



Date: June 11 2021

File: 010421 - 4200 Innes Road

To: Steve Belan, MCIP RPP
Planner II, File Lead
Development Review, Central, PIEDD

**RE: RESPONSE TO ROUND 2 COMMENTS | 4200 INNES ROAD
D07-16-18-0006**

Dear Mr. Steve Belan,

Enclosed in this letter and any attachments along with it are the combined responses and revised materials to the City staff comments received April 7, 2021 as well as subsequent comments received via email on April 20, 2021.

Our responses are provided in logical order, organized by discipline.

The following is a list of materials provided in support of this response package, including any appendices to this letter.

MATERIALS

- [Draft 4M Plan of Subdivision
- [Rendered Concept Plan, dated June 2021
- [Appendix A - Planning Addendum No. 2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

ENGINEERING

1. The engineering material submitted will allow us to proceed with drafting conditions of Draft Approval. However, it is to be noted that further detailed work on servicing will be necessary at the detailed design phase. To help complete the file at this time you should have a Functional Servicing Report prepared for approval. The FSR demonstrates that the subdivision is serviceable and along with the Phasing Plan, the Draft 4M-plan and Road Cross Sections we can determine if the services work in the street. The Phasing Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision are referenced in a number of places, but they didn't seem to be in the package submitted. Please provide these two items along with road cross sections. We can forward the cross sections on to City Forestry to ensure that street trees will fit with the servicing in these soils.

Response: *Acknowledged. The Draft 4M Plan is provided with this submission. The Functional Servicing Report was provided in the Subdivision Application Submission and no comments were provided. Detailed road design will be prepared during the design stage following draft approval. We will note that the right-of-way provided is a 24 metre standard collector in accordance with the City's 2019 document called "Designing Neighbourhood Collector Streets". On page 10, a 24 m ROW includes the provision of trees. There is no phasing plan for this project.*

PLANNING

2. The Block layout seems to be orderly. The edge of the subdivision will create an awkward block on the adjacent property on the north side of Vanguard just west of the street 2 intersection. There may be an opportunity to work with the property owners to the south to integrate the block pattern between these two properties and the same could be said about those lands on the south side of Vanguard along the eastern boundary of the site.

Response: *Acknowledged. Opportunity to collaborate with the abutting owner(s) on a logical parcel fabric will be pursued. In order to facilitate this, the registration of the plan of subdivision is to include the ability to lift part lot control as may be necessary to further parcelize the industrial lot fabric to ensure flexibility and economic viability along with better integration with abutting landowners reviewed at the time of development.*

3. There is a strip of City owned land abutting the eastern edge of the property. This strip has been obtained for a pedestrian pathway from the retail commercial

properties to the north, south to the residential. Early on, the City express that we would like a wedge of land in the north east corner of this subdivision to allow the path to angle over to the western side of the existing shopping centre building. We are still looking to obtain this wedge.

Response: *The revised Draft Plan of Subdivision incorporates a proposed wedge of land shown in the north-east corner for the purposes of the pedestrian pathway.*

4. There is another existing pedestrian path from Mer Bleue to your site between two of the Car Dealerships. A future pathway should be integrated into this plan from its terminus to your future streets. If this is not accommodated as a City owned Block we will be requiring a pedestrian easement to make this connection as part of a future Site Plan for this block.

Response: *A continuation of this pathway is identified through the middle of block 1.*

5. I realize that the Site Plan provided is just a demonstration. However, any future development of those blocks created by this subdivision will need to be planned accordance with the City's design guidelines. I have not yet received comments from the Urban Design group, however I will assume that they will indicate that there should be a mix of building heights and typologies along with active street frontages and private green spaces. Large parking lots will not be acceptable in the mixed use area. In the employment area larger commercial buildings are acceptable. Parking and loading areas should be located at the rear of the buildings.

Response: *Acknowledged. Concept plan has been adjusted to illustrate how buildings can be reoriented to face the street frontages and public realm, including the reorientation of a residential building to face the park and the provision of a potential employment oriented building also facing the park to ensure employees have accessible green space for lunches, no loading areas would about the park. All design guidelines will need to be followed for future Site Plan Control applications.*

PLAN OF SUBDIVISION

6. Please ensure that an updated Planning Rationale including direction related to how the proposal conforms to the EUC Mixed Use Centre CDP.

Response: *Please see the Planning Addendum No. 2 included as Appendix A.*

7. Please see attached UD Illustration. It is understood that the site plan and landscape plans are provided for illustration purposes, but they should be updated as soon as possible to reflect the CDP direction, and good design practices for mixed use communities, such as framing the public realm with built form and not

parking.

Response: *Concept Plan has been revised.*

8. A stronger connection is required to both Mer Bleue Road via the existing pathway to the west. A private street with sidewalks should align with this pathway network, to form a framing element for future built form. Easements in favour of public access should be sought and should form part of the subdivision approvals.

Response: *Lot 1 / Block 1 is not being developed as part of this plan of subdivision. As there is no current plan for the site, we cannot propose a private street. Maintaining flexibility for the development is critical to good planning for the future developer. The future developer needs to review all options to determine highest and best use of the site development. A suitable pedestrian connection will be designed and implemented as part of the future SPC application.*

9. A connection to the commercial lands to the north should be provided and connected to Vanguard Drive extension. This could be achieved through the provision of a pedestrian access easement or public walkway block. This will require coordination with the abutting landowner and should form part of the subdivision approvals.

Response: *Previous comment has been identified that there is an existing strip of City owned land abutting the east property line, in accordance with that request we are providing a corner parcel of land for the future connection to the commercial lands.*

10. The park block should be shifted west to become a centralized element for the proposed residential/mixed use community. The CDP includes direction that the park be located in alignment with and connected to the north/south active transportation corridor. This should be realized in the Plan of Subdivision.

Response: *Please see Planning Addendum No. 2. as Appendix A.*

11. Please provide cross sections for both proposed public rights of way for review and to ensure adequate room is provided for street tree planting.

Response: *Cross section is as per the City approved 24 m collector right-of-way. This approved right-of-way design includes the provision of trees.*

PARKS

12. It is important to note, the CDP shows the park block within the Mixed-Use area specifically for the intent to keep it away from industrial uses.

Response: Please see Planning Addendum No. 2. as Appendix A.

13. All plans and reports must be updated to show the public park and pathways.

Response: Concept Plan, Landscape Plan, and Draft 4M Plan are all updated accordingly. The Site Servicing Study and Transportation Study can be updated with the updated plans for final approval.

14. Parks doesn't have an issue, in principle, to the park going from the Mixed-Use to Employment (Industrial) lands, however, it needs to be done properly and protected from industrial uses. If this can't be achieved the Park will need to stay within the Mixed-Use lands and sheltered from industrial uses as intended.

Response: Acknowledged and agreed. Please see the Planning Addendum No. 2 as Appendix A. The industrial zone includes the provision of office uses as this is meant to be an employment area. Further, the draft OP indicates that these lands are meant to be a Hub and not remain as traditional industrial and freight uses. It is the intention of this subdivision to create a park that is situated between mixed use residential and a vibrant hub in accordance with the draft OP.

15. Currently, there are several issues with the plan as proposed.

- The frontages adjacent to the Park are not appropriate. Specifically, the private parking lot, loading area, and industrial side/rear laneway access for Industrial Building 2.
- Three of the 4 sides do not put "eyes on the park"; two of them are dangerous with frequent heavy vehicle traffic (North and East)

Response: There will be three sides with eyes on the park, office park to the east, mixed use residential to the west, and street frontage to the south. The north lot line can be screened with trees and a fence. Concept plans have been reoriented to address this but it is noted that these elements are controlled through the Site Plan Control process. No loading areas would be permitted beside the park. The design principle would be that employees would be able to access the park for lunch and amenity space. We also acknowledge that the draft OP does not identify these lands as strictly industrial and that they are referred to as a Hub which allows a greater variety of uses and intentions.

16. The park block should be shifted west and/or better integrated into the proposed residential components. The CDPs intent was to have the Park become a centralized element for the proposed residential/mixed use community.

Response: In accordance with the intention to keep this park centralized and accessible for the long term build out of this area, as well as ensuring maximum space is reserved for residential, it is important that the proposed park remain where

it is.

The proposed location needs to be cognizant of the direction set out in the draft Official Plan, which indicates that the current industrial zone could be rezoned to a mixed use subzone in accordance with the draft OPs “Hub” designation. Hub designation would more easily facilitate flexibility in the provision of various forms of employment in addition to residential as may be needed depending on the future of planning our communities in a post-pandemic world.

Please see Planning Addendum No. 2 as Appendix A for the full rationale on the proposed park location.

17. The CDP includes direction that the park be in alignment with and connected to the north/south active transportation corridor. This should be realized in the Plan of Subdivision.

Response: *The proposed parks location makes it accessible from both the north-south Noella LeClair Way as well as from Vanguard Drive and situates it to be more in line with a complete community, understanding the long-term direction for this area as a Hub in the draft new OP. The current industrial zoned lands were meant as areas for employment which is why they include office use; they were not meant to restrict the development towards industrial specifically. This planning issue was identified through the review process for the new Official Plan and it is why the City has removed “Employment Areas” and created different designations that more appropriately align with quality communities. The draft OP does not identify these lands as “Traditional Industrial Freight and Storage” which is the new “Industrial” specific designation.*

Should you have any questions about the revised submission, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,



Christine McCuaig, RPP MCIP M.PI
Principal Senior Planner + Project Manager

CC: Mauro Pambianchi, Smart Centres
Heather Jenkins, Smart Centres



planning
+ design

PLANNING RATIONALE ADDENDUM

24 Kirkstall Avenue, Ottawa, ON, K2G 3M5

www.q9planning.com

christine@q9planning.com

Date: May 27 2021

File: 010421 - 4200 Innes Road

To: Steve Belan, MCIP RPP
Planner II, File Lead
Development Review, Central, PIEDD

RE: 4200 INNES ROAD - R2 COMMENTS PLANNING ADDENDUM

Dear Steve,

In accordance with the requests outlined in the submission comments, the following outlines a review of the East Urban Community Phase 3 Secondary Plan (EUC 3 SP).

The EUC 3 SP specifies the vision of the area as a new complete neighbourhood that will be a mix of housing, employment, institutional and commercial services combined with leisure and recreational opportunities. The foundations for achieving this through design are to have a new vibrant core, achieve compact growth, incorporate complete streets, foster compatible and complementary growth, protect natural heritage systems, encourage distinct identities, and support economic development.

It is acknowledged that some of the policies relating to plan of subdivisions are specific to subdivisions that are more fine-grained with lots instead of blocks. This plan of subdivision is a creation of blocks to be development as mixed-use, high-density developments with one or more mid-, high-rise buildings.

The following is a review of the relevant policies:

General

1 - residential development will not be more than 55 per cent detached dwelling units and at least 10 per cent apartment dwelling units.

2 - The overall residential development shall meet the minimum average density target of 34 units per net hectare. Net residential density is based on the area of land exclusively for residential use, including lanes and parking areas internal to developments but excluding public streets, right-of-way and all non-residential uses

Comment |

The proposed subdivision meets the relevant general policies by proposing blocks for medium and high density residential and mixed use developments. No single detached dwelling blocks are proposed. The minimum density target of 34 units per net hectare is exceeded. The residential blocks collectively represent 10.5 acres (4.25 ha). Meeting the net hectare requirement would be anything over 145 units. It is anticipated that each individual building exceed 100 units and therefore the density target is easily met.

Parks

12 - A hierarchy of parks in the greenspace network is to be provided including Community, Neighbourhood, and Parkettes.

Comment |

A parkette is provided. There is no requirement for the parkette to be in the Mixed-Use Area, though it is noted as a recommendation. In consideration of this recommendation, the proposed parkette has been located directly abutting the Mixed Use area. The reasons for this are outlined below:

This was established to ensure maximum space for residential housing and to ensure the ability to provide a larger park.

It was also placed in this location in consideration of the lesser demands for industrial, office, and direct employment lands especially in acknowledgment of post-pandemic realities to which the planning and business communities have been engaging in notable discourse on.

It is also further acknowledged that the EUC 3 SP is not consistent with the proposed draft Official Plan. The original Employment Area lands (previously shown in blue) were discussed in the drafting of the new OP as limiting and were not meant to result in a trade and industry situation that would restrict the development of complete communities. The draft OP schedule for this area removes the employment area designation and applies a Hub designation, which welcomes far greater variety of uses and mix of uses than the existing employment area designation. The parkette has been situated in an area that is cognizant of the intentions of the new Official Plan to create better flexibility of uses and creates distinction between “Employment Areas” and “Traditional Industrial Freight and Storage”.

Conclusively, the park location provided allows more residential, provides a larger park, and positions the park in proximity to the area marked as Hub on the draft Official Plan which will ensure the park will be more easily accessible to more people, either visiting from home, from work, or in travel.

Cycling

13 - Cycling facilities will be established along Collector streets.

Comment |

No collector streets identified other than Vanguard. Vanguard ROW already determined and to be designed by City of Ottawa.

Pedestrian Priorities

There are two policies that deal with pedestrian measures and it is limited to collector streets. As previously noted, Vanguard is the only identified collector street on the plan that affects the Smart Centres lands and the ROW is to be designed by City of Ottawa.

Community and Urban Design

16 - Street and block layout designed to be safe and pleasant, connected, organized, blocks that are larger shall include pedestrian mid block connection, vehicle speeds passively controlled through design, street pattern and network facilitates all modal transportation, rear yards shall not abut collectors, parking should be to the side or rear of buildings, maximize tree planting where soils allow.

Comment |

The proposed street and block pattern is organized, simple, safe, and shows mid-block pedestrian connections. Easements for these connections is not required and is not recommended because the site plan layout showing on each block is conceptual and the exact location of pedestrian connections is not set. It is also possible that the blocks develop in a format that would include one or more internal streets, private ways, or POPS space. All of these components would and can influence pedestrian pathway locations. All Site Plan Control applications would be subject to the EUC 3 SP in design development of these blocks.

The proposed street widths were consistent with the requested 24 metre ROWs and the cross-section shows street trees and pedestrian infrastructure can easily be provided.

Conceptual building locations have been shown fronting the streets with parking oriented towards the internal space of the block and rear or side.

Traffic Calming

17 - Traffic calming measures required at time of development as a condition of approval.

Comment |

Acknowledged.

Sections 5 is not applicable and Section 6 is acknowledged. Clients have already engaged on the cost sharing components that relate to their lands, as applicable. During the Site Plan Control applications for the proposed development blocks, the owners / developers will be required to engage with OC Transpo, School Boards, etc to ensure that ridership is addressed and that bus routes and stops as applicable are situated appropriately. Building location will ultimately determine best locations for stops in order to ensure residents have minimal travel distance.

Should you have any questions please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,



Christine McCuaig, RPP MCIP M.PI
Principal Senior Planner + Project Manager

CC: Heather Jenkins, Smart Centres
Mauro Pambianchi, Smart Centres