

## Zzap Response to Team Review Comments – November 29, 2022

1. Staff recommend improvements to the design of the main level entrance at the front of the building. There are concerns of readability of the main building entrance (lack of distinguishing elements against the main wall, hidden nature below heavy cantilever), delineation of vehicle space versus pedestrian (use of curb, sidewalk, landscaping) and the general building experience, particularly for a pedestrian. Is there a reason for the heavily recessed entrance/cantilever? Please provide a revision to the design to address these concerns and include design rationale. It also seems that a door to the vestibule has been shown as a window on the elevation drawing.

### **ZZAP Response**

*The main entrance now projects out from the front building face and is defined by a canopy and distinct brick veneer cladding material and colour that runs the entire length of this building face. The building lobby has been enhanced to include larger windows that flank the entry doors which increases the readability and prominence of the building's main entrance. The glazing design is distinct; wide window openings will allow for transparency and visibility into the vestibule, lobby and adjacent common rooms/areas when viewed from the building's exterior. The pedestrian space has been enhanced to include a raised, wide curb that extends from the northeast corner to the southwest corner of the building face.*

2. The use of concrete walls with "architectural reveals" on the ground level is not conducive to meeting policy 1.8.2(c) regarding high quality building materials, articulation of and variation to the building facades and fine-grained architectural detailing. Staff recommend improvements to the architectural treatment of these facades to limit blank walls, as well as to include elements of variation and fine-grained detailing. Please provide a revised design and include design rationale.

### **ZZAP Response**

*The architectural reveals on the ground level have been replaced with brick veneer cladding. A finer grain appearance is achieved by:*

- *Articulating the front face of the building.*
- *Adding larger and more windows on the building base, thereby increasing the definition of each wall segment.*

3. A parking ratio of 1: 2 is proposed. Staff recommend reducing surface parking area to allow room for improvements to pedestrian access, landscaping/amenity space, and potentially buffering. Parking could be shifted within the building, or a reduction of parking to a 1:1 ratio could be supported given this site's proximity to transit and active transportation routes. Optimally, the area of parking at the front of the building would be removed to allow for improved landscaping/site design and pedestrian access. Alternatively, consider removing the rear parking area and accessing driveway along the northern side of the property to allow for a landscaped buffer adjacent to the existing low-density residential use. Depending on the chosen way forward, please note the following considerations:

- a. Policy 1.8.2(g) states that minimal parking be considered in the front of the building "only where appropriate landscape measures along the street edge are provided". It is acknowledged that a 3m area has been requested to be reserved for future road widening purposes and so significant enhancement in this area adjacent the road would not be recommended, however if parking is to remain in the front of building, what other specific landscaping measures would be taken to meet this policy?
- b. Please keep in mind the following Building Standards comment provided as part of Team Review Memo #1: "As per Code, the fire-truck access route to the primary entrance will need to comply with 3.2.5. for width of roadway and turning radius". **This requirement will be met.**
- c. The driveway access along the north of the site runs adjacent to 606 Bedford Hwy, an existing low-density residential property. The close proximity of this driveway to the existing use is not considered ideal by staff. For context, section 28CJ of the Halifax Mainland R-3 (General Residential and Low-rise Apartment) zone requirements requires a 20' side yard abutting any low and medium density residential uses and requires this yard be a "landscaped area which provides visual screening and which may include opaque fencing measuring a minimum of six feet in height. The landscaped area may include pedestrian walkways, landscaped open space and recreational". It is recommended that at a minimum an opaque fence be erected along the northern property line.

### **ZZAP Response**

*The surface parking has been removed from the front of the building. Spaces in the underground parking garage have been reduced from 108 spaces to 104 spaces. The total parking provided on site is now 114 spaces (a reduction of 11 spaces).*

*There is a significant grade change between the subject property and the neighbouring properties to the north. As such, there is an existing large retaining wall along this property line as the abutting properties to the north are at higher grade. This retaining wall is intended to be maintained or replaced as part of the development. As such, we do not see the benefit in providing a fence.*

4. The projected shadow for one day was provided, however this is insufficient in addressing "the potential impact of shadowing on surrounding residential buildings beyond what currently exists" as required by 1.8.2(k). Please provide a year-round study, as well as written analysis of possible impact. An example of what was provided for a similar proposal can be found here:  
<https://www.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/cityhall/community-councils/170508nwcc1315.pdf>

### **Response**

A shadow study has been provided to show the shadow impact at 9:00 AM, 12:00PM and 4 PM on June 21<sup>st</sup>, September 21<sup>st</sup> and December 21<sup>st</sup>. The 4:00PM shadows in December impact the neighbouring properties to the north to the greatest degree. However, the shadows cast by the existing multi-storey buildings located on Charlotte Lane (west of the subject site) generate the majority of the shadows cast.

5. A sidewalk has been provided throughout the site and it has been indicated in writing that a sidewalk connection will be provided to the street, however it is requested that this connection be shown on the site plan. This is requested to ensure safe pedestrian access to and from the site. Please also include details such as width and material.

### **ZZAP Response**

*A concrete sidewalk connection has been provided and is indicated on the site plan.*

6. If providing the landscaped podium (255.0 sqm) as an amenity space, the plan should be revised to include a door, pathway, and appropriate sitting or activity space to make the space accessible for use by residents. Consider moving indoor amenity spaces to this floor so that these spaces can open into the landscaped area and be integrated.

### **ZZAP Response**

*Due Rooftop amenity space/landscape podium is now provided on the Level 6 roof. This space is accessible to residents from the Level 6 corridor.*

7. Please reconfigure the rear and side entrances so that they are not accessed only by stairs. This is to ensure accessibility of the entrances. Ideally, these entrances would be at grade. If this cannot be achieved, please provide rationale.

### **ZZAP Response**

*Due to site grading, it is not possible to make all rear and side entrances fully accessible. The main entrance is fully accessible as required by national building code. All barrier free parking spaces have accessible access to the building. Requiring all entrances to be accessible is not possible nor is required by national building code.*

8. There is concern regarding the size and location of the refuse room. Is this sufficient room for four-stream waste receptacles? How will pick up operate/is there a sufficient turning radius for garbage trucks?

### **ZZAP Response**

*The refuse room has been relocated to the north side of the building, adjacent to the parking garage entrance. A 6'-0" wide opening is provided to allow for movement of garbage and recycling containers in and out of the room. The room is adequately sized for four-stream waste receptacles. Garbage trucks will pick up refuse near the vehicular entrance and turn around in the rear parking area to exit the site.*