

June 1, 2020

Kathy Rygus, Planner II
City of Ottawa
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department
110 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa ON K1P 1J1
Via email only: kathy.rygus@ottawa.ca

Dear Ms. Rygus

**Reference: Response to 4th Round Comments
Kizell Draft Plan of Subdivision
5618 Hazeldean Road (File No. D07-16-16-0020)**

This is our response to City comments on our fourth submission, the last of which were received on March 26, 2020. The City's comments are responded to in turn below, **in bold**.

Note that our responses refer to the block numbers on the previously submitted Draft Plan on which the comments were provided – due to revisions, on the revised Draft Plan submitted here some of the block numbers are different.

Please also find the following documents at this link: https://novatechengineering-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/jireland_novatech-eng_com/EjaOSL_N6FNBghJKgc1AMscBYUiz2O2TMgQZT7Wwtt4YoQ?e=ewaAQn

- Revised Draft Plan by Novatech dated May 2020;
- Conceptual townhouse layout on Blocks 303 and 304 by Novatech dated May 2020;
- A response letter to the engineering comments by Novatech dated June 1, 2020;
- Revised engineering plans and reports by Novatech;
- A response letter to the transportation comments by Novatech dated May 20, 2020, and;
- Revised Traffic Impact Assessment by Novatech dated May 2020.

Planning and Urban Design

1. High-Rise Blocks

The relocation of the high-rise blocks near the future park-and-ride location/ Hazeldean LRT station is supported; however, both Blocks 318 and 319 are now directly abutting proposed low-rise singles and townhouses in the Richcraft subdivision to the east. With the potential for sun shadow and wind impacts, traffic generation and the need for transitioning from the low-rise residential uses, it is recommended that the high-rise blocks be relocated to have frontage on either Robert Grant Avenue or Hazeldean Road. The high-rise blocks could be switched with the mixed-use Blocks 316 and 317 or a different configuration of the blocks could be proposed in this area of the subdivision.

High Density Residential should not necessarily be conflated with high-rise buildings. High-rise buildings are not proposed for Blocks 318 and 319. Mid-rise buildings (5-9 storeys) are proposed for these blocks. It does not make sense to switch these blocks with the mixed use blocks as the mixed use blocks *are* intended to have high-rise buildings.

The Arterial Mainstreet (AM) zone, which has a 30m / 9 storey height limit, is proposed for Block 318 and the R5Z with a height limit of 30m is proposed for Block 319. The provisions of the AM zone require that built form step down in height adjacent to residential zones (the Richcraft lands to the east are zoned R3Z). The result will be that the likely interface with the neighbouring R3 lands will be three storeys on the subject site, separated by a setback from the likely two storey dwellings on the R3 lands. It is accepted that a similar 'stepping down' would also be appropriate for the R5Z zoned block. We will work with City staff on the best way to incorporate this into the suggested Zoning By-law Amendment.

2. *Mid-block Connections*

With the reconfiguration of the high-rise blocks and the introduction of low-rise residential uses in the southwest portion of the site, mid-block connections should be introduced to provide connections to the Hydro corridor and further north to the parks and school through Blocks 301, 303 and 304 or between the single lots on Streets 11 and 12.

Pathway connections between Streets 9 and 11 via the Hydro corridor and between Streets 11 and 12 are shown on the revised Draft Plan.

3. Consider adding a local street connection from the area of Streets 11 and 12 to Robert Grant Avenue.

This was considered but not undertaken for two reasons: 1) to reduce the number of intersections with Robert Grant Avenue as fewer intersections will allow the Bus Rapid Transit and pedestrian and cycling paths to function better, and 2) to avoid cut-through traffic which would use Streets 11 and 12 and any through connection to avoid the intersection of Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue.

4. Please confirm the blocks intended for stacked/low rise apartments (Blocks 307, 308, 309, 310, 312, 313, 314?)

The blocks listed (plus Block 311) are at this stage intended for either stacked dwellings, low-rise apartment buildings or possibly back to back townhouses.

5. What is proposed for Block 304? If it is townhouses, show proposed lotting.

Townhouses are proposed here. We have prepared a conceptual layout of townhouses on this lot (dated May 2020, enclosed).

Environmental Planner

1. *Map 2 of the TCR/EIS (dated November 29, 2019) shows three areas of "potential tree retention. One of these areas is listed as Community 4 (cultural woodland) and part of that woodland is located within the watercourse block (Block 326). The trees in this block should be retained. The remaining trees in this Community 4 are located on Blocks 292 and 311. Although the TCR says there is potential tree retention in this area, it would seem unlikely.*

Trees in the open space Block 326 will be retained. We agree that tree retention in Blocks 292 and 311 is only potential, as per the TCR.

2. *In terms of next steps: The draft conditions for the subdivision will require conditions for the landscaping plan to include naturalization planting for Block 326 where there are currently no trees*

to supplement the existing vegetation per the EIS.

The EIS states in its conclusion that: ***“A generous assortment of native plantings as part of the landscaping for the site will help to replace the features and functions of the woody vegetation to be removed.”*** This suggests a balanced approach to replacing the vegetation that will be removed. Although the EIS doesn’t specifically require planting in Block 326, it may be a good location for it.

Forester

1. Please be advised that a permit is required prior to any tree removal on site.

Noted.

2. The potential tree retention areas are excluded and must be protected until it has been proven that they cannot be retained.

Noted.

Engineering

Please refer to attached engineering response letter.

Transportation

Please refer to attached transportation response letter.

Parks & Facilities

1. *From the last submission (January 2018 plan), the plan has increased by 513.7 units and decreased by 1.59 hectares of parkland. What is the justification for providing less parkland when the residential density has increased? Based on the master parkland agreement, the development is now 867 units over its 1,888-unit allowance and deficient 5.93 hectares of parkland based on the 1 hectare per 300 units rate.*
2. Parks requests additional parkland to service the high-density residential blocks. We do not believe that cash-in-lieu covering the entire parkland deficit is appropriate.

It is proposed to provide parkland for the low and medium density parts of the subdivision. These are the majority of the units in the development and will be developed first. The nature of these unit types is that the number of units that will be developed is quite predictable. It is proposed to provide cash-in-lieu or the high density blocks as these are projected to be developed last, when the LRT station is operational, which may be 10-20 years from now. This timeline and the nature of high density development makes it difficult to predict the number of units that will be developed on these blocks. We provided unit numbers to guide the zoning, which required calculating the highest potential unit yield. The final number of units developed on these lots may vary considerably and as such cash-in-lieu was considered to be a more flexible option.

Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority

MVCA did not complete a technical review as it appears it was revised to address City concerns. Our letter dated Aug 17, 2018 indicates that MVCA concerns had been addressed. We will provide further comments related to Storm Water at the detailed design stage.

Noted.

Ottawa Carleton District School Board

Comments were provided in a separate letter. In summary, they appreciated the changes made to the school site since meeting with them but were concerned about the number of intersections that surround the site and the impact these may have on a future Site Plan application for a school. They are seeking cooperation from the City in this process. The number of intersections adjacent to the school is not unusual for an urban area built around a 3.23 ha site. If the dwellings and thus the street layout were reoriented so that dwellings fronted onto the streets, the number of intersections may be reduced. We suggest that this is a less preferable option as it adds many driveways to the streets surrounding the school which introduces additional conflicts, particularly parking.

We trust the foregoing and enclosed satisfy your comments.

Sincerely,

NOVATECH



James Ireland, MPlA
Project Planner – Planning & Development