April 24,2023 regarding concrete pad and bench.

8. The civil and landscape plans show the sidewalk on the east side of Den Haag Drive and the north side of the access as being reconstructed in interlock paving. The

sidewalk must be constructed in concrete per City of Ottawa standards.

Response: The interlock has been removed, and concrete side is to be provided. See attached site plan.

9. The civil plans show depressed curbs across the sidewalk. Note that City of Ottawa standard detail SC7.1 does not include depressed curbs across the sidewalk (i.e., the sidewalk is flush concrete, and the private approach curb is completely discontinuous when it crosses the sidewalk).

Response: Site plan reflects SC7.1 design.

10. Private Approach should be 3m from side lot line. Per Section 25 (1) (p) and Section 25 (1) (r) of Private Approach By-Law, it is permissible to reduce the setback. However, the proponent must provide the rationale for a reduced setback and confirm the conditions of Section 25 (1) (p) have been met. Also note that no part of the Private Approach (e.g., the curb return) shall be permitted to encroach across the projection of the side lot line.

Response: Building placement and design layout is based off on the masterplaning originally designed by HOK and Canada Lands.

Although the Private Approach By-law requires that approaches must be at least 3.0m from the abutting property line, the proposed offset of 0.3m is recommended for City approval as it will not result in negative impacts to the adjacent property (140 Den Haag Drive), a new mid-rise development with no vehicular access on this street. The proposed access location can be safely accommodated and will not result in traffic hazards with the adjacent property, is located a sufficient distance from the nearest intersection street (LeBoutillier Avenue) and does not result in any sight line restrictions based on the established building setbacks. The curb radius is proposed to extend beyond the southern property limit, however this poses no hazard to the adjacent residential development at 140 Den Haag Drive.

Traffic Signal Design

11. No comments for this current circulation. Traffic Signal Design Unit reserves the right to make future comments based on subsequent submissions.

Response: Noted.

12. If there are any future proposed changes in the existing roadway geometry that would require the installation of a pedestrian crossover (Type B or Type C), the signalization of an intersection or modifications to an existing signalized intersection, the City of Ottawa Traffic Signal Design Unit would be required to complete a traffic signal plant design and would need to be engaged in reviews during the functional design stage.

Response: Noted.

13. Please contact Jon Pach: at 613-806-0142 or jon.pach@ottawa.ca and Diana Barrett: 613-807-3035 or Diana.Barrett@ottawa.ca to discuss traffic control signal requirements.

Response: Noted.

Received March 16, 2023

- Can you have Neuf include the provided corner side yard setback along with the provided step back (for the 4th-8th floors) on the Site Plan? Also include this for the Montreal side too.

Response: Added, please see updated site plan attached.

- The Site Plan should include a zoning compliance table – this is required to understand the zoning in place at the time of approval. The chart you’ve provided separately is not an approvable document.

Response: Added, please see updated site plan attached.

Please dimension bicycle lockups interior and exterior: space width and lengths, as well as aisle width. Ensure that it complies with Sec. 111.

Response: See attached site plan. 1500mm MIN. clearance provided.

- Include the number of bike lockups in each location on the site plan as it is on the landscape plan.

Response: See attached site plan with zoning compliance chart.

- Provide a detail of these lockups on plan.

Response: See attached L3-01, Detail 3 for Bike Rack on Unit Paving.

- It is preferable to have these lockups in the courtyard instead of a main frontage like Montreal Road.

Response: Noted.


- Tell me how the car-share will operate? Will the company be provided key card access? This presents security issues. Owners have had difficulties in the past with car-share spots within a private garage.

Response: Car-share will operate under building management with the intent that the car-share be provided to tenants.

- Has Addressing signed off on 800 Montreal Road or is the municipal address 120 Den Haag Dr?

Response: Municipal address will be maintained as 120 Den Haag Dr.





Other comments received.

Note: UDRP comments (we could not find date these comments were received but understand that no other visit to UDRP is necessary per email received from you on October 25, 2022 as follows:

Thanks for the email. I can confirm that a revisit to the UDRP is not necessary. Please be sure to address the UDRP comments in your resubmission.

1.a• The Panel supports the project and considers the building a positive addition to the neighbourhood, but the Panel believes further refinements to the building are needed to create a more simplified façade and clearly defined base, middle and top.

Response: Noted. Building materials and colours are revised to clearly define building elements.

1.b• The public realm needs further refinement; the proponent should continue integrating the interior courtyard with the adjacent park and treat the retaining wall as part of the landscape rather than an extension of the building.

Response: Low vegetation has been located along property line to separate the private property from the public park, creating a clear separation. The vegetation will allow for a

continuous green connection to the park while maintaining the proposed development's private green space. Community accessible pathway to be provided between park and existing development to the south during development's 2nd phase.

Architectural Expression

2.a• The Panel has concerns with the street facing projected balconies, especially at the corner, making the building feel top-heavy. The proponent should consider in-setting the balconies at the corner and explore recessing or integrating all of the street facing balconies to strengthen the project as a street wall building.

Response: Balconies revised to add more interest to the corner. 8th floor corner unit is recessed separating building top from middle. The light steel framing system chosen has limitations. The light steel frame requires a simplified load distribution from roof to foundation. Embedding balconies would interfere with loads and create additional structural elements.

2.b• The Panel notes the base and top floor treatment have created a corner expression that provides an opportunity to use a different architectural treatment to create a corner expression that will help connect the base, middle and top.

Response: Noted. See 2.a

2.c• The Panel recommends further refinement of the façade by removing the columns at the corner and creating a cantilever expression to simplify the base.

Response: Removing Column at the corner and cantilevering the 3rd floor would cause structural concerns. Reducing the cantilever would affect the base, middle, top separations.

2.d• The proponent should examine the end façades to emphasize the breaks and shifting volumes that serve to slender the façades.

Response: Noted. Design fulfills commenter intents.

Materiality

3.a• The Panel believes the building should be simplified as the base and top have different patterns of glazing and mullions, making the top appear taller.

Response: Noted. Mullions and glazing spacing has been revised to project elements from the middle of the building into the 8th floor, and ground floors.

3.b• The contrast of dark masonry at the base with the red brick middle portion needs further study. The changes in materiality appear co-planar, and the dark brick

between the windows does not successfully add depth or articulation.

Response: Dark masonry removed from between windows. Masonry detailing between windows have been added to break up façade and allow for some differentiation, and interest between windows.

3.c• The proponent should consider using contrasting colours to make the top lighter, establish a clear and consistent datum line where the material changes to glass and simplify the two-storey base.

Response: 8th floor has been revised to a lighter colour. A datum line complete with architectural masonry element has been included at the 2nd floor added to separate a darker red back from a lighter red middle. Clearly separating base, middle, and top separations.

3.d• The Panel appreciates the use of red brick and cautions that the white metal that currently extends to grade will be difficult to maintain; a material with greater durability and permanence (such as stone or precast) may be considered.

Response: Noted. Limestone base at all grade are provided for durability.

3.e• There was a suggestion to study the south perspective to understand whether the framing of the lower level is successful at grounding the elevation and if the dark portion is the appropriate height.

Response: Noted. Design fulfills commenter intents.

3.f• The proponent should consider introducing green roofs and using limestone materials to improve the site's sustainability.

Response: Green space above parking garage between building and existing park is part of the building design. No green roofing/blue roofing to be considered.

Public Realm and Landscape

4.a• The Panel recommends curving or terracing the retaining wall and using stone materials to create a distinct element that will be part of the landscape rather than an extension of the building. Furthermore, the Panel recommends the use of evergreen shrubs that are suited for Ottawa's climate and will provide year-round greenery.

Response: Noted. Retaining wall has been adjusted and segmented for smoother transition.

4.b• The Panel recommends seamlessly integrating the interior courtyard with the park.

Response: Noted. See item 1.b.

I trust that this submission is complete. As indicated in our previous submission and as discussed, no zoning changes are required to accommodate this site plan and as such we are hopeful that we can now receive site plan approval from you.

Please contact me at 722-7217 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Paquette Planning Associates Ltd.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Paquette', is centered on a light-colored rectangular background.

Daniel Paquette, MCIP, RPP
President

CC: Mr. Pierre Couture, Sovima