

**858 WINGATE AVE, OTTAWA, ON K1G 1S5 :  
PROJECT INFORMATION RE: MINOR VARIANCE**

**EXISTING BUILDING / PROPERTY:**

**Description:** Single storey detached residential building

**Zoning:** R1 - O

**Existing Building Area:** 120 sq.m. (1290 sq.ft.)

**Building Height:** 1 storey plus basement (approx. 4.7m [15'-6"])

**Existing Gross Floor Area (above grade):** 112 sq.m. (1210 sq.ft.) on 1 floor.

**Parking:** Existing parking is on the East side between the front facade & front property line.

**Committee of Adjustment  
Received | Reçu le**

**Revised | Modifié le : 2024-09-19**

**City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa  
Comité de dérogation**

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

**GARAGE:** The proposal seeks to add a garage building in the South-East rear corner of the property. This garage will be served by the existing driveway, although the driveway will need to be extended by approximately 14 feet.

**OVERVIEW and BACKGROUND:**

The intended Detached Garage is for use by the property owner to store vehicles and seasonal sports and yard equipment. Although there is no critical requirement for such a garage, many properties in the area feature rear detached garages,

**NEARBY GARAGES within the same ZONE:**

Some examples of similar construction within the neighbourhood are below :

794 Quinlan - rear detached garage



796 Wingate - rear detached garage



826 Quinlan - rear detached garage



1985 Arch - rear detached garage



It is understood that the garages shown above may have been built without the benefit of a Minor Variance OR at a time when the Zoning allowance permitted buildings with such proximity to property lines or even perhaps without a Permit. However, given they have not posed a problem to the neighbours - no complaint has been made about a non-permissible structure, leading to its removal - it can reasonably be inferred that such garages are not considered problematic by the adjacent property owners or by the larger community.

#### **APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE:**

Formally, this application is for the following:

The zoning regulations for detached garages indicate the building (including the eaves) to be setback from an interior side lot line or rear lot line 0.6m (23.5").

For this project, the proposal is to have the garage wall at 0.6m (23.5"). The eaves and gutter would then project a further 0.43m to the side and 0.3m to the rear.

The eaves would then would be .18m (7") from the side property line and 0.3m from the rear property line and therefore non-compliant.

Further, the driveway would require extension in order to get to the garage. The zoning regulations limit driveway location and length and require an edge of soft landscaping. This driveway occupies 100% of the side yard and therefore is non-compliant.

**As a result, this application seeks relief from :**

- roof eaves within the protected side yard area (regulation = 0.6m; proposed = 0.18m)
- roof eaves within 0.3m of the rear property line (regulation = 0.6m; proposed = 0.3m)
- driveway less than regulated min. width (regulation = 2.6m, Proposed = existing size to be maintained = 2.34m)
- driveway size/location (regulation = 50% of occupied yard; proposed = 100% of yard)
- driveway with no soft landscaping at interior side lot line (regulation indicates 0.15m of soft landscaping at interior lot edge; existing driveway = 0.0m of soft landscaping)

**Note:** It' seems worthy to distinguish the driveway minor variances area a matter of the existing condition no longer matching the current regulations versus the owner's desire for something unusual. The driveway has existed in its current form, less than regulated min. width, occupying the whole of the side-yard and featuring no soft landscaping at lot line edge since the origin of the property.

#### **MINOR VARIANCE CONSIDERATIONS:**

**1. Is the variance minor?** Yes

**2. Is the variance desirable for the appropriate development or use of the property?** In the view of the owner and designer, the proposal represents a practical and functional improvement with little or no negative impacts to nearby properties.

**3. Is the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law maintained?**

In the view of the owner and designer - Yes.

**4. Is the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan maintained?**

In the view of the owner and designer - Yes.

The following is a statement from the homeowner to help explain the reasons and intentions for the development.

*The request to have the garage closer to the boundary than is permitted is to allow a vehicle to be driven directly into the garage without having to veer right*

*after moving past the house. Likewise when reversing a vehicle out of the garage, there would be considerable maneuvering required to avoid contact with the garage door frame and the rear corner the house. If the variance was not granted, this offset would be too great to get a vehicle in/out of the garage.*

**IMPACT:**

Despite the intended proposal being non-conforming, it proposes structures and features that are consistent with other properties and in compliance with the general neighbourhood.

In conclusion, it is the owner and designer's opinion that the information shown here indicates the proposed development is appropriate. We respectfully request the members of the Committee of Adjustments to reach the same conclusion.

**Renzo Cecchetto, B.I.D., BCIN #377253**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R30' followed by a stylized flourish.