

***APPLICATION to the
COMMITTEE of ADJUSTMENT
for RELIEF from ByLaw 2008-250
1115 BLASDELL AVENUE
Ottawa, Ontario***

Committee of Adjustment

Received | Reçu le

2023-07-04

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa
Comité de dérogation



--- street view - as existing ---

***Don Brown, B.Arch., BCIN
Brown Custom Design***

***APPLICATION to the COMMITTEE of ADJUSTMENT
for RELIEF from ByLaw 2008-250***

- Cover Letter -

***1115 Blasdell Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario
June 2023***

Committee Members:

As Agent on behalf of the Owners of 1115 Blasdell Avenue ... it being a single family bungalow residence constructed circa 1954, we are requesting the consideration and acceptance of the Committee of Adjustment in relation to 2 Minor Variances

As follows:

Variance a) :

- > for a Reduced Front Yard Setback --- (West wall) ★***
a) - to reduce the required Front Yard setback for the proposed new 2nd Floor addition, from required 6.0m, to be 4.57m ... so as to match the existing 4.57m Front Yard Setback of the residence's current 1st Floor West wall.
[Section 144.(1).(d)]

Variance b) :

- > for a Reduced Rear Yard Setback: --- (East Wall) ▲***
(Note: existing Rear Yard at Garage is 5.69m = 21.34%)
>> as based upon these 3 required criteria, from the same ByLaw Requirement - S 152 , T-152.B , end note 7 :
i) to reduce the 25% of Lot Dept to be 20%
ii) to reduce the 25% of Lot Area to be 20%
iii) to reduce being a minimum of 6m to be, 5.35m
> for i) and ii) criteria:
- the C/L average lot depth is 26.66m
- the required 25% of lot depth is $26.66m / 4 = 6.67m$
(note: the rear lot width is slightly greater than the front lot width, so the 25% of Lot Depth value will take precedence over Lot area, as the lesser % criterion.)
>>>- the proposed new Rear Yard setback is 5.35m = 20.0%

*- the merits for creating this New Family Room:
The new 1 storey Family Room is to project into the existing rear yard but only 0.34m more than does the existing Garage. This will have a negligible perceived effect from the street and will also help to maintain the effective use area of the current Rear Yard, whilst providing a much needed connection from existing residence to their Rear Yard, which currently, has none.*

> for iii) criterion: as ByLaw 2008-250 states in S 152, T-152, end note 7 (as one with the required 25% Rear Yard criteria noted above), the new works require relief from the 6m minimum requirement, to be 5.35m (currently it is 5.69m)

Such proposed variances will permit the Owner to:

- i) - construct a new 2nd storey Bedroom level addition atop the full perimeter of their existing 1st storey residence, with a matching footprint, so as to be finishes to appear built as one*
- ii) - construct a new 1 storey at grade Family Room to the rear of existing bungalow, which will take the place of their existing 1 storey Garage, with some expansion to the North and East, while being further from Blasdell Avenue ... the 3-part variance will apply only for the rearward (East) expansion by 0.37m, relative to the existing Garage's location*
- iii) - not requiring any variances for either, the works will also include the addition of a small 1 storey Entry Vestibule as structured atop the existing 'cold room' foundation, as well as a new 2 storey stair tower that will provide for consolidated access to all 3 levels, from the Basement on up to the new 2nd Floor, while being legitimately located in the Interior Side Yard (North)*

Neighbourhood Context:

The residences along the short, 4.5 block long, street that is Blasdell Avenue, are of 2 natures: The North side is populated with many and varied single family residences, being a mixture of bungalows and 2 storey residences. The South side commences with 2 storey early 1950's rental row dwellings, and in the vicinity of 1115 Blasdell, such have been replaced with 'modern' 3.5 storey walk-up townhomes. 1115 Blasdell will not be at all out of place amidst these structures.

In respect to the context of this property's with its immediate neighbours, as proposed, the expansion and renovations of 1115 Blasdell will be a fitting and appropriate renovation in this location.:

- the lands to the Rear (East) is a mature forested area and not subject to future development*
- residence to the North is a 2 storey structure, as from 1954*
- residence across Juliette Street, to the West, is also a 2 storey structure as from 1954, but added to and externally renovated*
- the structure(s) facing and across Blasdell Avenue from the Subject Property, are a group of 12 Unit 3.5 storey brick-faced townhouses, which by their nature, loom over the single family homes along the North side of Blasdell Avenue.*

Please refer to the included documentation and photographs as herewith provided, to better 'describe' the pending renovations and additions project, and it's context in the newighbourhood.

In summary:

We propose that these requested Minor Variances are both reasonable and appropriate in the context of this project's scale and location, and further that such also meets the intent of the 4 Tests, in the Planning Act

>>> see further below for such rationale

Don Brown, B.Arch., BCIN

Neighbourhood Context Photo:

↓ Subject Property



Looking East

Neighbourhood: Manor Park (East) - as part of the older, section, to the Easterly side of St. Laurent Blvd (early 1950's development area)

The Subject Property: - 17.98m x 26.53m

(only slightly irregular - Rear 18.08m & Int. Side 26.78m)

The typical property size in this neighbourhood for near all lots, is nominally 15.25m x +/- 30.5m (varies street to street)

The street ROW's in this neighbourhood are 50 ft (15.24m) in width

Materials and Building massing forms:

It is proposed that the new works will be finished to be sympathetic to, and consistent with, the area's 1950's built forms & materials

Notable / Distinctive Trees:

The 4 large fir trees facing Blasdell and Juliette are beyond the work area and are to be protected and retained. They are currently at distance from the existing residence having the 2nd Floor added atop. The proposed low-to-ground front deck area is to be supported on helical piles so as to not interfere with the trees and their roots. Refer also to the Tree Information Report.



Side Notes: - the subject property was constructed circa 1954, and thus predated AZ-64, and all subsequent Zoning ByLaws :

- Front Yard setback reg'ns. have been consistent since AZ-64 as requiring 20 ft at first and as then became 6m***
- Rear Yard setback reg'ns. though, initially as per AZ-64 were but 10ft and in 1982's, Z2K ByLaw, metric equal as 3.0m. Since then the Rear Yard criterion changed to be as noted, above. Such now is typically 25% depth / 25% lot area criteria with a 6m rear yard minimum.***

Current 2008-250 Zoning: - it is R1PP

- ***Table 152.B. and applicable End Notes apply for here for this building's criteria, but for:***
 - ***End Note #5 does not apply since there is to be no enclosed garage, nor carport***
- ***Section 144.1.(d) states Front and Corner Side Yards need not be greater than Table 152.B requirements:***
 - ***Corner Side Yard of 4.5m matches T. 152.B***
 - ***Front Yard by S.144.(1).(b) requires matching the abutting neighbour's Front Yard (6.89m) but need not be greater than 6.0m as par T.152.B. ... > hence the 'benchmark' Front Yard Setback criterion need only be related to 6.0m***

Summary of the 2 Minor Variances being sought from 2008-250

1. - **Variance a):** 
 - ***for relief from required Front Yard Setback: Table 152.B. R1PP - further to A.144.1.(b).***
 - **To reduce the required Front Yard Setback from 6.0m to be 4.57m , [so as to still match the existing setback]**
 - ***Note: - The framing of the new 2nd Floor is to match as above existing, and with existing face brick being removed, the exterior new finishes shall be no closer than is the face of the current brick.***
2. - **Variance b):** 
 - ***for relief from the required rear yard setback criteria: TO REDUCE the required 25% "Lot Depth" and 25% "Lot Area" factors , to be both 20.0% so as to Permit***

a new Rear Yard depth at the Family Room that equates to being 5.35m. ($0.20 \times 26.66 = 5.33m$)

- Note: - the averaging of North and South Side lot lines describes an existing Lot Depth of 26.66m , for which 25% represents 6.67m - The existing Garage being removed, currently has a Rear Yard Setback of 5.69m. The proposed new Family Room is to project but 0.37m further into the existing Rear Yard than does the existing Garage.

Notes: - the existing 1950's Garage is to be removed so as to permit the construction of a new 1 storey Family Room addition to the East, with a part of it's roof area constructed as a sitting deck, as overlooking the Rear Yard and the heavily forested NCC Greenspace.

- The Lot is slightly wider at the Rear than at the Front, so the required lot area for rear yard will also be sufficed by using the same factor, as varied to be 20.0%

The appended documentation presents and notes further in the graphics, the ByLaw Clauses and specifics that are applicable in each instance. In addition, the following are also included:

- Minor Variance Application ... and fees*
- Tree Information Report > no issues, just protect CRZ*
- Site survey and Surveyor's real Property Report*
- Site Plan noting Variance 'locations', etc*
- Proposed Elevations*

Satisfying the Planning Act 4 Tests:

- with reference also to the notes above ...

Test #1 : - Are Requested Variances 'Minor' ? YES

- Variance a)



- The proposed Front Yard Setback is to be one and the same as historic / existing. The new 2nd floor is designed to be set upon the existing bungalow's footprint, with any and all new wall finishes respecting the same Front Yard Setback.

- Variance b)



- firstly, the new Rear Yard works face the substantial NCC forested lands as abutting so no rear neighbours are in play re: overlooking, encroaching upon, etc
- the new proposed Family Room will only project rearward towards the NCC forest by an additional 0.34 m, vs the existing Garage footprint.

- Parking is being provided open air, in a manner that is Zoning ByLaw compliant & sympathetic. The existing Garage has not been used for car storage and as such, the new parking 'pattern' will be akin to as historic.

The 'used for storage only' Garage is being removed to make way for a new Rear Yard oriented Family Room. Currently, the house does not relate to the family use Rear Yard at all. Occupants are 'blind' to such overlook, let alone access at this time.

Test #2 : - Are the Requested Variances desirable for the appropriate development of the lands in question ?
- YES - for all

- The design theme is that of still being respectful of the general neighbourhood Manor Park 'vernacular', such as it is, much of which there has been to 'polish up' historic houses, and many being updated, sensibly up-sized and the like*
- the new rear yard works face the substantial NCC forested lands as abutting, so no rear neighbours are in play. Parking is being provided in a manner that is Zoning ByLaw compliant & sympathetic.*
- the 'used for storage only' Garage is being removed to make way for a new Rear Yard oriented Family Room. Currently, the house does not relate to the family use Rear Yard at all.*
- the new works are to rectify this near 70 year deficiency, in consort with the other interior renovations and new 2nd floor. The new stair tower has a blank Northerly facade for the privacy of the Owner, and also the adjacent neighbour, whose driveway is most adjacent. This neighbour's house as nearest, also has but only a small Bathroom window facing onto the subject property on the upper floor, and a small Kitchen window more forward on the ground floor.*
- All works are being undertaken for the betterment of the Owners, without detriment to others.*

**Test #3 : - Do the Requested Variances conform to the general intent of the Zoning Bylaw ? - YES - for all
- in kind with the remarks made above for Test #2.**

**Test #4: - Do the Requested Variances conform to the general intent of the Official Plan ? - YES - for all
- The subject property fully complies with the intent of the Official Plan's "General Urban Area" land use designation (Residential). The new Draft study presentations for the upcoming revisions to the City Official Plan shows no change here to the land use nor density provisions, from those as currently in place.**

On behalf of the Owners, we are seeking hereby your concurrence and approval of these 2 Minor Variances, (one as having 3 sub-parts) as presented here, within this Application.

**Don Brown, B.Arch., BCIN
dbrown5052@rogers.com
(613) 262-4483 cell**