## MacIntosh, Taylor

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { From: } & \text { Connor Wallace <connor@zzap.ca> } \\ \text { Sent: } & \text { Wednesday, September 7, 2022 2:53 PM } \\ \text { To: } & \text { MacIntosh, Taylor } \\ \text { Subject: } & \text { [External Email] RE: Planning Application \#23821-600 Bedford Highway, Halifax }\end{array}$
[This email has been received from an external person or system]
No problem - see red text below.

## Engineering

1. It is expected that widening of the Bedford Highway will be necessary in order to accommodate the Bedford Highway functional plan. Therefore, additional property will be required. Engineering is advising that HRM will be investigating acquiring 3 meters of property along the Bedford Highway frontage with the applicant in the future.
The updated site plan includes a 3 m buffer between the parking stalls in front of the building and the front lot line. The buffer is in place to accommodate future road widening. When road widening occurs, a retaining wall may be required to address grades between the development and the widened ROW.
2. HRM will not permit changes in grades within the public right of way to accommodate grading on private property. Can you please comment on the grade especially with respect to driveway access Proposed driveway access is to be sloped and will ramp up from the Bedford Highway towards the grade of the building which is above the highway. Driveway connection within the public ROW is intended to meet HRM grading requirements.
3. Traffic and Engineering have reviewed the TIS prepared by WSP, dated July 2021 and the following comments must be addressed;
a. A left turn lane on the Bedford Highway will not be considered for this development as the left turn volume is less than $5 \%$ of the advancing through volume, and the Bedford Highway functional plan does not allocate space for turning lanes into private properties in this section of the corridor.' Noted.
b. The applicant should consider widening the driveway to accommodate two-way vehicle movement.
Site Plan includes a widened driveway access to accommodate two-way movement.

## Halifax Transit

1. A formal connection between the sidewalk on the property to the street should be created, taking a whole journey approach to accessibility.
A sidewalk connection will be provided to the street/street sidewalk.
Let me know if you have any further questions.

## Connor

## zap

architecture + planning
Connor Wallace (he/him) | MCIP, LPP
Principal
9022665481 zzap.ca

From: MacIntosh, Taylor [macintta@halifax.ca](mailto:macintta@halifax.ca)
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 2:41 PM
To: Connor Wallace [connor@zzap.ca](mailto:connor@zzap.ca)
Subject: RE: Planning Application \#23821-600 Bedford Highway, Halifax
There were prior decision requests made by Engineering and Halifax Transit also. Are you able to provide responses to these at this time?

## TAYLOR MAC ${ }^{\text {ANTOSH }}$

(SHE/HER)
PLANNER II
URBAN ENABLED APPLICATIONS
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES | PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT

## HALIFへX

T. 902.219.0836
halifax.ca

From: Connor Wallace [connor@zzap.ca](mailto:connor@zzap.ca)
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 2:33 PM
To: MacIntosh, Taylor [macintta@halifax.ca](mailto:macintta@halifax.ca)
Subject: [External Email] RE: Planning Application \#23821-600 Bedford Highway, Halifax
[This email has been received from an external person or system]
Hey Taylor,
See below responses to 'Prior to Community Engagement' comments that were provided back in August - which some updates.

1. Please provide a shadow study in order to evaluate the shadow impacts (1.8.2(k)). Shadow study provided
2. Balcony and spandrel are spelled incorrectly on the plans. Please update this information. Revised building drawings have updated this error
3. There is a 2 unit dwelling that shares a southern property line and a 4 unit dwelling that is on the northern property line. How does the development respond to these uses? A parking area is located immediately beside the 2 unit dwelling-- how will this be mitigated?
Building footprint has been reduced so the maximum dimension is less than 64. 20m setbacks are provided along southern and northern property lines to provide separation from abutting uses.
4. Hemlock Ravine Park is located behind this site. How are the views affected from this area, specifically Cabin Lake Trail?
As shown on the updated site plan. The ground elevation of the Cabin Lake Trail is approx. 1520 m higher than the elevation of the rooftop of the proposed building. As such, the building will not affect views in this area.
5. How will the landscaped area in the rear of the lot meet this policy requirements (1.8.2 I) around CPTED? What measures will be implemented there?
The rear portion of the lot is proposed to be a parking area. This area will be lit at night and units will be facing into this area providing 'eyes on the street'. The revised plans include lighting details showing the how this area will be lit.
6. Please include lighting on the site plan to ensure compliance with CPTED policy. Lighting details are provided in updated drawings package.
7. Please provide a landscape plan with sufficient detail to evaluate 1.8 .2 (a) and (j). Preliminary landscape details provided within updated drawings package.
8. Please increase the interior amenity space to bring it into compliance with 1.8.2 (h). Please provide some details around what the space will be used for and how the space will be used. This will be incorporated into the development agreement.
Please refer to sheet A-03 in the updated Building Drawings package. There are various amenity spaces allocated within the ground level of the building (totaling approx.. 2,500 sf.)
9. The change in materials and colours provides articulation and variation, however, the building is long and this variation can appear monotonous, given the length. The Regional Centre MPS and LUB provides useful information around built form requirements and represents HRM's best understanding of built form and design requirements. This document recommends a maximum building dimension of 64 m , whereas this building is 78.2 metres in length. What is the rationale for this building length?
Max building dimension has been reduced and is now approx.. 63 m . The façade includes a variety of materials, colours and projections/recesses to articulate/break up the façade.

Let me know if this is sufficient.
Regards,
Connor

## zap <br> architecture + planning <br> Connor Wallace (he/him) | MCIP, LPP <br> Principal <br> 9022665481 zzap.ca

From: MacIntosh, Taylor [macintta@halifax.ca](mailto:macintta@halifax.ca)
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 2:09 PM
To: Connor Wallace [connor@zzap.ca](mailto:connor@zzap.ca)
Subject: RE: Planning Application \#23821-600 Bedford Highway, Halifax
Hi Connor,

I hope you had a nice long weekend. I've noticed that the resubmission is missing a written response to the comments provided in the Team Review document, as requested on the first page of the memo. Could you please provide this to me as soon as possible. This application is intended to be distributed to other review agencies at a meeting tomorrow.

Regards,

TAYLOR MACINTOSH
(SHE/HER)
PLANNER II
URBAN ENABLED APPLICATIONS
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES | PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT

## H^LIFへX

T. 902.219.0836
halifax.ca

