



No.	Comment
1.0	Planning/Urban Design
1.1	UDRP comments have been previously distributed for your review and response from the August 6/7, 2020 session. Please see comment responses 12.73-12.75 below.
1.2	The cash in lieu of parkland report is schedule for December 10, 2020. As per the recommendation of the report, cash in lieu will be required for the addition GFA that exceeds the current zoning. A payment will form part of the site plan control schedule and agreement Noted.
1.3	Landscape Plan – L1.0, no comments, however as part of the review comments for Block 207 there should perhaps be an examination of the walkway between the two projects due to loading and pedestrian conflicts. The proposed pulper has been removed and the proposed planter has been narrowed to increase the space through this area. The total clear width is no 4.8 metres. When a truck is loading/unloading, it will require only 3 metres, which leaves 1.8 metres as a clear pedestrian pathway.
1.4	Details on the implementing zoning by-law will be forwarded as the report is prepared for Committee and Council. Noted.
1.5	As noted in the public comments below, many concerns were raised regarding the perceived lack of jurisdiction to develop the subject lands. Any relevant court decisions should be noted in the response package. This matter was reviewed by the Ontario Municipal Board, and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in 2015/2016 with appeals of the project ultimately dismissed, and leave of appeal refused.
2.0	Waste Services
2.6	<p>I was reviewing this site plan and noticed the have 2 garbage rooms one for commercial and one for residential which is great, I have a few questions on this site plan before it can be approved:</p> <p>a) I need the measurements of the garbage room b) What is the size of the door openings leading to the loading dock? (2.2m required) c) Loading area, will it be at ground level ? d) What is the height of the roof in the loading area or its not covered? e) Will it be a compactor unit for the garbage if so it will change the below allocations?</p> <p>For the 204 residential units this is what they will need for containers: •Garbage: 6 x 4 yard bins •Eiber: 2 x 4 yard bins •Glass metal plastic: 1 x 4 yard bin •Organics: 4 x 240L carts</p> <p>a) The total area and measurements of the garbage room have been added to the Ground Floor Plan. b) The size of the door openings leading to the loading dock are over 2.2m in width as noted on the Ground Floor Plan. c) The loading bay will sit at ground level and at the same elevation as the garbage room (53.000 ASL). d) The loading bay is covered and has a vertical clearance of 6.9m (min). This has been noted on the Ground Floor Plan. e) A tri-sorter unit will be used to compact waste. See the Ground Floor Plan for the allocation of garbage, fibre, glass/metal/plastic, and organics bins.</p>
3.0	Planning Forester
3.7	No comments. No permit is required. Noted.
4.0	Natural Heritage
4.8	No comments. Noted.
5.0	Transportaion
	Transportation Engineering
5.9	Staff agree that there is no need currently for an updated TIA study. Noted.
5.10	Staff in the Transportation Strategic Planning unit have been advised of the request for feedback on the permanent counting station options. Follow up with Zlatko Krstulic (Zlatko.krstulic@ottawa.ca). Noted. Parsons is continuing to work with the City on this.
	Traffic Signal Design

No.	Comment	
5.11	There is existing underground and above ground traffic plant/interconnect in the area of proposed construction (NE corner of Block 207). Underground traffic plant and traffic signal hardware is to be maintained, protected and accessible at all times during construction.	Noted.
5.12	The proponent of the project and its contractor is responsible for all the costs associated with reinstatement of the damages to existing underground traffic infrastructure.	Noted.
5.13	No protective hording is to encroach on existing traffic signals infrastructure that is to be accessible 24/7/365.	Noted.
6.0	Engineering Review Comments	
	General Comments (Applies to all engineering plans)	
6.14	I do not see any job benchmark provided for this site. Please show and label one Geodetic benchmark for this site or put a note on the plan stating which benchmark will be used for this site and add elevation on the note.	Note has been included on the plans for job benchmark #3 with an elevation of 50.204. Refer to Zibi Ontario MSS drawing EX-1, dated June 27, 2018 for benchmark location.
6.15	Please place City of Ottawa project # D07-12-20-0097 and plan number 18212 on all plans using BOLD BLACK TEXT at the outside of the broader line on the plan.	City project number and plan number have been included on the recised drawings.
6.16	Please remove "Not for Construction" with Issued for City Review or something else.	The "not for construction" note has been replaced with "issued for City review" on all plans.
6.17	In the title block, include the name of Owner, full address including Postal Code; telephone no.	The name of Owner, full address, postal code and phone number has been included on the revised drawings.
6.18	Please add a note at the note sections on all the plans stating that all the standards quoted on the plans are current as per City and provincial standards and regulations.	Note has been included on the revised drawings. Please refer to General Notes #1 on all drawings which states "all works and materials shall conform to the latest revision of standards and specifications for the City of Ottawa..."
	Site Servicing Plan	
6.19	Please remove "By City forces" from the watermain connection note as this is a private watermain and the connection will be done by a contractor.	Water connection note updated with "by City forces" deleted.
6.20	As the ZIBI site will have perimeter meters at the entrance, please put specific notes regarding this on the plan as before.	Perimeter meter note has been included on the servicing plan.
6.21	Please show the weeping tile connections on the plan.	Foundation drainage to discharge to storm service lateral. Service lateral note has been revised for storm and foundation drainage.
6.22	Please show the fire hydrants (4,5,6, &7) on the servicing plan.	Hydrants 4,5,6, & 7 have been shown and labelled on the revsied servicing plan.
	Technical Memorandum	
6.23	Page 1- please specify here clearly the name of the study, date of preparation, revision etc. that is amending with this technical memorandum.	The updated memo has indicated the Functional Servicing Report that is being ammended.
6.24	Page1- I see a lot of attachments have been added with this memorandum. Please add here the attachments those are really needed for this memorandum and remove other attachments.	Please note the attachments listed on page 1 are necessary to be included as the information is discussed in the memo.
6.25	Page1- Please add references of the attachments in the memorandum clearly and specifically so that we can review the memorandum properly.	Project numbers and Study titles have been indicated in the updated list of attachments for reference.
6.26	Table 1, 2 and 3 are not clear to me. I could not understand the comparisons among the tables in finding the demand of the block 206.Please make it clear with the appropriate demand of the columns that the demand for 206 is acceptable as per approved MSS. Call me if you want to discuss.	Table 1 and Table 2 illustrate that the anticipated full buildout MSS water demands compared to the development phase demands have little influence on the available pressures as indicated from boundary conditions received for the different demands. As requested a table (Table 3) has been included to illustrate the MSS demand from the blocks in the proposed development phase compared to the current anticipated demands based on the latest site plan.
6.27	Page 3- Required fire flow is 2100l/m. As per the table 3, four fire hydrants (4,5,6, & 7,) will deliver the required fire flow. Please add more information here such how these four fire hydrants will meet up demand.	Additional text included to indicate the demand applied to each hydrant to sum up the 21,000 L/min required fire flow.

No.	Comment	
6.28	As per the latest city fire flow bulletin maximum 3 fire hydrants can be considered for calculating fire flow demand for a site- please add your rationale here with respect to using four hydrants instead of three hydrants. Please note, this is very important and will need to be verified by the respective city's water unit.	DSEL cannot locate a where it is indicated in the technical bulletin 2018-02 that indicates buildings are to be designed such that a maximum of three hydrants are required to provide fire flows. Please note that the approved MSS previously indicated that 22,000L/min was required for fire protection and was estimated per the 2018-02 technical bulletin. Therefore, more than three hydrants were required to support the building's fire demand per the City's fire flow estimates.
6.29	Please show all the related fire hydrants on the servicing plan and label them.	Hydrants 4,5,6, & 7 have been shown and labelled on the revised servicing plan.
6.30	Page 4- Sanitary Servicing: Please submit a digital copy of all the related design and construction papers for the ultimate private sewage pumping station as mentioned in this section for our review.	Noted. The ultimate sewage pumping station will be submitted under a separate cover.
6.31	Page 4 -Stormwater management, this section is very brief and incomplete. Please add more information here such as weeping tile discharge from this site and up to ultimate discharge point i.e. outlet to the Ottawa river, etc.	Additional text included in the stormwater management section to indicate that foundation drainage is proposed to discharge to the storm sewer located in Chaudiere Private and ultimately outlets to the Ottawa River.
6.32	Please note the submitted SWM plan is not complete. It needs to be shown up to the end point of the outlet with a demarcation line showing proposed and existing on the plan.	Note the SWM plan illustrates the drainage to the storm sewers up to the existing storm outlet headwall including all drainage areas tributary to the sewers.
6.33	Please include a copy of the approved ECA in the appendix.	A copy of the approved ECA has been included in Appendix A.
6.34	We used to believe that the removal capacity of an OGS was 80%, but the recent research done by the manufacturer indicates that it does not provide 80% TSS removal as is supposed to be. Please include a certificate in the appendix from the manufacturer for the installed infrastructure about its real removal capacity.	Please note the OGS servicing the development is existing and was installed as part of phase 1 of the Zibi development. The drainage from the subject Block 207 development consists of mainly rooftop drainage which is considered to be clean.
Geotechnical Investigation		
6.35	Page 6: Information related to the existing building 508A and 509 has been added in this report, but the report scope indicates this study deals for 205a, 206, 207 and 208 blocks. Please explain it here in this section.	The existing buildings 508A and 509 were located in proximity to the proposed Blocks 205a, 206, 207, and 208. Therefore, information about these existing structures and their founding conditions are considered relevant for planning proposed construction activities in their vicinity, and have been included in the Geotechnical Investigation Report accordingly.
6.36	Page 7: Month of April is the appropriate month to assess the water level in the monitoring well, but here it has been done in August -please explain here clearly that the data are still acceptable for geotechnical consideration.	Typically, the groundwater levels are measured in the monitoring wells after a stabilization period of 5 to 10 days following installation of the monitoring wells. This procedure was followed in this case and is considered acceptable.
6.37	Page 7 ground water table data: This table is not acceptable. All data reported here from 2006 which is 14 years old and the current study is dated June 29, 2020. With the new construction activities and the time passed by these data are too old to reflect the current field situation. Please revised the study with the current field data.	Groundwater level readings obtained from the 2006 geotechnical investigation were carried out by others and are presented in the Geotechnical Investigation Report in order to present the geotechnical information available to Paterson at the time of preparing the report. Further, the groundwater levels from our most recent geotechnical investigation in 2018 have been added to Table 1 in the current Geotechnical Investigation Report (Paterson Group Report PG3202-2 Revision 6 dated November 25, 2020).
6.38	Page 9:" It is understood that the proposed underground parking level will require a groundwater waterproofing system based on the groundwater observations at the boreholes completed within the basement level of the existing buildings along the Buchanan Channel. Foundation drainage and waterproofing details are presented in Figure 2 - Foundation Drainage Details in Appendix 2." The waterproofing system is very important and needs a detail description of the system here for our review. Please add this information here for our review. I did not see the Figure 2 in Appendix 2. Please include the figure in the appendix and description in the page 9 of the report.	Figure 2 - Foundation Drainage Details has been provided in Appendix 2 of the current Geotechnical Investigation Report (Paterson Group Report PG3202-2 Revision 6 dated November 25, 2020). Additional details regarding the proposed waterproofing system have been added to Section 6.1 of the current Geotechnical Investigation Report (Paterson Group Report PG3202-2 Revision 6 dated November 25, 2020).
6.39	Page 13: Please mention here specific applicable seismic site classification for this site.	It should be noted that the seismic site classification is a Site Class A for the design of buildings proposed for the subject site that are founded upon a bedrock bearing medium. Reference should be made to Page 14 of the aforementioned report for our conclusion with regards to the seismic site class.

No.	Comment	
6.40	Page 26: A temporary Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) permit to take water (PTTW) Category 3 may be required if more than 400,000 L/day of ground and/or surface water are to be pumped during the construction phase. At least 4 to 5 months should be allowed for completion of the application and issuance of the permit by the MECP- Please confirm here whether a PTTW is required or not as it needs 4to 5 months to get approval from the Ministry.	Permit has already been obtained.
6.41	Page 27: Geotechnical Slope Review: The submitted SPCA is for block 206. I am not reviewing Whole ZIBI site or Phase 1 of the ZIBI Site. Please clarify why it is needed for this site. If it is not needed for this site, it should be excluded from the study.	Given the general proximity of the proposed Block 206 to the slopes along the Ottawa River and Buchanan Channel, the results of the slope stability analysis have been included in the Geotechnical Investigation Report for completeness.
Environmental Site Remediation Program		
6.42	The Planning Rationale and Design Brief prepared by Fotenn appears to show the underground parking structure for Block 206 extends beyond the future Miwate Private right-of-way in the southwest portion of the site (see screencap below). Please note that the land below and west of future Miwate Private has not been remediated and an RSC has not yet been obtained.	Noted. It is understood that the RSC must be obtained prior to occupancy. This approach is what was permitted for Block 205A, 208, and 211. Contaminated soil will be removed at the same time as mass excavation for the building.
6.43	Please confirm it by providing necessary plans and documents that the underground parking boundary is located within the Phase 1 development lands that were remediated in 2018 and for which a Record of Site Condition was obtained in October as per the attached documents. If the perimeter of the new development falls within the Phase 1 development, it is good otherwise I do not know how this application will proceed without obtaining an RSC for the encroached contaminated land.	Confirmed that a portion of underground extends beyond the existing RSC area. It is understood that the RSC must be obtained prior to occupancy. This approach is what was permitted for Block 205A, 208, and 211. Contaminated soil will be removed at the same time as mass excavation for the building.
6.44	I think it will be a major concern for us for the ZA application too if the underground parking boundary falls within the contaminated land.	It is understood that the RSC must be obtained prior to occupancy. This approach is what was permitted for Block 205A, 208, and 211. Contaminated soil will be removed at the same time as mass excavation for the building.
Environmental Noise Assessment		
6.45	Page 3: "Control Guidelines (ENCG) specifies that the recommended indoor noise limit range (that is relevant to this study) is 50, 45 and 40 dBA for retail, living rooms and sleeping quarters, respectively, as listed in Table 1. However, to account for deficiencies in building construction and control peak noise, these levels should be targeted toward 47, 42 and 37 dBA." – I do not understand this rational. Due to building deficiencies it should have higher not lower. Please note lower value than the required as per guideline will not be acceptable to us. Please revise this and make changes where needed any portion of the study accordingly.	In-field measured partition assemblies can perform worse than laboratory tested assemblies due to minor construction deficiencies. To account for this, we are targeting lower indoor noise levels, which results in a higher standard of building construction, thus exceeding the ENCG minimum standard. Targeting a higher indoor noise level will result in an exceedance of the ENCG criteria. It should be noted that plane of window noise levels do not exceed 65 dBA, therefore Ontario Building Code (OBC 2012) standard windows and exterior walls will be sufficient to achieve the target indoor noise level.
6.46	Page 7, Table 4: Please explained here how did you calculate assigned values in the column "Total"?	Octave band sound power levels in Table 4 are presented in linear sound (dBZ) and total sound power levels are presented in A-scale sound (dBA). The A – Scale is correlated to human hearing which is less sensitive to lower frequency noise. These terms are further defined in Section 4.1. See enclosed Noise Study Addendum for further information.
6.47	Intentionally blank	-
Wind Study		
6.48	Page 10, Section 5.2: Wind Comfort Conditions: 1.8m (6ft) wind barrier around perimeter..... • What type of barrier will be used here? Please add a bit more info about it. • Around perimeter : Is it around the amenity area ?	Per Section 5.2, the wind barrier will be 1.8 metres around the entire perimeter of the outdoor amenity terraces. These solid barriers are indicated on the architectural plans.
Site Lighting Certificate		

No.	Comment	
6.49	<p>Provide a site lighting certificate, sealed by a P. Eng. that satisfies the following condition:</p> <p>Prior to the Site Plan Approval, the applicant shall provide a certificate, from an acceptable professional engineer, that the site lighting has been designed to meet the following criteria:</p> <p>a. It must be designed using only fixtures that meet the criteria for Full Cut-Off (Sharp cut-off) Classification, as recognized by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA or IES), and;</p> <p>b. It must result in minimal light spillage onto adjacent properties. As a guideline, 0.5 fc is normally the maximum allowable spillage.</p> <p>Please consider these comments in combination with comments you receive from other technical groups, agencies and the public. Contact me if it is necessary to resolve any conflicting comments and/or include the above comments with your summary to the applicant. Also, please add the following statement in the letter to the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •“Please provide a resubmission which addresses each of the comments or issues listed above. •A cover letter must also be included which states how each of the preliminary comments above was addressed on the resubmission. •Please provide us a .pdf copy of the revised drawings and reports (either by USB drive or e-mail).” 	To be provided prior to Site Plan registration.
7.0	Building Code Services	
7.50	Regarding file # D07-12-20-0097, for the location of 300 Miwate Private, Due to the ongoing nature of the Zibi SPC application for the overall site, Building Code Services Branch has NO additional comments in relation to this portion of the proposed site plan control application.	Noted.
8.0	Hydro Ottawa	
8.51	The Owner is advised that there is medium voltage underground infrastructure along the east and north sides of the property, and entering the premise for servicing.	Noted.
8.52	Prior to any excavation, the Owner and its agents shall arrange for an underground electricity 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 1.5m of any Hydro Ottawa underground plant unless the exact position of plant is determined by hand digging methods. Direct supervision by Hydro Ottawa forces, and protection or support of the underground assets shall be at the Owner's expense.	Noted.
8.53	The Owner shall ensure crossing of Hydro Ottawa underground assets is carried out per Hydro Ottawa's engineering specification UDS0013, "Temporary and Permanent Support of Hydro Ottawa Duct Banks when Undercut by An Excavation" which can be found at https://hydroottawa.com/accounts-services/accounts/contractors-developers/commercial-design-specifications . The adoption of this specification does not relieve the Owner in any way for damage made to Hydro Ottawa plant.	Noted.
8.54	The Owner shall not use steel curb and sidewalk form support pins in the vicinity of Hydro Ottawa underground plant for electrical safety.	Noted.

No.	Comment	
8.55	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.	Noted.
8.56	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.	Noted.
8.57	The Owner shall enter an Installation and Service agreement with Hydro Ottawa.	Noted.
8.58	The Owner shall convey, at their cost, all required easements as determined by Hydro Ottawa.	Noted.
8.59	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.	Noted.
8.60	The Owner shall be responsible for servicing the buildings within the property. Only one service entrance per property shall be permitted.	Noted.
8.61	The Owner shall be responsible for all costs for feasible relocations, protection or encasement of any existing Hydro Ottawa plant.	Noted.
8.62	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.	Noted.
8.63	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.	Noted.
9.0	Bell	
9.64	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.	Noted.
9.65	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.	Noted.
9.66	The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.	Noted.
9.67	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.	Noted.

No.	Comment	
9.68	If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.	Noted.
9.69	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.	Noted.
9.70	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.	Noted.
10.0	Rogers	
10.71	Rogers has no comment or concerns in regards to this circulation. Please contact Martin Proulx at 613-688-2191 or e-mail at martin.proulx@rci.rogers.com for Rogers Site Servicing if approved, or if you require additional information	Noted
11.0	Portage Power	
11.72	Portage Power received a notice regarding an application for a zoning by-law amendment (File No. D02-02-20-0059) relating to a building height increase at 300 Miwate Private. Please note that Portage Power constructed a hydroelectric generating facility at 4 Booth Street from 2015 to 2017. We designed the facility and performed a noise study based on the information provided by Windmill/Zibi in 2015. Any changes to the development plans since that time would not be covered by the study and we don't accept any responsibility for noise related complaints.	Noted
12.0	Urban Design Review Panel Comments	

No.	Comment	
12.73	<p>Site Plan and Landscaping</p> <p>The nature and uses of the site have changed significantly with the introduction of a mixed-use neighbourhood and the Panel has concerns with the industrial heritage rationale justifying the lack of proposed trees. The Panel recognizes the history of the industrial site and the need to reflect this history in the design; however, with the evolution of the site from industrial to a mixed-use residential area, the landscape intent should also evolve.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the wind impact and the solar exposure be further studied.</p> <p>The Panel indicates that the ground level treatment of the development is not fully resolved, including the elevations and the proposed uses as they relate to the surrounding public realm.</p>	<p>The proposed development of Block 206 and 207 incorporates tree planting where possible within the site. This will be further expanded through future phases of the project. Within the constrained Booth Street corridor, there is no additional area to accommodate street trees within the right-of-way.</p> <p>Various wind reports have been completed since the initial SPA application, including Wind Impact, Cladding Pressure, and Stack Effect studies (submitted as part of the SPA and Permit applications). Some mitigation strategies, including the addition of wind screens on the Level 3 terrace of Block 206, have been incorporated into the SPA and Construction Drawing sets. These wind impact studies have confirmed that the siting and orientation of both blocks is advantageous and helps to limit detrimental wind impacts on the pedestrian realm and upper outdoor amenity levels.</p> <p>Solar exposure was further explored as part of the cladding designs of both Blocks. The One Planet Living metrics require that building thermal performance must exceed the minimums set out by code. On Block 206, efforts were made to achieve a lower window to wall ratio on all facades and increase thermal performance in the exterior wall through the incorporation of insulated back-up wall assemblies at all spandrel panel locations. Block 207 already reflected a lower window to wall ratio and, given the height and uses being proposed, we believe the façade treatment appropriately responds to solar exposure throughout the year.</p> <p>In order to enhance the pedestrian realm, the north elevation of Block 206 has been redesigned to minimize the physical and visual impacts of mechanical services at grade (ex. recessing the gas meter) and emphasize the presence and approach to the entrance lobby for residents and visitors alike. Incoming gas services have been rerouted to sit within the alleyway and away from street boulevards. Pedestrian entrances for both Blocks have been recessed and enhanced through the addition of canopies and signage paneling above. A salvaged medallion (EB Eddy Company, founded in 1851) will be mounted onto the vertical face of the Head St. Square elevation of Block 206 and act as a feature element on that façade. The salvaged pulper has been relocated to the northwest corner of the site to avoid congesting the pedestrian and vehicular experience in the alleyway and allow for the inclusion of additional seating areas, unit paving, and landscaped planters. The new pulper location will act as a focal point on the site and bring visual interest to the intersection of Miwate Priv and the future Woonerf.</p>
12.74	<p>Built Form</p> <p>The Panel indicates that the DNA of development on the Island, as envisioned through the masterplan process, is a cluster of mid-rise buildings that work together to serve as a backdrop to the National Capital landscape, and not be in competition with National Symbols. To this end, the Panel has significant concerns about height creep. The height should be reduced to conform to the heights in the developed JDRP built form plan as approved by Council.</p> <p>The Panel supports framing the public realm with the podium and the mid-rise building.</p> <p>There is a suggestion to design a stepped slab building for this site. Though not ideal, this would be one way of bringing down the height while maintaining some gross floor area.</p>	<p>The Zibi Master Plan always contemplated high-rise buildings at specific locations on this Islands, including on the north side of Head Street Square in the location of Block 206. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment only seeks to increase the permitted height by 2.5 metres over the current permissions.</p> <p>The built form is generally consistent with the massing model used in the preparation of the Master Plan, positioning the high-rise component of Block 206 at the north end of the site, with a low-rise interface to Head Street Square.</p>

No.	Comment	
12.75	<p>Architecture and Materiality</p> <p>The Panel appreciates the elegance of the architectural expression. With respect to the two buildings, the Panel is supportive of the distinct designs; however, suggests that the colouration and weathering of the metal panels for the office building be further studied to ensure that the material reflects the design intent.</p> <p>For Block 206, with respect to colour, consider a different hue which is a bit warmer and softer than the stark white, to create a quieter expression with a material combination that blends in with the background.</p> <p>The Panel has expressed some concerns about the North façade treatment. The base of the building appears very heavy.</p>	<p>The metal panel systems have since been further explored with respect to their colouring, texture, and weathering. The redesign provides varied panel finishes in a similar tonal range to ensure the original design intent is maintained. The paint system being proposed for the metal cladding on Block 207 will have tonal warmth and richness similar to that of weathering steel (Corten) however, unlike Corten, it is a stable finish that will not weather and stain over time.</p> <p>The cladding colour for Block 206 has been revised from stark white to a warm white. The darker portions of the façade, including mullions, louvers, and glazed spandrel assemblies have been revised from black to a warmer charcoal gray tone in order to reduce contrast and quiet the expression of colour throughout.</p> <p>The base of the building has been redesigned as noted in the revised materials.</p>