

CITY COMMENTS NOVEMBER 27, 2019	LÉPINE RESPONSES JUNE 2020
<p><u>Planning Staff Comments</u></p> <p>While it is acknowledged that Arterial Mainstreets are targeted areas for intensification and priority areas for consideration of increased building height and density, any new development nonetheless is expected to complement the character of the surrounding built form and context, and increased building height is to be compatible with the adjacent existing development that is not within the Mainstreet designation.</p>	<p>In addition to other references in this application to the proposed building heights, Table 5 — Official Plan Section 2.5.1 Design Objectives on page 17 of the September 2019 Planning Rationale relates to the height strategy. The relevant Official Plan Design Objective appears in the fourth row of Table 5:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>To ensure that new development respects the character of existing areas.</i></p> <p>The corresponding statement in the September 2019 Planning Rationale addressed the height strategy:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The proposed height strategy will provide a sensitive transition of building heights down toward Livery Street and the neighbouring residential development. The proposed heights for the apartment buildings along Robert Grant Avenue will create a landmark for this important future transit node.”</i></p> <p>In addition to the design revisions to the concept, all references to “sensitive” in the Planning Rationale will be replaced by the word “compatible.” This response document outlines the revisions to the proposed development concept that aim to increase the degree of compatibility with the adjacent existing development.</p>
<p><u>Building Height, Massing and Transition</u></p> <p>It is staff’s opinion that the proposed development would benefit from improved compatibility and transition with the surrounding development by reducing the height of the building on Livery Street adjacent to the two-story townhouses across the street. . . . further consideration is needed to provide a more appropriate transition from the adjacent low-rise residential properties. For instance, a stepping back that reflects the height of the low-rise units facing the site could provide a transition in the design of the building. An alternative would be to reduce the height and break up the massing of the building. A third alternative would be to reorient the buildings on the site, so that the one- storey community amenity building faces the Livery Street townhouses.</p>	<p>The revised concept includes modifications that address two of the three transition methods recommended in the staff comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The façades of the building across Livery Street from the townhouses incorporate significant stepping back of the fifth and sixth floors, thereby presenting a four-storey façade to the street. The main floor grade of the existing townhouses is approximately 1 metre higher than Livery Street, such that the peaks of the townhouses are more than 11 metres higher than the grade in front of the proposed Lépine building along Livery Street. Assuming a maximum height of less than 15 metres at the top of the fourth floor façade, the height difference between the tops of the townhouses and the top of the fourth floor façade would be no more than 4 metres or approximately one storey. Along Livery Street to the east of the Lépine property, the City has approved apartment blocks and stacked townhouses with a maximum height of 15 metres across the street from townhouses of the same height as those across Livery Street from the Lépine project. On the west and north sides of Livery Street, the heights across the street from the townhouses will be the same. The total distance from the fourth floor façade of Building A would be greater than 31 metres to the façades of the townhouses across the street; from the fourth floor façade, more than 34 metres; and from the sixth floor façade, more than 37 metres. On the north side of Livery Street, the distance from the new apartment block façades to the townhouse façades across the street is much shorter at 25 metres. 2. The revised concept illustrates various architectural devices intended to break up the massing of the Livery Street façade, including ground-oriented apartment patios, varied articulation on the third and fourth floors, and alterations to the roof lines of the fourth and fifth floor façades. 3. Creation of a ground-oriented, varied, and attractive residential façade conforms with many urban design principles that promote active street frontages. Placement of an amenity building along Livery Street will break up the rhythm and scale of the desired residential façade and add substantial traffic volumes to Livery Street. Vehicular access to the amenity building is proposed from Robert Grant Avenue. Other considerations relating to the placement and function of the amenity building are discussed later in this response document.

<p>Also, with respect to the transition with the townhouses opposite the site, please remove the parking garage access on Livery Street, or at minimum, revise the location. A parking garage entrance should be integrated within the building and oriented away from the street. In addition, please address potential methods for directing the bulk of vehicles to the Robert Grant Avenue garage access. Livery Street is a local residential street that is unsuited to accommodating 200 vehicles in the peak morning and afternoon hours.</p>	<p><u>Orientation of Underground Parking Access</u> Although the same access point is proposed, the garage door will be recessed back more than 37 metres from the sidewalk, with a landscaped roof that will extend over most of the driveway entrance as it descends to the garage door. The garage door will be 1 metre lower than the curb and there will be hedges and trees planted on both sides of the driveway. In addition, the garage door will be angled at 45° in order to reduce its visibility from the street. This will eliminate the effect of a garage door facing the street, which is the prevalent condition for suburban residential development, including the townhouses along the east side of Livery Street.</p> <p><u>Livery Street Traffic</u> The Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) in support of this application confirms that Livery Street has sufficient capacity for the projected maximum number of additional vehicle trips generated by the proposed development, Due to the design of the underground garage and use of Robert Grant Avenue as the primary access, the actual number will be lower than this maximum projection. As is the case with Lépine’s apartment community at William’s Court in the Kanata Town Centre, the underground parking layout will be designed so that the most convenient access point for all vehicles parked underground will be at Robert Grant Avenue. William’s Court does have a secondary garage access along Canadian Shield Avenue, although fewer than 20% of all trips use that access because the underground parking layout makes it more time-consuming for residents to use. For the purposes of safety and effective management of service and loading vehicles, it is essential that the underground parking have two access points. In unusual circumstances when the primary access might not be open for any reason, the secondary access will ensure safe and efficient circulation in the short term. Other considerations relating to the placement and function of the access to the underground parking are discussed later in this response document.</p>
<p><u>Section 3.6.3 of the Official Plan</u> Section 3.6.3 of the Official Plan states that high-rise buildings may be permitted at one of three nodes (In this case, within 400 metres walking distance of a Rapid Transit Station on Schedule D of the Official Plan: criteria are satisfied) and where the development provides a community amenity and adequate transition is provided to adjacent low-rise.</p>	<p>The current staff comments refer to extracts from Official Plan Section 3.6.3, which were adopted through the Official Plan Amendment 150 Settlement of Appeals (OPA 150 Settlement). These amendments to Section 3.6.3 came into force and effect on July 18, 2019, when the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal (LPAT) issued its Memorandum of Oral Decision and Order with respect to the OPA 150 Settlement. The subject Zoning By-law Amendment Application (File Number D02-02-19-0062) was received by the City of Ottawa on May 24, 2019, eight weeks prior to the LPAT Memorandum of Oral Decision and Order on the OPA 150 Settlement. Nonetheless, Lépine is responding to these comments in good faith.</p> <p>This is correctly stated in Section 4.3 on page 23 of the Planning Rationale: <i>“Although the subject application for a Zoning By-law Amendment was submitted before the issuance of the July 18, 2019 Memorandum and Order, any future Site Plan Control application for the proposed development will be subject to approved Official Plan Amendments, including the OPA 150 Settlement.”</i></p>
<p>Please clearly describe what community amenities that are being provided to support the rezoning. It seems unlikely that the community building with its gym and pool will be available to non-residents of the complex, so it cannot be considered an amenity. . . . [continued on next page]</p>	<p>As illustrated in the revised concept and addressed in the amended Planning Rationale, a number of outdoor amenities on the Lépine site will be accessible to the public, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pathways that will provide pedestrian access through the site between the Rapid Transit Station to the north and the Village Green to the south, should pedestrians choose such routes • street furniture and open air structures

<p>[continued from previous page] . . . The pathways provided are hidden within the interior of the site, are obscured by buildings and do not provide a welcoming public realm to the public from either Livery Street or Robert Grant Avenue. They appear to serve residents of the complex, so do not constitute a community amenity. Please consider what amenities you will be providing and revise the Planning Rationale as required to address how the proposal addresses this policy.</p>	<p>Lépine is considering making the community building available to non-residents of this apartment community. A number of operational, maintenance, and liability issues will need to be resolved in consideration of this idea before the apartment community is developed. In the interim, residents in the area have convenient access to the City’s new CardelRec Complex at 1500 Shea Road.</p> <p>The proposed pathways on the Lépine site, which will connect the Rapid Transit Station to the north with the Village Green to the south, are considered secondary to the pedestrian and bicycle path network within the public City-owned rights-of-way along Robert Grant Avenue and Livery Street. As illustrated in the revised concept drawings, the pathways on site will provide an attractive and more intimate pedestrian experience with a sense of enclosure, as an alternative to the exposed Multi-Use Pathway (MUP) along Robert Grant Avenue and the public sidewalk along Livery Street. The dimensions between the proposed buildings on both sides of the principal north-south pathway on site are similar to the dimensions of the Livery Street right-of-way.</p> <p>Earlier planning for this area did not provide a direct pedestrian access between Livery Street and the future Rapid Transit Station. The developer proposes to register a surface easement for a publicly accessible sidewalk between the Livery Street sidewalk and the future Rapid Transit Station (see figure at end of these resubmission responses). Lépine would construct the publicly accessible sidewalk over these private lands, to the same standards and specifications as the Livery Street sidewalk, while it is expected that the City would assume liability and responsibility for maintenance of the sidewalk after construction.</p> <p>Many of these design details will be addressed at the Site Plan Control stage.</p>
<p>As noted above, staff do not support the statement in the Planning Rationale that the height strategy “provides a sensitive transition of building heights down toward Livery Street”. Please revise the concept and amend the Planning Rationale as required to address how the proposal addresses this policy.</p>	<p>As noted above, all references to “sensitive” in the Planning Rationale will be replaced by the word “compatible.”</p> <p>The introductory paragraphs in Section 2.5.1 of the Official Plan includes a definition of <i>compatible</i>:</p> <p><i>“In general terms, compatible development means development that, although it is not necessarily the same as or similar to existing buildings in the vicinity, can [sic] enhances an established community through good design and innovation and coexists with existing development without causing undue adverse impact on surrounding properties. It ‘fits well’ within its physical context and ‘works well’ with the existing and planned function. Generally speaking, the more a new development can incorporate the common characteristics of its setting in the design, the more compatible it will be. Nevertheless, a development can be designed to fit and work well in a certain existing context without being ‘the same as’ the existing development. Planned function refers to a vision for an area which is established through a community design plan or other similar Council-approved planning exercise, or the Zoning By-law. The planned function may permit development that differs from what currently physically exists; addressing compatibility will permit development to evolve toward the achievement of that vision while respecting overall community character.</i></p> <p>This qualitative definition indicates that there can and should be many different degrees of compatibility. It does <u>not</u> suggest that being compatible or not compatible is a black or white, yes or no proposition. The concept presented in the original application has many characteristics that clearly demonstrate compatibility with the surrounding lands uses. The revisions included in this resubmission further enhance and improve upon this compatibility.</p>

<p><u>Site Design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access from Robert Grant only is preferred. Eliminating vehicular access from Livery Street will provide more flexibility in site design including allowing for pedestrian connections from Livery to Robert Grant. • Pedestrian and cycling access north/south and east/west need to be better analyzed and developed when it comes to building location and orientation. Currently, the plan provides little to no access from Robert Grant to Livery. • Underground parking entrances should be enclosed within buildings. • In addition to the site having proper connections to adjacent properties and (future) destinations, it is also important for a site of this size to have a focal point, further analysis needs to be completed in this regard. Chapter 3 of the <u>Urban Design Guidelines for High-Rise Buildings</u> provides design direction for pedestrians connections, mid-block connections and public spaces. 	<p>Lépine considers that most of these Site Design comments are better suited to a Site Plan Control application. Many of these matters cannot be resolved until certain options are explored and decisions are made prior to detailed design and development. All of these Site Design comments will be addressed in subsequent Site Plan Control applications.</p> <p>Nonetheless, Lépine offers the following responses to the Site Design Comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing vehicular access to one point along a public road is never the best approach to providing safe and properly functioning access for emergency, loading, or service vehicles. The revised concept indicates that the currently proposed access to Livery Street would operate as a secondary access, carrying no more than 20% of vehicle traffic entering and leaving the site. This will be accomplished through design of the underground parking garage, which will incorporate traffic direction measures to make the Robert Grant Avenue access more convenient, quick, safe, and efficient for vehicles. Such design techniques have resulted in minimal use of the secondary access point at William’s Court in the Kanata Town Centre (block bounded by Maritime Way, Canadian Shield Avenue, and Great Lakes Avenue) and at Le Sanctuaire du Mont Royal in Montréal, which were both developed by Lépine. • The revised concept illustrates the pedestrian pathway network on site, which includes pedestrian access to Robert Grant Avenue, Livery Street, the future Village Green, and the future Rapid Transit Station. The proposed pathway along the north side of the Lépine property provides excellent direct and unrestricted pedestrian access from Robert Grant Avenue to Livery Street through attractive landscaping, as opposed to pathways that might be constructed across the future Rapid Transit Station, which would likely be asphalt or concrete. Given that the City did not provide for direct pedestrian access between Livery Street and the future Rapid Transit Station, the developer proposes to register a surface easement on private land for a publicly accessible sidewalk between the Livery Street sidewalk and the future Rapid Transit Station. Further details will be provided in future Site Plan Control application(s). • The revised concept illustrates how the underground parking entrances will provide direct access into the underground garages at the building façades. Garage doors will be below grade, set back from the public roadways, covered by green roofs where feasible, and screened from public view using a variety of architectural and landscape techniques. Further details will be provided in future Site Plan Control application(s). • Guideline 3.4 in the <i>Urban Design Guidelines for High-Rise Buildings</i> states, “Where appropriate, particularly in <u>densely populated areas such as the Central Area and the emerging downtown districts, provide at grade or grade-related public spaces such as plazas, forecourts, and public courtyards, which may be under public or private ownership</u> [underline added].” The City’s implementation of this Guideline is generally concentrated on commercial office buildings in downtown Ottawa. Lépine incorporates community focal points of a residential nature in all projects. Such focal points include commemorative markers and monuments, gathering spaces such as gazebos, community gardens for residents, and outdoor activity spaces such as outdoor chess and shuffleboard. Further details will be provided in future Site Plan Control application(s).
--	--

Building Location, Orientation, Density and Height

- Buildings fronting onto Livery Street should be more reflective of the low-rise character of the street and contain ground-oriented units. Depending on the length of the building, two separate buildings may be more appropriate and reflective of the character of Livery Street.
- Any taller buildings should be oriented towards and located closer to the future transit parking lot/hydro corridor to reduce the impact of shadowing and overlook.
- Any building above 9 storeys must maintain a 23-metre setback from any other high-rise building and 11.5 metre setback from the adjacent property to the south along Robert Grant Avenue.
- Different massing and orientation options should be explored to demonstrate how a similar density could be achieved with different building configurations. These options could include podium/tower buildings or a mixture of a tower and a bar building. The Urban Design Guidelines for High-Rise Buildings provide detailed direction with respect to the location, orientation and height of bar buildings. Bar buildings should not exceed 12 storeys in height.

Some of these Building Location, Orientation, Density and Height comments can be addressed now at the rezoning stage, but others will be better addressed in more detail in future Site Plan Control application(s).

- The revised concept illustrates the following along the Livery Street façade:
 - Ground-oriented apartments will open out to patios at grade.
 - A four storey façade (less than 15 metres in height) is proposed along Livery Street, with a setback of 6 to 9 metres from the east property line (only a 3-metre setback is required) and significantly stepped back fifth and sixth floors.
 - Because the setback along Livery Street will be significantly deeper than required, ample space will be available for large trees in front of the Livery Street façade, which will provide additional screening and privacy for the residents on both sides of Livery Street.
 - There will be a total distance of greater than 31 metres between the four storey façade along Livery Street and the façades of the townhouses across the street.
- The revised concept shows one proposed high-rise building of 18 storeys adjacent to the future Rapid Transit Station and Robert Grant Avenue. As agreed at the pre-application consultation meeting for this application, it is inappropriate for the long edge of a residential building to face a hydro corridor and parking lot, so the longer façade of the 18-storey building is proposed to face Robert Grant Avenue. The revised concept includes a redesign of the 18-storey building and a reduction of its footprint, so that the proportions and massing of the building are those of a point tower.
- Although there is only one proposed high-rise building remaining in the revised concept (the 23-metre rule only addresses separation distances between two or more high-rise buildings), the single 18-storey building can be separated by 23 metres from the other proposed residential buildings on the site. The revised concept does not include any high-rise buildings near the south property line of the site.
- Different massing and orientation options have been prepared for City review and public presentation at the March 3 community meeting, including the original proposal, as-of-right massing with all 9 storey buildings, UDRP recommendations with respect to a point tower and podium concept, and the revised concept.
- This resubmission requests the removal of the requirement in Exception 2152 that 50% of the frontage along Robert Grant Avenue must be occupied by building [street] walls. This requirement was apparently intended to implement certain design guidelines from the Fernbank CDP; however, analysis and testing of the proposed concept in relation to all other considerations indicates that this requirement is neither necessary nor sufficient for the realization of the CDP vision or other significant policy goals. For example, the requirement for 50% of the Robert Grant Avenue frontage to be street wall conflicts with the reduction of the Building C footprint to achieve a point tower. The revised concept effectively satisfies the need for active street frontages, without having to provide 50% of the Robert Grant Avenue frontage as street wall.

<p><u>Building Location, Orientation, Density and Height [continued]</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Ottawa <i>Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings</i> define <i>bar building</i> and <i>slenderness ratio</i> as follows: <i>Bar building</i>: A short and wide high-rise building, typically with a larger floor plate and a slenderness ratio of 2 : 1 or more. <i>Slenderness Ratio</i>: The proportion between the width and the height of a building mass. • The revised concept shows the proposed footprints for the four buildings. Given that the definition of bar building applies only to high-rise buildings, Building C is the only building in the proposed concept that should be evaluated in relation to the bar building guidelines. The <u>maximum</u> dimensions of the Building C footprint would be 56 metres in length by 29 metres in width, which would result in a slenderness ratio of 1.9 : 1, slightly less than 2 : 1. According to the definitions in the <i>Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings</i>, there are no high-rise bar buildings proposed in the revised concept. • Although the <i>Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings</i> state, “A point tower with a small floor plate is the preferred built form,” point towers cannot be built on top of podiums in every instance. In this resubmission, the footprint of the proposed 18-storey Building C has been reduced by 196 m² (11%), from 1,820 m² to 1,624 m². Placing Building C on a podium above grade would be counterproductive in terms of efforts to optimize the landscaped area and reduce the building footprints and massing on the site. Any further reduction in the floor plate of Building C would result in a height that would be too tall in the context of this community. Lépine will continue to refine the building forms and will determine the most appropriate and efficient built form prior to submitting future Site Plan Control applications.
<p><u>Proposed Zoning Provisions</u> The following comments are provided in response to the requested Arterial Mainstreet (AM) Zone site-specific provisions.</p> <p>a) Increased Building Height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the transition discussion above, the requested increase in building height from 30 metres to 54 metres for the segment of the property fronting on Robert Grant Avenue must be evaluated in conjunction with the building design. As noted above, different building configurations should be considered, and bar buildings should not exceed 12 storeys in height. 	<p>The Zoning Provisions proposed in the initial application submission are either modified in accordance with the revised concept or explained in more detail in the following discussion.</p> <p>a) Increased Building Height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in the discussion above, Lépine has evaluated and will continue to consider different building forms and configurations for all the buildings on the site, including the proposed 18-storey building shown in the revised concept for rezoning. An expanded section 3.2 in the revised Planning Rationale provides additional justification for the proposed height of 18 storeys for the one high-rise building. The placement, orientation, general form, massing, shadow casting, and relationship of the proposed 18-storey building with the other proposed buildings on the site are all consistent with the height strategy guiding this application and are compatible with the context surrounding the Community Core as envisioned in the Fernbank CDP. <p>A height of 18 storeys for the tallest building is proposed in order to achieve a number of apartment units close to the total of approximately 550 to 560 apartments that could be developed in nine-storey buildings under the existing zoning. The number of units per floor in the proposed 18-storey building has been reduced in comparison with the original May 2018 application, in order to reduce the floor plate of the high-rise building (11% smaller than the May 2018 proposal). With the reductions in the numbers of apartment units in Building A along Livery Street (due to the stepping back of terraces) and Building B (due to a reduction in height from 12 to 9 storeys), the most effective and viable way to achieve a total of 504 apartment units over the entire site is for Building C to be 18 storeys.</p>

Proposed Zoning Provisions [continued]

- b) Minimum interior side yard of 7.5 metres along southerly lot line
Staff recommend that the minimum side yard setback from the southerly property line be increased to 12 metres. The recommended separation distance between high rise buildings is 23 metres, so one-half of this distance should be provided on the subject site to allow for a future building on the abutting parcel to the south.
- c) Resident Parking Rate
A reduced parking rate of 1.0 parking space per dwelling unit from the minimum requirement of 1.2 parking space per dwelling unit may be acceptable. Please provide information regarding parking required and provided in other Lepine developments in the City.
- d) Visitor Parking Rate
The requested reduction of 50% of the minimum required visitor parking spaces based on +/- 560 dwelling units (from 112 to 56 spaces) is significant. Before staff can support such a reduced standard, please provide a sampling of comparable existing apartment developments in a suburban context (not within the Central Area or mixed-use centre/Town Centre), where reductions in visitor parking requirements of this scale have been implemented in zoning. Please also provide specific details regarding parking required and provided in other Lepine developments in the City.

- b) Minimum interior side yard dimension along south property line
In accordance with the revised concept and zoning Schedule included in the revised Planning Rationale, no high-rise buildings are proposed along the south property line. A setback of 7.5 metres for any buildings of nine or fewer storeys, if mirrored on the property to the south, would provide a total separation distance of 15 metres between buildings.
- c) Resident Parking Rate
The request for a Zoning Exemption to reduce the required rate for resident parking is withdrawn. The minimum rate of 1.2 resident parking space per dwelling unit shall continue as the requirement for this development. A new Exemption to the requirements of Section 101(6)(c) in Part 4 of the Zoning By-law is requested below.
- d) Visitor Parking Rate
The request for a Zoning Exemption to reduce the required rate for visitor parking is withdrawn. The minimum rate of 0.2 visitor parking space per dwelling unit shall continue as the requirement for this development. A new Exemption to the requirements of *Section 101(6)(c) in Part 4 of the Zoning By-law* is requested below.

New Request for Parking Exemption

The new request for an Exemption relating to Section 101(6)(c) in Part 4 of the Zoning By-law is based upon the distinctions the City of Ottawa draws among the parking requirements for Areas B (Outer Urban/Inner Suburban), C (Suburban), D (Rural), X (Inner Urban), Y (Inner Urban Mainstreets), and Z (Near Major LRT Stations), as set forth in Part 4 and illustrated in Schedule 1A of the Zoning By-law. These distinctions are predicated on the notion that parking behaviour, demand, and community expectations vary according to the generalized characteristics of each Area's predominant land use, intensity of development, residential density, and function within the broad geographical scope of the city; and that these differing characteristics call for different parking requirements in each Area. As currently adopted and implemented, Section 101(6)(c) assumes the prevalent development context within Areas X, Y, Z and, in some cases, Area B; however, the surface parking restrictions required under Section 101(6)(c) are not well suited to the parking behaviour, demand, community expectations, predominant land use, intensity of development, residential density, and function of Area C (Suburban), where surface parking is the norm and underground parking is rarely provided. Because of the characteristics of Area C and given that this proposed development will provide all required parking underground, it is appropriate that additional surface parking be provided for visitors without eliminating the parking reductions of Section 101(6)(c). The following language for the Exemption is proposed:

Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 101(6)(c) in Part 4 of the Zoning By-law, a maximum of 16 surface parking spaces may be provided on the site without eliminating the reduction in the number of underground parking spaces permitted under Section 101(6)(c).

The overall effect of withdrawing the request for reduced parking ratios and adding this request for an exception to the surface parking prohibition in Section 101(6)(c) will be an increase in the total number of parking spaces by 50 more spaces, from 617 spaces proposed in May 2019 to 667 spaces now being proposed. This parking increase is accompanied by a reduction in the number of residential units by approximately 50 apartments, which will effectively result in less demand for parking spaces.

<u>Transportation Comments</u>	A revised TIA and responses to all the transportation comments will be submitted directly to transportation staff.
<u>Engineering Comments</u>	Lépine's consulting engineers at Novatech advise that all the engineering comments are typically addressed through the Site Plan Control process. The responses to these and any other engineering comments will be provided during future Site Plan Control reviews.
<u>Corporate Real Estate Office</u>	<p>There are no active or future rail corridors within 300 metres of 1000 Robert Grant Avenue. The future Rapid Transit Station immediately to the north of the subject site and the adjacent segment of Robert Grant Avenue are planned for Bus Rapid Transit, not Light Rail Transit.</p> <p>Canadian Pacific Rail abandoned the railway tracks along the Carleton Place Subdivision rail corridor on October 29, 1967. In 1990 the former Region of Ottawa-Carleton adopted a policy to negotiate with railway companies for the purchase of abandoned rail rights-of-way to protect the corridors for long-term transportation and utility uses. Consistent with this policy, the Region of Ottawa-Carleton acquired the Carleton Place Subdivision rail corridor, including the former rail line to the north of the subject site. This policy was carried forward in subsequent City of Ottawa Official Plans. The former Carleton Place Subdivision rail line to the north of the subject site was abandoned and the trackage and rail ties were removed in the early 1990s. This former rail right-of-way has been dedicated and used as a portion of the Trans Canada Trail for more than twenty years. The closest proposed Lépine building would be located more than 126 metres to the south of the Trans Canada Trail.</p> <p>Lépine's concrete exterior panels, together with the design and materials used in construction of the interior walls, provide superior noise attenuation well in excess of Ontario Building Code standards, including those for residential buildings near 400 series highways and freight rail corridors. In the event that freight rail service is ever reintroduced within the former CPR corridor, the proposed buildings will be constructed such that they mitigate any impacts from a future rail line.</p>
<u>Parks Planning Comments</u> Cash-in-lieu of parkland equal to 10% of the value of the property at the time of site plan approval will be collected at the time of the Site Plan Control Agreement.	Noted, thank you.
<u>Planning Forester Comments</u> No concerns with rezoning. Following Site Plan Control Approval, please contact Mark Richardson (Mark.Richardson@ottawa.ca) to obtain a tree removal permit.	Noted, thank you.
<u>Hydro Ottawa</u>	All advisory comments are noted. The site design includes additional setbacks from the hydro easements so that work on site will not interfere with the hydro facilities.

<u>Urban Design Review Panel Comments</u>	<u>Lépine Responses</u>
<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>The Panel sees that the main challenge associated with this development is integrating with the existing low-rise neighbourhood while anticipating future commercial uses on adjacent properties.</p> <p>The Panel sees considerable potential for further enhancing the public realm and recommends point towers with considerable separation between the buildings. Limiting the access points to the development is also critical to the success of the development.</p>	<p>The revised concept includes modifications that address transition methods recommended by Planning staff and UDRP, which will further integrate the development with the surrounding context, including the future Village Green and commercial development permitted on the properties to the south.</p> <p>The UDRP recommendations with respect to point towers have been considered in relation to the site coverage and overall massing. The revised concept includes modifications pertaining to building height, separation distances between buildings, building footprints, massing, site layout, circulation on site, and access to pedestrian, bicycle, and road networks off site. The redesign of the 9-storey Building B and the 18-storey Building C includes reductions in the footprints of those buildings. The proportions and massing of Building C are closer to those of a point tower.</p>
<p><u>Massing Distribution</u></p> <p>The consensus from the Panel is that the density should be concentrated on Robert Grant and adjacent to the future transit parking lot. This approach is best for pedestrian access and connectivity, and it reduces traffic and other related pressures on the low-rise neighbourhood. Clear openings are required to connect pedestrians from transit, and from the low-rise neighbourhood as they circulate through the site.</p>	<p>The density is concentrated on Robert Grant Avenue, with approximately 397 apartment units proposed in Buildings B and C along Robert Grant Avenue and approximately 107 apartment units proposed in Building A along Livery Street. 79% of the apartment units are proposed along Robert Grant.</p> <p>A similar proportion of the density is proposed adjacent to the future Rapid Transit Station, with approximately 354 apartment units proposed in Buildings A and C, which are proposed as far to the north on the site as possible. 70% of the apartment units are proposed adjacent to the future Rapid Transit Station.</p> <p>As shown on the revised site plan concept, clear pathway openings are provided on site, which will connect pedestrians to the surrounding community, the Village Green, and the future Rapid Transit Station. Earlier planning for this area did not provide a direct pedestrian access between Livery Street and the future Rapid Transit Station. The developer proposes to register a surface easement for a publicly accessible sidewalk between the Livery Street sidewalk and the future Rapid Transit Station. In the event that pedestrians on their way to or from the Village Green or the future Rapid Transit Station choose to take longer detours through the subject development site, ample and clear access points, breaks between buildings, and pathways will provide access into and out of the site. Generous distances between buildings along the proposed pathways will provide attractive pedestrian experiences on site, providing a sense of enclosure in contrast to the windswept Multi Use Pathway along Robert Grant Avenue, which will also be exposed to all types of vehicular and Bus Rapid Transit traffic. For example, the distance between Building A and the Amenity Building is proposed to be greater than 18 metres. This will be the space through which the primary pathway from the site to the future Rapid Transit Station can pass. Although the width of the entire Livery Street right-of-way is 18 metres, the distance between the curb on the east side of Livery Street and the west edge of the public sidewalk on the west side of Livery Street is 11 metres. The pedestrian experience on the pathway network on site will be superior to what will be provided in the public realm; however, pedestrians will have choices of routes to take.</p>

Massing Distribution [continued]

The current design concept is reminiscent of the towers in the park approach of the mid-20th Century. A shift to point towers on podiums would introduce an architectural language and a character that is more current.

The Panel recommends smaller footprints and taller buildings as an alternative approach that can assist with sustainability goals and could limit the shading to east side (transit parking lot). One suggestion from the Panel is to locate point towers along Robert Grant, up to a height of between 22-28 stories in order to yield 400 units in the tower. The other 150 units could be distributed through podiums that define the greenspace on the property, or in other low-rise typologies.

The Panel's preferred site layouts described above would result in improved access to sun and light for the residents of the proposed buildings, increased sky views, and would generally make the development feel lighter and airier.

The defining feature of *towers in the park*, as conceived by Le Corbusier and imitated through the 1970s and later, is the placement of high-rise buildings in the centre of large sites, with extensive setbacks from the property line. This leaves large areas around the perimeter of the property for landscaping or surface parking. The principal criticisms of Le Corbusier's vision, particularly as manifested in public housing projects, is that the large building setbacks often create unused space around the perimeter of the site, which in turn results in public streets and sidewalks devoid of vitality. Although the *towers in the park* concept has been blamed for societal ills such as crime and social isolation, the merits of this model are being re-examined and, when well executed, the concept is experiencing a revival (<https://www.dwell.com/article/modernism-2.0-a-tower-in-the-park-even-jane-jacobs-could-love-d4c198a9>).

The construction of *point towers on podiums*, often including curtain wall, became fashionable in the 1980s; therefore, this style is neither current nor contemporary. *Point towers on podiums* are usually developed in high-density urban areas such as the Lake Ontario shoreline in the Greater Toronto Area or False Creek and the West End of Vancouver. Many planners and urban designers have promoted this concept over the past two or three decades because it can allow more sunlight to reach the ground and can add vitality to an urban street, particularly if the podium includes several entries along the street for small-scale retail or restaurants; however, this model has recently drawn criticism because it can create towers that are too tall and have no connection to the street or surrounding neighborhood (<https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-xpm-2003-03-16-0303160430-story.html>). In addition, the floor plans for such slender towers are highly inefficient and, when wrapped in curtain wall, perform very poorly in terms of energy efficiency.

The proposed concept does not specifically adhere to either the *towers in the park* concept or the *point towers on podiums* model; nor should it be required to do so. Quite obviously unlike the *towers in the park* archetype, the proposed site design places the buildings around the perimeter of the site, creating both an attractive and active street wall where appropriate (facing Robert Grant Avenue and Livery Street) and clear openings where accessibility for pedestrians is required.

Towers of 22 to 28 storeys are too tall for this community context. The allocation of both height and density proposed in this application achieves a higher percentage of apartment units adjacent to Robert Grant Avenue and the future Rapid Transit Station than the site layout and height distribution recommended by the Panel. The proposed building placement and orientation will result in shadows being cast mostly to the north onto the future Rapid Transit Station, with minimal shadow impacts on the neighbouring community and the open areas on the site.

Rather than point towers placed on top of above-grade podiums, Lépine develops underground parking garages underneath the entire site, which effectively serve as podiums below grade for all the buildings. This provides for more green space at grade and brings the active residential façades with patios and balconies down to the pedestrian level. The response below to the UDRP comments on amenities and landscaping describes the integral function of the podiums being below grade and providing more landscaped area on the site than the suggested podiums above grade.

<p>Access and Circulation</p> <p>The Panel recommends that access to the development should be from Robert Grant Avenue so that traffic is kept off Livery Street.</p>	<p>For the purposes of safety and effective management of service and loading vehicles, it is essential that the underground parking have two access points. Reducing vehicular access to one point along a public road is never the safest approach to providing proper functional access for emergency, loading, or service vehicles. The revised concept indicates that the currently proposed access to Livery Street would operate as a secondary access, carrying no more than 20% of vehicle traffic entering and leaving the site. This will be accomplished through design of the underground parking garage, which will incorporate traffic direction measures to make the Robert Grant Avenue access more convenient, quicker, safer, and more efficient for vehicles. The Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) in support of this application confirms that there will be ample capacity on Livery Street to accommodate the projected traffic generated at the secondary garage entrance. As discussed elsewhere in this response document, the underground parking layout will be designed so that the most convenient access point for all vehicles parked underground will be at Robert Grant Avenue.</p>
<p>Opportunities for shared access with the adjacent property to the southeast should also be explored in order to allow for improved connectivity to the future transit station, village square, commercial uses, and the existing low-rise residential development.</p> <p>Locate the vehicular access from Robert Grant on the south side of the property so that eventually a driveway can be shared between the two sites.</p> <p>The village green next door will likely be in the middle of their site. Connecting the open space of this development into the adjacent site will be important.</p> <p>The Panel recommends removing the parking access off Livery Street and ensuring parking garage access points are integral to the buildings and not located within the landscape.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the City should provide a full movement intersection at Robert Grant Avenue and the access to this development.</p>	<p>The Panel would not be aware of the previous concept design and analysis that the City and the landowners developed in support of the Community Core and Village Green in the Fernbank Community Design Plan, the subdivision of the area, and the zoning for the Community Core and Village Green areas. That previous concept design and analysis examined the possibility of an additional roadway connection over private land between Robert Grant Avenue and Livery Street, but located on the south side of the Village Green parcel, not between the subject property and the Village Green. At that time, it was determined that there should not be any roadway or driveway separating the subject property and the Village Green because the two sites need to provide for uninterrupted pedestrian connections between the Village Green and the future Rapid Transit Station. The proposed design is based upon that previous analysis and design.</p> <p>Vehicular access from Robert Grant Avenue along the south property line would result in an inefficient site layout, unnecessary pavement within the site (particularly adjacent to the Village Green), and a significant interruption to pedestrian circulation between the Village Green and the future Rapid Transit Station. As specified above, a roadway on the southern edge of Block 202 (Village Green) has already been planned. The best location for driveway access from Robert Grant Avenue into the site is near the midpoint of the Robert Grant Avenue frontage, as designed.</p> <p>The applicant will not presume the precise location, orientation, or design of the open space on the Village Green. Those decisions will be made by the owner of the Village Green lands and the City. Nonetheless, the proposed design provides enough flexibility at the interface between the subject site and the Village Green to allow for future exploration of numerous open space design options.</p> <p>The need for a secondary access to the underground parking from Livery Street is justified and explained at length elsewhere in this response document.</p> <p>The locations of the garage doors and the configuration of the internal driveways have been redesigned in order to integrate the entrances with the buildings and to screen the garage doors from the rest of the site and the adjacent public streets.</p> <p>Redesigning the Robert Grant Avenue network, intersections, and functional design is beyond the scope of the applicant's responsibilities.</p>

<p>Amenity and Landscape</p> <p>The Panel suggests rethinking the placement and design of the podiums as they will be an important aspect of defining the grounds and amenity areas of the property.</p> <p>The Panel recommends locating the clubhouse along Livery Street and integrating it into the larger neighbourhood’s recreational landscape. Create a dialog with adjacent greenspaces to help the project get community buy-in.</p>	<p>The proposed design does not include any podiums above the engineered grade of the site, which will be finished at the same elevation as the ground floors of the buildings and the landscaping on top of the underground parking garage. The zoning concept properly defines the building placement, landscaping, and amenity areas at a level of detail appropriate for a Zoning By-Law Amendment application.</p> <p>Other than a modest hardscaped plaza of 2,500 m² planned for the future Village Green, the Multi Use Pathway along Robert Grant Avenue, the vegetated areas within the unmaintained hydro corridor, and the Trans Canada Trail, there are no existing or planned public green spaces near or adjacent to the subject site. The larger neighbourhood’s recreational landscape does not include any public parks, natural areas, or amenities close enough to the subject site to influence where the proposed amenity building should be located. The proposed location of the amenity building is adjacent to the future Rapid Transit Station, providing easy access and high visibility for this amenity. This proposed location also helps to screen the visual and noise impacts that the future Rapid Transit Station will have on the site and the Village Green. The distances from the proposed location of the amenity building to the Village Green, the two adjacent public streets, and the rest of the community are optimal for pedestrian access in all directions. This would be the first private development in the community where high-quality landscaped green areas would be accessible to the public.</p>
<p>With the objectives of lifestyle and sustainability in mind, the Panel recommends designing the landscape with the intent of connecting pedestrians to the Trans Canada Trail. The larger neighbourhood will require feeders into the trail in order to take advantage of this important asset.</p>	<p>The resubmitted design clarifies the pedestrian network internal to the site, which provides numerous connections to off-site public pedestrian networks in the direction of the Trans Canada Trail. There is nothing in the proposed site design that would impede pedestrian traffic from the site to the Trans Canada Trail to the north. The lands between the proponent’s property and the Trans Canada Trail are not owned by the proponent and are subject to significant restrictions in favour of Hydro One. The proponent has no control over any uses or development on the lands to the north of the subject site.</p>
<p><u>Councillor Comments</u></p>	<p><u>Holding Provision for Building C Pending Opening of Extension of Robert Grant Avenue</u></p> <p>This resubmission proposes that a holding provision (h) be included with the proposed rezoning, which will be applied to the construction of Building C until the extension of Robert Grant Avenue is open between Abbott Street and Hazeldean Road. Proposed language for the holding provision and a revision to the proposed zoning schedule are included in the revised Planning Rationale. Building C, which is the one high-rise building in this resubmission, is proposed to have a height of 18 storeys (65 metres) and 247 apartment units (49% of the total proposed 504 apartment units).</p> <p><u>Ground Floor Commercial</u></p> <p>The existing approved zoning provides for retail commercial uses on the site and those uses will not be removed. Due to current uncertainty with respect to the future of retail commercial in general and within this neighbourhood in particular, it is premature to commit to any particular commercial uses on site at this time. Nevertheless, the ground floor amenity spaces proposed in the residential buildings and the amenity building can be converted to small scale service retail uses to benefit the local community. Lépine does not develop commercial office or retail uses to serve regional catchment areas. Subject to confirmation of feasibility and commercial viability, any future commercial retail conversions will be developed at a small scale that is</p>

appropriate for serving the needs of the local community.

Councillor Comments [continued]

Height and Massing of Building “A” Facing Livery Street

As explained in the responses above to the Planning and UDRP comments, the revised concept includes modifications that address transition methods to enhance compatibility with the existing residential development to the east. The context of the adjacent built form includes the townhouses on the east side of Livery Street (11 metres or two storeys with peaked roofs) and both stacked townhouses and apartment blocks on the north side of Livery Street (15 metres or four storeys with peaked roofs). The proposed transition methods include stepping back of the upper storeys, ground-oriented apartment patios and upper floor balconies to activate the street frontage, varied articulation and fenestration to break up the rhythm and scale of the façade, and alterations to roof lines on the upper floors. Further detailed explanation and illustration of these transition methods are included in the resubmitted design package and revised Planning Rationale.

Section 2.5.1 of the Official Plan clarifies that “compatibility” does not mean “the same as” surrounding development. It is unreasonable to expect facades across the street from each other be the same height. The height transitions proposed in this resubmission provide for graduated building heights that are compatible with the heights of the townhouses across Livery Street and the stacked townhouses and apartment blocks in the adjacent R4 zone.

Transit-supportive and Car-sharing Measures

The Councillor’s comments on measures to support transit and car sharing had related to the previous request for an Exemption to reduce the parking requirements for the proposed development. Although the applicant has withdrawn that request, there is merit in noting that Lépine is presently discussing the provision of car-sharing services with a car rental company, for this proposed development and the company’s other apartment communities. Lépine will also provide transit information to all residents in order to encourage and facilitate the use of all forms of public transit as they become available in this neighbourhood. Additional information related to transit and active transportation is provided in the TIA and Planning Rationale.



Detail



Concept for publicly accessible sidewalk between Livery Street sidewalk and future Rapid Transit Station; width and depth of surface easement to be confirmed through Site Plan Control review process; easement to be registered pursuant to Site Plan Control approval (see page 3 above).