

# Response to Comments

## 3484 Innes Road, 240 & 270 Lamarche Avenue

1

May 26, 2023

**Mr. Michael Boughton, RPP MCIP**

Senior Planner, Development Review – East  
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department  
City of Ottawa  
110 Laurier Avenue West  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Via Email: [michael.boughton@ottawa.ca](mailto:michael.boughton@ottawa.ca)

**RE: Response to Comments  
3484 Innes Road, 240 & 270 Lamarche Avenue  
Draft Plan of Subdivision (D02-02-21-0118) & Zoning By-law Amendment (D07-16-21-0033)**

Dear Mr. Boughton,

Please find enclosed our response to technical circulation comments received on January 23, 2023, in relation to the above-noted applications. In addition to the responses to comments provided below, the following materials are enclosed:

- / Correspondence with Phil Castro regarding parkland dedication, dated June 2022;
- / Revised Geotechnical Investigation, (Report PG4488-1), prepared by Paterson Group, Revision 2 dated May 13, 2022;
- / Revised Environmental Noise Control Study (Report PG4488-2), prepared by Paterson Group, Revision 3 dated February 23, 2023;
- / A revised Tree Conservation Report, prepared by IFS Associates, revision dated January 31, 2023;
- / A revised Draft Plan of Subdivision of Blocks 149, 150, 174 And 176 on Registered Plan 4M-1629, and Part of Lot 5 Concession 3 (Ottawa Front), Geographic Township of Gloucester in the City of Ottawa, prepared by Annis, O'Sullivan, Vollebekk Ltd.;
- / A revised Area Certificate for the Draft Plan of Subdivision, prepared by Annis, O'Sullivan, Vollebekk Ltd., dated May 17, 2023;
- / A revised Transportation Impact Analysis Step 5 Final Report, together with Appendix and Synchro files, prepared by Parsons, dated April 2023; and
- / A revised Functional Servicing Report, prepared by Novatech, revision date May 18, 2023.

### City Staff Comments

#### Draft Plan of Subdivision Application

1. *Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision.* Please address the following remaining minor technical comments.
  - a) Despite the provision of Block 8 on the draft plan, additional corner sight triangle at the corner of Innes Road and Lamarche Avenue is required to be taken from Block 3. Such taking is to be consistent with the conceptual intersection design illustrated on the attached preliminary Road Modification Approval (RMA) design drawing. Please coordinate the extent of the additional sight triangle with Neeti Paudel, Project Manager (Transportation).
  - b) Dimension the width of additional road widening Block 7 on the draft plan.

**Response: The additional corner site triangle is consistent with the conceptual intersection design illustrated in the RMA.**

2. *Parkland Dedication.* No further comments. The attached memorandum, dated 23 January 2023, from Jessica Button, Parks Planner, is provided simply for your information.

**Response: The calculations set out in the PFP memorandum differ from the calculation of required parkland agreed upon with Phil Castro, the previous parks planner for the file. As per the attached correspondence, the required dedication for the land identified as right of way and park should not be calculated at the apartment rate (10%) but should be pro-rated based the percentage of the overall development area.**

3. *Signalization of Lamarche Avenue/Innes Road Intersection.* A revised TIA remains to be resubmitted for City staff review. It is understood that your transportation consultant and City staff continue to address the design of the signalized intersection for the purposes of the RMA.

**Response: Noted. Please refer to the revised TIA enclosed with this submission.**

4. *Street 1 Geometry.* The proposed radii of Street 1 as shown on the draft plan of subdivision and illustrated on the Parsons Draft Option 1 of Street 1 and MSU Circulation drawings are accepted.

**Response: Noted**

5. *Timing of Draft Plan Approval.* As was recently conveyed to Miguel Tremblay by email message, dated 12 January 2023, and followed up by email message dated 16 January 2023, there remain too many unknowns respecting the EUC Stormwater Pond 1 design for City staff to grant draft plan of subdivision approval at this time. Accordingly, and as detailed in her 12 January 2023 email message, the Manager, Development Review – East will not render a decision respecting the draft plan of subdivision until the following five matters have been satisfied.
  - i. An update to the Gloucester East Urban Centre (Area E-3) Stormwater Area-specific Development Charges By-law and Background Study to reflect the updated cost estimate of EUC pond 1 expansion works and other works in the E-3 area. The update must be approved by Council with all opportunities for appeal exhausted.
  - ii. Council approval of a front-ending application for the EUC Pond 1 expansion works.
  - iii. Execution of a front-ending agreement, including the placement of the required securities, for the EUC Pond 1 expansion works.
  - iv. Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks approval of the Environmental Compliance Approval application for the EUC Pond 1 expansion works (undertaken by Glenview).
  - v. City issuance of a commence work notification for the EUC Pond 1 expansion works.
  - In the meantime, City staff will continue to review the subject application in preparation for draft plan of subdivision approval.

**Response: An update on the timing of these matters is requested.**

6. *Engineering Review Comments.* I regret that City staff's review of the engineering reports are not available at this time and will follow soon.

**Engineering review comments were received on February 9, 2023. The following comment was received:**

*A1. Blocks 149 and 150 were assumed to store up to 100-year stormwater on the site. Typically, subdivisions provide an average storage volume of 50m<sup>3</sup>/ha, the current design assumes 116 m<sup>3</sup>/ha. Please demonstrate that the ROW block can provide 78m<sup>3</sup> of storage for the 100-year event. The maximum depth of ponding must be less than 0.35m.*

**Response:** Storage volumes within the ROW block are provided within the road sags and catchbasins. Figure 6 Conceptual Grading Plan has been updated to show the 100-year ponding depths, areas, and volumes within these storage zones. The previous ROW storage value of 78 m<sup>3</sup> was based on a preliminary rational method calculation and is now outdated. The ROW storage value within Table 7.2 of the Functional Servicing Report has been updated to 48.5 m<sup>3</sup> in conformance with the preliminary PCSWMM model results and conceptual ROW surface.

## Zoning By-law Amendment Application

7. *Proposed Zoning Provisions.* The following few remaining comments address the details of the proposed zoning by-law amendment.

a) *Rear/Interior Side Yard Setbacks* – An exception provision to permit a yard setback of 14.5m to the now proposed one-storey projection of Building A from the west lot line is accepted. An appropriately worded exception will be in the Zoning Details of the future draft City staff report for your review.

**Response: Noted.**

b) *Reduced Visitor Parking Rate* – Further to the explanation provided in your response letter, it is still requested that actual empirical data from your client's portfolio of existing suburban rental apartment developments across the City, preferably those not within proximity to a rapid transit station, be provided to demonstrate that the reduced visitor parking rate of 0.1 spaces per dwelling unit is indeed functional and appropriate. I also will research other similar suburban apartment developments to determine what visitor parking standards were approved and employed and to learn whether there have been any concerns expressed with them.

**Response:**

The City applies two different rates for minimum visitor parking – 0.1 per unit in Areas Z, X, Y and B, and 0.2 per unit in Area C for parking, which covers most of the Outer Urban Transect and virtually all of the Inner Urban Transect. Despite this lack of granularity in parking minima, site-specific zoning has permitted a minimum rate of 0.1 visitor spaces per unit for a number of projects in Area C, including 380 Herzberg Road and 2 the Pkwy in Kanata.

None of Lepine's current suburban Ottawa projects benefit from a reduced visitor parking rate. Lepine does not have utilization rates for their visitor parking in tabular form, but in their experience their provided visitor parking is significantly underutilized. For this reason, they are seeking reduced visitor parking in this project.

In addition to the required visitor parking, retail/commercial parking spaces will be provided. A reduction for commercial parking is not being sought, even though the nature of the commercial uses is to be small-scale service commercial uses that will primarily serve the immediate neighbourhood. In practice, the retail and visitor parking spaces serve similar functions, and will likely be used by the same individuals – for example, visitors who frequent the coffeeshop while visiting residents of the development. Based on the currently submitted Site Plan, nine (9) retail/commercial spaces are proposed in addition to 29 visitor spaces. Together, these spaces will provide a pool of 38 short-term parking spaces, which is likely to meet visitor and short-term parking demands in all but extreme peak demand situations. Planning parking to meet peak demand results in significant negative externalities and is not supported by the policy directions of the Official Plan.

## Review of Submitted Reports

8. *Functional Servicing Report, Novatech, dated (Revised) 14 December 2022.* City staff's comments in response to the submitted report are to follow.

**Response: Noted – they have been received and are addressed above.**

9. *Geotechnical Investigation, Paterson, dated 13 May 2022.* City staff's comments in response to the previously submitted revised Geotechnical Investigation report and response memorandum of the same date are to follow.

**The following comments were received in a memo dated February 9, 2023:**

***Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Multi-Storey Residential Buildings, prepared by Paterson, project PG4488-1, dated May 21, 2019.***

*A2. Info only: The City prefers that all geotechnical information be contained in a single document. Any comments or amendments should be reflected in a revised report.*

**Response: Noted. Pleaser refer to the enclosed revised Geotechnical Investigation (PG4488-1, Revision 2, dated May 13, 2022).**

*A3. Specify if there are any restrictions for tree setbacks.*

**Response: Based on the shallow nature of the encountered bedrock within the northern portion of the site, and on the anticipated founding depth for the proposed buildings. Tree planting setbacks are not anticipated for the subject site. However, further discussion on tree planting setbacks have been added to the report. Reference should be made to section 6.8-Landscape Considerations in our above-mentioned revised report.**

*A4. The geotechnical report does not specify the number of proposed stories for the proposed structures.*

**Response: The number of buildings and stories for the proposed development are provided under section 2-Proposed Development of our geotechnical report, based on the latest conceptual plans. It is understood that Zones 2 and 3 consist of future development. The geotechnical report should be updated once the detailed design for these zones becomes available.**

10. *Environmental Noise Control Study.* It is noted that an updated noise study was not included in the latest revised submission materials. Please provided such revised report along with the next resubmission.

**Response: Please refer to the enclosed revised Environmental Noise Control Study (Report PG4488-2, Revision 3).**

11. *Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA).* A revised TIA was not included with the latest revised submission materials as was requested. Please provided such revised report in the next resubmission.

**Response: Please refer to enclosed revised TIA, prepared by Parsons.**

12. *Design Brochure, Neuf, dated December 2022.* No comments. The brochure is accepted as submitted.

**Response: Noted**

## Technical Agency Comments

13. *Conservation Authorities (RVCA)* – No concerns noted in memorandum dated February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023

**Response: Noted.**

## Additional Comments

14. The following correspondence from Michael Boughton was received on February 10, 2023

Further to City staff's comments just recently provided to you, I would like to inform you of a transportation and pedestrian related discussion that City staff and Caivan are having concerning Caivan's subdivision application. As you know, Caivan's application for the east mixed-use blocks across Lamarche Avenue from your client's site is also currently under review.

For context, as you recall, the attached original conceptual development plan created by Fotenn with City staff's input for the four mixed-use blocks (previous Lepine zoning amendment proposal) contemplated one large park to serve all four development blocks. However, with the current Lepine proposal, the parkland has been divided in two, with one park block now proposed on each side of Lamarche Avenue. Caivan is to provide the second park block in its current subdivision application for the two east mixed-use blocks.

In response to Caivan's latest revised submission, Parks Planning staff requested a pedestrian crossing across Lamarche Avenue to connect Caivan's proposed park along Lamarche Avenue with the one planned along Street 1 in your client's subdivision in order to achieve some permeability and connectivity between the two future subdivisions. The pedestrian crossing is proposed at the southern intersection of Street 1 with Lamarche Avenue to facilitate a safer pedestrian environment. Your client's concept site plan (Neuf) also shows such a pedestrian crossing at Street 1.

Considering that your client's site plan proposes bulb outs at the Street 1 intersection with Lamarche Avenue, the curb-to-curb width of Lamarche Avenue would be 7.0m. Given this, a Road Modification application and agreement might not be necessary if the PXO is a type D (attached). Nonetheless, City staff are requiring Caivan to provide a plan and assess warrants first for a PXO. A raised crossing likely would not be supported by OC Transpo and Fire Services, as Lamarche Avenue is a collector roadway.

I am not requiring a response from you other than an acknowledgement that there are ongoing discussions with Caivan about a possible PXO across Lamarche Avenue. If a PXO is deemed warranted (what type, we don't know yet), then I may have to express it and any associated obligations on your client, if any, in a condition of draft plan of subdivision approval.

**Response: Noted.**

We trust that the above response satisfies the remaining outstanding technical circulation comments. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Bria Aird, RPP MCIP  
Senior Planner