



15 April 2020

Mr. Domenic Idone
Epcon Enterprises Ltd.
207 MacLaren St, Ottawa, ON

**RE: Amendment to:
Cultural Heritage Impact Statement: 246 Gilmour Street, Ottawa, ON**

Mr. Idone,

Further to the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement that was prepared by Lalande + Doyle Architects; this letter is to provide information on modifications that were undertaken to the development that is proposed for 246 Gilmour Street in Ottawa.

The main changes reflected under this amendment are:

1. The design has lowered the stone foundation and extended the brick to align with the adjacent building.
2. The Main Entrance column has been revised to be straight in order to be more in keeping with the character of the HCD.
3. The colour of the cornice on the Third storey has been revised to charcoal to match the upper cornice.
4. The use of brick on the east facade has been increased.
5. Additional metal panelling has been added on the lower three storeys on the West façade.
6. The mechanical penthouse at the top of the building will be finished in a light-coloured panelling.

It should be noted that the changes to the exterior of the building have resulted in the loss of bedrooms, meaning that one (1) three-bedroom unit and two (2) two-bedroom units have been lost. The project now consists of two (2) two-bedroom units in addition to one-bedroom and studio units.

In addition, below are our responses to the comments issued by Anne Fitzpatrick, MCIP RPP Heritage Planner with the City of Ottawa:

H: Heritage Comments:

1. Ontario Heritage Application to be submitted.
Response: Novatech prepared the Heritage Application, which is submitted concurrently with these responses to the first technical circulation.
2. General Comments:
 - Heritage staff still have concerns with the proposed height and massing of the building, which is located on a smaller lot and how this impacts the streetscape and the neighboring building.
Response: The proposed design does not adversely impact streetscape and the neighbouring building.
 - The red brick should be extended to all facades.
Response: the proposed design is based on expressing the prevailing 3 to 4 story brick datum line respecting the heritage materiality of the District, above which another material expression is used. Brick is already used on all four sides.

- The top storeys, which are clad in an aluminum composite metal appear too prominent. Metal paneling is not characteristic of the HCD. Has consideration been given to extending the brick to the top storeys as well? The top portion of the building will be visible looking east down Gilmour and should be constructed of compatible materials.

Response: The proposed design is based on expressing the prevailing 3 to 4 story brick 'datum line' respecting the heritage materiality of the District, above which another material expression is used. Compatibility is subjective. The metal panelling is 'compatible' with the brick and with the adjacent school.

Comments received by email from Anne Fitzpatrick

C Current Conditions:

1. Review for accuracy and spelling: "The property is also within the Centretown Heritage Overlay and subject to the provisions of Section 60 of the By-law." The property is located within the Centretown Heritage Conservation District (Part V of the OHA) and is subject to the Heritage Overlay - Section 60 of the Zoning By-Law."

Response: the corrections have been made in the updated CHIS.

2. Review for accuracy - "The majority of buildings on this block of Gilmour Street are made up of two, three and four-storey structures, mainly single multi residential buildings

Response: the corrections have been made in the updated CHIS.

D Background Research and Analysis:

1. Please review and include the relevant heritage policies in the Centretown CDP and City of Ottawa Official Plan as part of this section.

Response: relevant information is included in the CHIS.

3. Update HCD Map with more recent version

Response: the map that is included in the CHIS was provided in a Report that was obtained from Sally Coutts, City of Ottawa. If there exist a more recent version, please provide as it is not available off the web.

F. Description of the Proposed Development:

1. Include description of materials.

Response: the corrections have been made in the updated CHIS

G. Impact of Proposed Development

1. The CHIS has been submitted in support of a Site Plan Control and Re-Zoning Application. As part of the re-zoning there is a request to increase the permitted height (from 14.5 metres to 20 metres). There is also relief being sought for lot area, lot width, setbacks etc... Please include analysis on the re-zoning application and comment on the appropriateness and compatibility with the Centretown HCD.

Response: As the CHIS is an independent assessment, please refer to the Novatech report.

2. Please review and provide comment on the City of Ottawa's Official Plan Policy 4.6.1 (9), which states: When reviewing applications for zoning amendments, site plan control approval, demolition control, minor variance, or the provision of utilities affecting lands/properties adjacent to or

across the street from a designated heritage resource, adjacent to or across the street from the boundary of a heritage conservation district, or within heritage conservation district, the City will ensure that the proposal is compatible by: [Amendment 14, September 8, 2004] [Amendment #76, OMB File #PL100206, August 18, 2011:

- a) Respecting the massing, profile and character adjacent to or across the street from heritage buildings; [Amendment #76, August 04, 2010}.
Response: The proposed development completely respects the massing, profile and character of the adjacent to and across the street buildings. The fact that the CPAC Building is across the street has already set a precedent for the future possibilities of development on this street.
 - b) Approximating the width of nearby heritage buildings when constructing new buildings facing the street.
Response: the proposed development is smaller than the existing adjacent buildings, and the design reflects prevailing building widths based on the lot size.
 - c) Approximating the established setback pattern on the street.
Response: The design respects prevailing lot setback patterns.
 - d) Item 10.4: Being physically oriented to the street in a similar fashion to existing heritage buildings.
Response: There are no other buildings facing the street on the side of the proposed development.
 - e) Item 10.5: Minimizing shadowing on adjacent heritage properties, particularly on landscaped open spaces and outdoor amenity areas.
Response: Not relevant. Refer to RMA shadow study; also see letter from Novatech on this topic.
 - f) Item 10.6: Having minimal impact on the heritage qualities of the street as a public place in heritage areas.
Response: the proposed development has minimal impact to the street and is providing the required setbacks and landscaping to meld with the existing streetscape.
 - g) Item 10.7: Minimizing the loss of landscaped open space.
Response: This is not relevant to this proposed development.
 - h) Item 10.8: Ensuring that parking facilities (surface lots, residential garages, stand-alone parking and parking components as part of larger developments) are compatibly integrated into heritage areas.
Response: The proposed development does not have any surface parking and parking is compatibly integrated.
 - i) Item 10.9: Requiring local utility companies to place metering equipment, transformer boxes, power lines, conduit equipment boxes, and other utility equipment and devices in locations that do not detract from the visual character or architectural integrity of the heritage resource.
Response: this is not relevant to this proposed development.
3. Please review and provide comment on the Heritage Policies in the Centretown CDP, specifically Section 6.5 Heritage Approach “Heritage Context “.
- When adding a new building or additions to existing buildings on a site adjacent to a heritage building or streetscape, the following guidelines shall apply:

- Use compatible materials
Response: All materials proposed are compatible with the existing and with the Centertown Heritage Conservation District Plan.
 - Use setbacks, front and side, to appropriately transition with adjacent building heights
Response: There are proposed setbacks for the front and sides and are indicated on the plans submitted.
 - Minimize the use and height of blank walls
Response: the revised design has no blank walls.
 - Inform new development with adjacent building ground floor heights and heritage character to enhance the public realm.
Response: the front façade has introduced a step-back at the third-floor line of the adjacent building and the ground, second and third floors are lined up.
 - Modulate façades through the use of vertical breaks and setbacks in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding heritage structures
Response: facades have been revised to provide vertical breaks and setbacks to enhance to compatibility with the adjacent structures.
4. Please review and provide comment on the Infill Guidelines in the Centertown Heritage Conservation District Plan - V11.5 Building Conservation and Infill Guidelines.
Response: Plan has a map for maximum height considerations and the site of the proposed development is not identified, but it is adjacent to sites that propose 9 storeys (30m) heights that are identified as “mid-rise”. The Plan also states that “New buildings must support active frontages, be of a human scale at grade and promote a safe and visually stimulating environment. New buildings must preserve access to light; reduce shadow impact; appropriately transition with existing heritage and neighbourhood; and maintain privacy with existing buildings.
5. There should be additional analysis on the impact of the proposed height of the building to the adjacent building.
Response: Addressed. No impact including shadow.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you have any questions.

Regards,



Louise C. Lalande, OAA, MRAIC, CAHP LEED AP
Lalande + Doyle Architects Inc.