



## As We Heard It Report – Project Inbox

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments sent to the new Zoning By-law Inbox at [newzoning@ottawa.ca](mailto:newzoning@ottawa.ca). This report includes an index of topics, an overview of each of the topics and a summary of questions organized by theme and staff responses. This report summarizes comments received from May 31, 2024 to July 31, 2024. Approximately 230 detailed submissions were sent to the Inbox during that time period.

### Index

	Topic	Page No.
1	Neighbourhood Zones	1
2	Mixed-Use Zones	4
3	Parking	5
4	Driveways	6
5	Trees	6
6	Rural Zones	7
7	Stormwater Management	7
8	Public Consultation	7
	Summary of Questions by Theme and Staff Responses	8

### Overview of Topics

#### 1) Neighbourhoods

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Intensification might not leave enough greenspace in neighborhoods to regulate city temperature and help wellbeing.</li> <li>▪ Concern about overbearing existing infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ Concerns about light pollution, noise pollution, privacy, ambiance, character, and over-all quality of life</li> <li>▪ Caution against general inconveniences in neighbourhoods due to increased construction</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Worries about increased crime and reduced neighborhood cohesion after intensification.</li> <li>▪ Projection of property values diminishing due to lot severances nearby.</li> <li>▪ Significant intensification without a secondary plan nor evidence of zoning proposals to facilitate needed community services will likely lead to residents being significantly renovicted in the coming years.</li> <li>▪ Request for reconsideration of the proposed elimination of distinctions between the R4UA, UB, UC, and UD subzones in the proposed new N4 zoning. This is to ensure equity and appropriate densification, especially considering the recent doubling of density in the current R4 from the R4 zoning review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Missing Middle Housing</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Emphasis on the need for missing middle housing in the suburbs. Lack of effective missing middle zoning would mean elderly people won't be able to age in place, housing will become even more unaffordable, and suburbs will remain car dependent leading to high transportation costs. Urban sprawl will worsen because the only option available for residents to live in a dense area will be 30+ storey towers beside transit hubs.</li> <li>▪ Suggestion to permit a minimum of four storeys city-wide to allow for more livable space and more dwelling units.</li> <li>▪ Doubling density will likely eliminate any family-sized accommodation anywhere in neighbourhoods as is the likely result in new developments.</li> <li>▪ Change to permit greater heights could eliminate affordable (missing-middle) walk-ups and would likely replace current housing estates (PUDs) which offer many residents some affordability.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Worry that the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) in some cases appears to extend too far into Neighbourhood Zones.</li> <li>▪ Neighbourhoods in the same transect appear in several cases exempt from the new minor corridor zoning, while poorer neighbourhoods bear the full weight of minor corridor changes.</li> <li>▪ Concern that the new Mainstreet zoning will contribute significantly to added density which will weigh heavily on the need for community services like parks for which there are no plans.</li> </ul>



<p><b>Neighbourhood Built Form Standards</b> (Setbacks, Height, Design Standards, Yard Requirements)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Caution against making density difficult to achieve through height restrictions, lot sizing, and minimum setbacks which will lead to suburban areas having almost no meaningful change.</li> <li>▪ Proposed front yard setbacks should generally align with existing setback patterns.</li> <li>▪ Concern about the excessive minimum lot width required (18m) for Neighborhood Subzone E</li> <li>▪ Concern that proposed side yard setbacks will not be enough to ensure adequate sunlight and a sense of privacy for occupants and abutting residential buildings.</li> <li>▪ The need for more appropriate or measurable direction to protect the residential rear yard semi-private realm.</li> <li>▪ Concern that multiple entrances in the front wall or façade of a building could represent a detriment to streetscape or neighbourhood character.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Neighbourhood Site Functional Standards</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 803, subsection 11: Advocate to keep the minimum functional path of travel at 1.2 m, without the choke point width of 0.9m (permitted for a distance of up to 0.6 m). This could cause problems with hauling garbage to the street especially in the winter.</li> <li>▪ Request for a designated place for garbage to sit for pickup so it does not block the sidewalk, or large dumpsters are placed on the road for days at a time.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comments about Specific Areas</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request to not designate Lyon Street through Centretown (Lisgar to Arlington/Catherine) as a minor collector, as it is a residential street that goes through a heritage zone.</li> <li>▪ Request that the area around Dundonald Park should be reflected in the new zoning by-law as a heritage zone.</li> <li>▪ Concerns about great intensification proposed in Vanier due to Mainstreet and minor corridor upzoning. The proposed 60-80 uph target for inner transects will especially be borne by an area with significantly less park and green space and lower median income.</li> </ul>
<p><b>By-law Wording</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request to refine proposed wording regarding not permitting four units on each side of a severance of a given lot, to clarify the Draft 1 intent and avoid misinterpretation.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Suggestion that the definition of a residential use building should mention standard uses such as detached, duplex, semi-detached, apartment, etc. to assist the public in knowing what's permitted for their residential lands. The OP does discourage typology, but better direction is required.</li> </ul>
--	---

## 2) Mixed-Use Zones

Theme	As We Heard It
Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Call to require separation distances between shelters and sensitive uses (schools, daycare, and residences).</li> <li>▪ Request to reconsider maximum number of rooming units in a building (24) – this is a very large number.</li> </ul>
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Worry that incentivizing high-density development within city limits might push development pressures onto surrounding areas, leading to sprawl, environmental harm, and strain on resources.</li> <li>▪ Support for density around transit hubs and having more mixed-use zoning.</li> </ul>
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Front yard setback permissions are only based on the underlying zone regulations. Front yard setback averaging has been deleted. Concern that there will very likely not be room for viable mature front yard trees, nor the ability to maintain some semblance of streetscape character.</li> <li>▪ Concern that a maximum setback provision along the non-Mainstreet frontage of a corner lot could create conflict with parkland dedication policies relating to minimum frontage, as buildings may need to be sited further from an exterior lot line to accommodate parkland.</li> <li>▪ Request that Mainstreet maximum setbacks be tied to the lot line abutting the designated Mainstreet and not both exterior lot lines of a corner lot. This ensures there is appropriate flexibility for building placement and design on deep lots. A second building fronting a non-Mainstreet lot line shouldn't be held to the same standard as the building serving as the face to the Mainstreet.</li> </ul>



<b>Height</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 30m maximum building height is too high for a minor corridor. 45-degree angular plane or any required setbacks seem to be missing.</li> <li>▪ Concern that future high-rise development near residential areas might affect the viability of solar panels.</li> <li>▪ Caution against height permissions being based on “grade” instead of “existing average grade”. This allows the "grade" around the building to be manipulated / raised and thus the building height can be higher.</li> </ul>
<b>Private Service Enclaves</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request to provide a dedicated zone including all 16 areas identified in Annex 9 – Private Service Enclaves in Urban Area to address problems specific to them.</li> </ul>

### 3) Parking

Theme	As We Heard It
<b>Parking Minimums</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduced parking minimums can cause parking shortage and increased traffic congestion.</li> <li>▪ Recommendation to consider how many residents need cars, especially those with families and during the winter or rainy season, and for large grocery orders, for example.</li> <li>▪ Support for removal of parking minimums.</li> <li>▪ Suggestion that minimum parking should be required in areas outside of the urban core.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking Maximums</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Caution against maximum parking rates not reflecting the need for people to have 2 or 3 cars at their household, especially in suburban and rural areas.</li> <li>▪ Advocacy that provision Section 602(4) be altered to say that Table 602 applies but that the maximum number of permitted parking spaces is not fewer than 2. That way, a single or duplex dwelling on similar lots would each have a maximum of 2, and then a triplex 3, four-plex 4, etc.</li> <li>▪ Concern that there does not seem to be any lower parking maximums in Hubs than there is in the N zones.</li> </ul>



<b>Garages and Carports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concern that if on-site garages are minimized, there will be an effect on EV battery charging efficiency during the winter months.</li> <li>▪ Advocacy that permitting temporary plastic bag garage units (carports) anywhere in the front yard of residential dwellings inappropriate in terms of quality urban design, regardless of their setback from the street.</li> </ul>
<b>Bike Parking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request to require a minimum of two bike parking spaces per unit where no to little parking is provided.</li> </ul>

## 4) Driveways

<b>Driveways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request to increase options for more driveway space to support transit usage increase goals.</li> <li>▪ Suggestion that trailers should be permitted in driveways provided there is adequate space, and it sits 0.6m back from the road. Double-width driveways can safely accommodate a trailer. Side yards and backyards are not feasible for most people especially as they become increasingly small or eliminated entirely.</li> <li>▪ Call for driveways in the front to be prohibited for lots where there is a rear lane (not just prohibiting front yard parking). Any new driveways should be required to have access from the rear lane.</li> </ul>
------------------	---

## 5) Trees

<b>Trees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request for more clarity on how by-law requirements for soft landscaping will be increased to leave room for trees.</li> <li>▪ Emphasis on requiring sufficient space for a mature canopy tree to flourish in the rear yard of every lot.</li> <li>▪ Rear yard setbacks should not be reduced from 30% to 25%. Projections into the rear yard are also allowed as well as accessory structures. Together this may result in space that won't support tree growth.</li> </ul>
--------------	---



## 6) Rural Zones

<p>Rural Zones</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concern that AG and RR lands are not well-used, as they are neither used for agriculture nor they are permitted to use as residential (with higher density).</li> <li>▪ Suggestion that rural properties without city services, but with suitable water supply and septic system, should be permitted to have more than one Secondary Dwelling.</li> </ul>
--------------------	---

## 7) Stormwater Management

<p>Stormwater Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In Section 201 - Adequate Services and Stormwater Management - page 65: Exemptions (b) says that any addition in any zone that is less than 55 m<sup>2</sup> is exempt. This is a very large addition.</li> </ul>
------------------------------	--

## 8) Public Consultation

<p>Public Consultation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support for developing a density calculator.</li> <li>▪ Suggestion to shift the density calculation equation to solve for the maximum number of units allowed on a lot to avoid confusion.</li> <li>▪ Political jargon can make it challenging to determine the impacts of the Draft 1 changes.</li> <li>▪ Lack of clarity about non-residential uses in neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>
----------------------------	--



## Questions – Key Themes

<b>Question:</b>	How would this new zoning draft affect maximum permitted driveways?
<b>Response:</b>	<p>Driveway requirements for the N1-N4 Zones can be found in Section 606 (Access for One to Three Parking Spaces) of the By-law, particularly Table 606, which can be found on pages 137 to 139 in the Draft 1 By-law document (<a href="https://engage.ottawa.ca/28126/widgets/119508/documents/131758">https://engage.ottawa.ca/28126/widgets/119508/documents/131758</a>).</p> <p>Maximum driveway widths are based on lot width and not a specific subzone within the N1-N4 zones. The new draft New Zoning By-law permits double-wide driveways only on lots greater than 15-metres wide – this is intended to ensure that driveways do not occupy a significant portion of yards and sufficient space is retained to support permeable space, landscaping, and retention/growth of street trees. Front yard parking requirements can be found within Section 604 (Location of Parking) of the draft Zoning By-law, on pages 133 to 135 of the Draft 1 document linked above.</p>
<b>Question:</b>	Will other technical provisions (shadow studies) and the potential of community resistance under the site plan approval process make 4-storey infill projects under N4B a less likely form of densification?
<b>Response:</b>	<p>The Official Plan policies for the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay direct the new Zoning by-law as follows:</p> <p>“The scale of the project will determine whether site plan control will be required. As site plan control is not required for developments of 10 or fewer units, this does provide some incentive to keep development below that threshold.”</p> <p>Under the current Shadow Analysis Terms of Reference, shadow studies are only required for Zoning By-law Amendments for developments of 5 or more stories within the Greenbelt or 3 or more outside of the Greenbelt.</p>





<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Is the new zoning bylaw with its neighbourhood overlay going to turn predominantly R3 neighbourhoods such as the Glebe into major infill construction zones as we see in Westboro and Sandy Hill?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>Approximately 0.5% of properties City-wide are redeveloped each year on average, but that can vary quite a bit by neighbourhood. While the new Zoning By-law will expand permissions, it is difficult to predict the scale and type of development that will actually occur, nor does it guarantee that infill will necessarily be denser than what it replaces. The Zoning By-law can manage the built form and function of new development to ensure it is contextual, as set out in the Official Plan for the Neighbourhoods designation.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Where can I find information on the permitted building form under N4B (i.e., small-rise apartments, stacked towns etc.)? Is it the same as the current R4UD?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>A form-based approach is proposed for the new Zoning By-law. This regulates density in some zones, building size, massing, and setbacks, but no longer uses typologies found in the current Zoning By-law 2008-250.</p> <p>The standards specific to the N4B zone can be found in the Neighbourhood Zones section, Section 801. In particular, Table 801A addresses the maximum height and density standards for the N4 primary zone, and Table 801B addresses the minimum lot width and yard setback standards for the B subzone.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Built Form Standards provisions are in Section 802 and Neighbourhood Site Functional Standards are in Section 803.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Can you please let me know if any new maximum parking rates are proposed for employment uses such as manufacturing, warehousing, etc.</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>Maximum parking space rates can be found in Section 602.</p>



<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Am I correct to understand that, per Section 612, Subsection 3, that I can now park my recreational travel trailer (of any length) in my driveway (Ward 6 Stittsville, Zone Code N3B) so long as I can still park my primary vehicle in my driveway or garage.</p> <p>The text in subsection 3 is confusing how it applies when compared to Table 612A, so clarification is appreciated. I have a double wide driveway that can easily accommodate my recreational travel trailer and I can still easily park in my driveway or garage.</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>Concerning your inquiry about Section 612 and Table 612A of draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law, a recreational trailer would be permitted in the N3 zone, provided the trailer is parked in a rear or interior side yard and is at least 0.6 metres away from the lot lines. As well, you would be limited to only parking one recreational trailer on your property, per Table 612A. A recreational trailer may not be parked within a required or provided front yard.</p> <p>For clarity, the definition of a yard can be found under Section 199 of draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law. It has been pasted below for reference as well. Accordingly, to park a recreational trailer, it would have to be on the portion of your driveway (if any) that extends into the interior side yard or rear yard, per the requirements of Table 612. Parking the recreational trailer in the front yard, per the definition above, would not be permitted.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>What is the location criteria for applying the suffix to the Neighbourhood Zones? Will it apply only where the current Residential Neighbourhood Commercial Suffix (Section 141) applies?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>In the first draft of our Zoning By-law, the -c suffix is shown as applying to properties that have the -c suffix in our current Zoning By-law. Currently this means that it only applies to about 85 properties, since many of those existing -c properties have other designations such as “Minor Corridor” within our new Official Plan – such that properties with those designations would get corresponding zoning that have broader commercial/mixed-use permissions.</p> <p>That said, we’re identifying potential locations where the suffix could be added in accordance with our 15-minute neighbourhood policies, which may show up in the 2nd draft of the new By-law (to go public in early 2025).</p>



<b>Question:</b>	Please confirm if my understanding is correct. If there is a building structure that does not conform to the new set-back regulations, we can modify/repair it, but as soon as the structure is taken down - we have to abide by the new set-back regulations.
<b>Response:</b>	If there is an existing structure on a lot that complies with Zoning By-law 2008-250 but, after adoption of the New Zoning By-law at the end of 2025, does not comply with new zoning regulations, the building would be considered legally non-compliant.

<b>Question:</b>	Could you please share the methodology that was used to determine which streets would get "Minor Corridor" designations?
<b>Response:</b>	<p>The Minor Corridor designation was introduced as part of the Official Plan review process, done prior to review and work on the New Zoning By-law. The City's Official Plan was adopted and came into force in the late Fall of 2022. The Official Plan policies for Minor Corridors can be found in Section 6.2 of the Official Plan (<a href="https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/documents/files/section6_op_en.pdf">https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/documents/files/section6_op_en.pdf</a>).</p> <p>The Minor Corridor Zone (CM) and its subzones implement Official Plan policies in Section 6.2 pertaining to Minor Corridors.</p> <p>The CM zone will replace approximately 23 different parent zones and 131 subzones that occur along the 78 designated Minor Corridors but, will carry forward permitted uses. In many instances, the number of uses permitted on a lot has increased.</p> <p>For additional discussion on the Minor Corridor zoning, please see pages 78 and 79 of the report that went to Joint Committee April 29th: <a href="https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178597">https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178597</a>.</p>



<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>When discussing coach houses, the new wording is great. Is it possible for stronger clarification by adding a “Coach house located on a lot larger than 0.4 hectares in the rural and urban area must be serviced...” This will eliminate any doubts!</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>Thanks for your suggested edits to the coach house provisions with respect to servicing. We will review this suggestion as we move forward with addressing the coach house regulations.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Having read the Draft 1, p62 specifies “Utility Installation means the equipment used to make or deliver a utility product, commodity or service and includes the actual building, plant, works, utility line, tower, relay, pedestal, and may also include a storm water management facility, but excludes antenna systems and renewable energy generation facility. (installation de services publics)</p> <p>As written, this means that The City is providing no zoning control at all over renewables, other than this.</p> <p>p88, Section 213 Utility Installation, states:  “(3) In the AG – Agricultural Zone, a utility installation consisting of a battery energy storage system is limited to 2 per cent of the total lot area, to a maximum of 1 hectare. ”</p> <p>A BESS is (correctly) not defined as a Renewable Energy Generation Facility I have a heard a rumor that The Province may have asked the City not to include anything in the by-law yet, while they consult Municipalities, but I believe any consultations may have concluded. Can you shed any light on the plan going forward?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>The short answer is yes, we are still waiting to bring forward provisions specific to renewable energy generation.</p> <p>The single page you refer to in your e-mail on Utility Installation (Section 213) does not apply to renewable energy generation.</p>



Last year, a City-initiated zoning by-law amendment added “renewable energy generation facility” a new land use to the Zoning By-law, but the use was not included as a permitted use in any zone. This means that a zoning by-law amendment must be approved by Council before a renewable energy generation facility is permitted on a property.

Staff are working to bring a report on Battery Energy Storage Systems this Fall. If you would like to be added to the list of people to be notified of this report, please let us know at [newzoning@ottawa.ca](mailto:newzoning@ottawa.ca). The timing of zoning for other types such as solar and wind is currently pending further direction from the province and is therefore still under review.

<b>Question:</b>	Where can I find the new zoning By-law that would allow you to build 4 units?
<b>Response:</b>	<p>The new Zoning By-law proposes to permit at least four dwelling units on any parcel of urban residential land as defined under the Planning Act (i.e. fully serviced residential lot). This is in accordance with changes to the Planning Act made by the provincial government via Bill 23, as well as the City’s commitments to CMHC’s Housing Accelerator Fund. Work on the new zoning by-law draft aims to ensure the implementation of the Planning Act.</p> <p>For proposed zoning by-law provisions around this topic, I would suggest referring to the following in the Draft 1 document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 801 – Neighbourhood Zones 1-6 (N1- N6), Subsections (5)(e)(i), (iii), and (iv) – New provisions to ensure that at least four dwelling units are permitted on a parcel of urban residential land as defined by the Planning Act, even if density calculations would say otherwise</li> <li>• Section 701 – Coach Houses, Subsection (1) – Carried forward from Sections 133(1)(a) and 133(3) of the current Zoning By-law with modifications to reflect that all fully serviced N1-N6 zones will allow four dwelling units on a lot, which may be configured as either four units within the principal building or three units in the principal building plus one unit in a coach house.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 709 – Oversize Dwelling Units, Subsection (1) – Revised from Section 54 of the current Zoning By-law, where oversize dwelling units were originally only intended to be permitted as-of-right in detached dwellings and a maximum of eight bedrooms in an oversize dwelling unit is permitted. Given that it is proposed to allow four dwelling units on any fully serviced residential lot, the maximum cumulative number of bedrooms contemplated on a lot containing an oversize dwelling unit is revised to sixteen (i.e. four standard 4-bedroom dwelling units times 4).</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Question:</b>	Why are some neighbourhoods being divided into two or more zones?
<b>Response:</b>	<p>Some areas within residential neighbourhoods are located within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay as defined in the City’s Official Plan. As per Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan, the Overlay <i>“is applied to areas of the Neighbourhood Designation in close proximity to Hubs and Corridors to signal a gradual evolution over time that will see a change in character to support intensification, including guidance for a change in character from suburban to urban to allow new built forms and more diverse functions of land. The intent is to identify areas that may gradually evolve through intensification to a more urban than suburban built form.”</i></p> <p>One of the criteria set out in the Official Plan for a lot to be considered “within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay” for the new Zoning By-law is whether a property is generally within 150 m of a Mainstreet or hub. Lots that meet that criteria are generally proposed to be rezoned to a higher density Neighbourhood (N) zone as opposed to a lower density zone for the interior of the neighbourhood, in accordance with the aforementioned Official Plan policy.</p>



<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>The new Zoning By-law has no section on the Evolving Overlay, now called the "Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay" pursuant to Omnibus Official Amendment No. 1 approved by Council on Sept. 13, 2023. I could find no occurrence of the expression in the text of the By-law.</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, which applies to areas in close proximity to hubs, Mainstreets, and transit stations as defined in the Official Plan, is proposed to be addressed in the Zoning By-law by applying higher density Neighbourhood (N) zones to the areas to which it applies. For example, in the Outer Urban transect, areas currently zoned R1 in the current Zoning By-law 2008-250 are generally proposed to go to a N2 zone in the new By-law where not located within the Overlay, and to a N3 zone where located within the Overlay.</p> <p>More information on the methodology behind how the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay policies of the Official Plan were applied can be found in the Draft 1 report which went to Joint Committee and Council in April/May, which can be found at this link. More specifically, Document 10 of the report focuses on the Neighbourhood zones and how they are applied in the draft By-law. Please refer to the sections titled "Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay" starting on Page 16 as well as "Mapping the Neighbourhood Zones" starting on Page 17.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>In the case of dual zoning on a segment of a minor corridor, such as a Hub (H3) on a minor corridor CM3, which designation takes precedence and what provisions in the Zoning By-law regulate this situation?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>This confusion may be related to the distinction between Official Plan designations and the zoning designations that implement them. There are two layers to our planning framework. The Official Plan designates lands as Minor Corridor or Hub; the Zoning By-law provides zones (i.e. H3 or CM3) to implement those designations. In some cases, a Minor Corridor might pass through a Hub, in which case the Hub designation will take precedence, in keeping with Section 6.1.1(6) of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Dual zoning should not be occurring – if two zones are appearing on the map for the same lands, please notify staff of the location so that this may be resolved. It is likely a technical error.</p>





<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>How can density targets in the proposed ZBL be more than double what is in the OP? As we in Kitchissippi are aware, there is no such thing as slow-moving, "Gentle Intensification". Significant redevelopment happens fast. It is not accompanied by concomitant increases in the greenspace, public services, schools, etc. that make a city livable.</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>OP uph targets and Neighbourhood zone uph maximums are, despite both using "units per hectare", measuring different things at two different scales:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The density targets in the Official Plan represent the average level of density that is intended to be achieved across the entirety of each transect. For example, the 60-80 UPH target prescribed in the OP for neighbourhoods in the Inner Urban transect is an average that applies across the entirety of that transect.</li> <li>•The units-per-hectare maximums in the N1-N4 zones, however, are just that – they are the maximum intended to be permitted on a lot, and apply on an individual lot basis (as zoning does more generally). For example, if an individual 15 m x 30 m lot contains a detached dwelling (1 unit), that lot has a density of 22 UPH. The overall density of the neighbourhood in which that lot is located may be higher or lower depending on the lot sizes and types of housing that exist within the rest of the neighbourhood.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Section 501 mentions the floodplain map and I was wondering if this includes the 1 in 350-year flood map. If the 1 in 350 flood map does not inform development, is there a reason?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>Under the Planning Act, the Official Plan must be in conformity with the Provincial Policy Statement. Likewise, under the Planning Act, the Zoning By-law must implement and be in conformity with the policies in both the Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement. The flood plain overlay in the current and draft Zoning By-laws implements the policies in the Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan, which prohibit development in the 1 in 100 year flood plain.</p>





For details in the Provincial Policy Statement, refer to the definition on page 43, which for river, stream and small inland lake systems defines the flooding hazard limit as the one-hundred-year flood. For details in the City of Ottawa Official Plan, refer to Section 10.1.1. 1), which states, 1) Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in the 1 in 100 year flood plain or in an erosion hazard area.

Regarding climate change, policy 3.1.3 on page 32 of the Provincial Policy Statement directs municipalities to address climate change in relation to hazards, stating the following, 3.1.3 Planning authorities shall prepare for the impacts of a changing climate that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards.

To address this provincial policy, new policies were introduced in the Official Plan in Section 10.1.3 concerning the 1 in 350 year flood plain. These policies are intended to be implemented through community planning processes that will direct sensitive land uses away from the 1 in 350 year flood plain before new communities are built, and at the site level through the development review process when development is proposed on a parcel of land located in the 1 in 350 year flood plain.

The policies in the Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan do not apply prohibitions on development in the 1 in 350 year flood plain. For this reason, there is no policy basis for prohibiting development in the 1 in 350 flood plain in the Zoning By-law. Of course, all development is prohibited in the 1 in 100 year flood plain, so when new communities are being planned, development is not permitted in the 1 in 100 flood plain in a new community or on any lot in the city.

To sum up, at this point under the Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan, there is no direction to prohibit development in the 1 in 350 year flood plain. However, the Official Plan takes proactive measures to direct sensitive land uses away from the 1 in 350 year flood plain in new communities before they are built. For lots in the 1 in 350 year flood plain located in areas of the city that are not in planned new communities, the policies in the Official Plan require flood risk to be evaluated through the site plan control or plan of subdivision process, and mitigation measures must be applied as part of the planning and design of the site through servicing studies required as part of the development approvals process.



<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>What considerations of property values have been taken into account in the new Zoning By-law?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>Regarding property values, there is no evidence to suggest that development applications and new construction adversely impact property values, and such assessments are not considered by planning in review of applications, including Rezoning.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Currently, the minimum lot width is measured at the front wall of the building, not at the front property line. Would that be the location of the new proposed measurement (15 metres) for the new zoning bylaw as well?</p> <p>Regarding the widening of driveways: Say the lot meets the 15-metre minimum setback between the front property line and front of the primary building, does this mean that the driveway can be widened at that spot and cars can be parked side by side?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>In Section 199 of Draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law, lot width is defined as the following:</p> <p>“Lot Width means the horizontal distance between the side lot lines measured at right angles to the lot depth, from a point that is equal to the front yard setback requirement for the primary zone.”</p> <p>As well, if the lot in question is proposed to be zoned Neighbourhood, please know there are front yard landscaping requirements per Section 803 of Draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law (Pages 171-172) that would apply. If the lot in question is 15 metres wide, then 40% of the front yard needs to be provided as contiguous soft landscaped area.</p>



<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Based on the shape &amp; location of existing single-family homes with space for coach houses in the city, it's very awkward (from a good water flow standpoint) for the water sewer to be connected to the city sewer through the existing building. Can the zoning permit coach houses sewer out be directly connected to the city, separate from the existing building? I believe the intent of having the sewer of a coach house go through the main building was to prevent lot severance. However, lot severance is an administrative decision where the answer could be no, even if the coach house and main house connect to the city sewer separately. Allowing the coach house and main house to connect to the city sewer separately would encourage more units to be built, because it would not force someone to rip up their finished basement to dig deeper &amp; wider for a coach house sewer connection.</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>In general, where a unit is intended to be permitted as a coach house, the intent is that coach house be accessory to a principal building. This is why a coach house is required to be located on the same lot as the principal dwelling and must be serviced from the principal dwelling. It is worth also noting that the Official Plan policy also speaks to this.</p> <p>Where a separate residential building located on the same lot is serviced separately, the lot as a whole would instead be defined as a “planned unit development” and the lot including both buildings would be subject both to the provisions of the applicable zone (e.g. if the lot is zoned N1-N6 – Neighbourhood in Draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law, it would be subject to the Neighbourhood zone provisions of Section 801 starting on Page 166) as well as the Planned Unit Development provisions in Section 703 of the Draft By-law, shown on Page 158 of the draft text.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Will the new Zoning By-law regulate e-bike charging?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>We are not currently anticipating regulating e-bike charging in the new Zoning By-law. The main issue is that it would involve reviewing electrical plans to ensure compliance, which are not typically regulated by zoning. However, there is nothing in the current or new draft zoning by-law that would prevent e-bike charging facilities from being installed in bike parking areas.</p>



<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>If two semi-detached dwellings are built on a 60' lot, or even a 50' wide lot, will 4 units be allowed on each side of the semi (or maybe five or more if the maximum density allows for it)?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>While the Neighbourhood zones of the Zoning By-law indeed propose to allow up to four-unit buildings on every serviced residential lot with a Neighbourhood zone, in the case of a semi-detached dwelling the entirety of the building would have to meet the maximum permitted density and thus four units may not necessarily be permitted in each half if that were to result in that density being exceeded. For example, in the case of a 15 m x 30 m N2 zoned lot, this would come out to a maximum of 6 dwelling units total, and this total would apply the same way even if those six dwelling units were configured in a “semi-detached” form.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Can you explain the implementation process for applying Evolving Neighbourhood overlays?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>Thank you for your email and your interest in the draft By-law. Staff would refer to the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay policies detailed in Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan as to how these were applied in the draft Zoning By-law.</p> <p>As such, lands generally located within 150 metres from either street, as well as lands within 150 metres of the extent of the Hub designation, would be considered to be within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay and accordingly are proposed to be zoned a higher density Neighbourhood zone (e.g. N3) in the draft By-law.</p> <p>More information about how the mapping of the Neighbourhood zones was determined for the draft Zoning By-law, including how the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay policies were applied, can be found in the staff report on the draft Zoning By-law, and in particular Document 10 of this report (“Neighbourhood N1-N6 Zones and Provisions”), found here: <a href="https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178621">https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178621</a>.</p>



<p><b>Question:</b></p>	<p>Could you please explain what the text on page 168 of the Draft 1: "even if density calculations would say otherwise," refers to?</p>
<p><b>Response:</b></p>	<p>The provisions drafted around "four units per lot" are as follows in the draft By-law, from Section 801(5)(e):</p> <p>"Where the maximum permitted density in Table 801A would result in fewer than four dwelling units permitted in the whole of a building on a lot serviced by municipal water and sewerage systems with adequate capacity, a maximum of four dwelling units is permitted in that building provided all other provisions of this By-law are met". For example, the provisions for maximum building height, minimum lot width and all setbacks from lot lines would need to be met for four units to be permitted.</p> <p>Note that the provision refers to the whole of a building – in other words, if the density calculation results in the maximum number of units in a single building being four or less, then four units would be permitted in that building regardless of the density calculation. However, if the lot contains (for example) one half of a semi-detached, then the "four units" provision would not kick in. (The semi-detached would still be required to permit two additional units as is required by Bill 23, but in the case of a lot containing one half of a semi the lot would not be required to allow a fourth unit.)</p>