



Draft 1 Consultation Summary

The engagement activities for the first draft of the New Zoning By-law facilitated meaningful public participation and feedback through various methods since the Draft 1 provisions were released to the public on May 31, 2024.

The project's EngageOttawa page garnered 50,000 hits during Draft 1 for a total of 80,000 hits throughout the project's entire duration. During the Draft 1 consultation, over 2,300 individuals attended a mix of in-person and virtual meetings, and the project received well over 800 email and electronic comments and questions from the public. Information on comments received by the project.

Key engagement activities for Draft1 included a virtual city-wide open house held on June 20, 2024, which saw participation from 325 individuals. The As-We-Heard-It report from this event was included in the project's Information Previously Distributed (IPD) report tabled at the Planning and Housing Committee on September 11, 2024, and can be found in this document as Appendix I.

Additionally, five virtual sessions were held in July, August, and September to provide Ward-specific information on the proposed zoning changes. Staff presented a city-wide overview of the proposed By-law before breaking out into ward-specific presentations followed by a question and answer period. The As-We-Heard-It report for these virtual sessions was tabled along with the Q4 2024 staff update to the Planning and Housing Committee on December 04, 2024, and can be found in this document as Appendix III.

In the fall, five in-person workshops were held throughout the city. Information boards were provided to participants to learn about the project and key changes to the Zoning By-law. The workshops featured stations focused on different topics, allowing participants to discuss their concerns with City Planners and fellow attendees. Members of Youth Ottawa assisted with registration and note-taking. More information on the in-person workshops can be found in this document as Appendix IV.

The advertising campaign, which ran from May to October 2024, utilized a mix of print, online, social media, and out-of-home advertising to reach a broad audience, raising awareness and encouraging participation. Additional information on the project's advertising campaign can be found in Appendix VI.

Key Themes

The consultation process for the first draft of the New Zoning By-law, revealed several key themes during the public engagement period. In residential areas, participants expressed interest in the impact of intensification on greenspace, infrastructure, and overall quality of life. Issues such as light and noise pollution, privacy, and property



values were frequently mentioned. There were also calls to reconsider the proposed elimination of distinctions between certain subzones and to address the need for missing middle housing in suburban areas, while other comments considered retaining the look and feel of their community as an important concern to them.

For Mixed-Use Zones, feedback highlighted several concerns about high-density development. Residents living in low-density housing near taller buildings often raised issues related to shadowing. There were also worries about the mixed use areas into local residential areas could lead to a loss of neighborhood character and increased traffic congestion. Additionally, concerns were expressed about the potential for high-density development to contribute to urban sprawl, impacting the availability of greenspace and leading to overcrowded infrastructure. Noise pollution from increased activity in mixed-use areas and the impact on privacy were also common themes.

Parking emerged as another significant theme, with mixed opinions on the removal of parking minimums. Some participants suggested implementing parking maximums and discussed the impact of reduced on-site garages on electric vehicle charging. There were also requests for more driveway space to support to accommodate multiple vehicles especially in areas with low transit servicing.

The importance of soft landscaping and sufficient space for tree growth to mitigate climate change impacts was emphasized. In Rural Zones, participants discussed the use of agricultural and rural residential lands and suggested allowing more secondary dwellings on rural properties. The consultation also highlighted the need for effective stormwater management, with comments about exemptions for large additions and the necessity of adequate provisions for new developments.

General feedback included support for developing a density calculator and suggestions for improving clarity in the zoning by-law language. Overall, the community's feedback underscored a range of interests and priorities regarding the new Zoning By-law. The city is committed to addressing these themes and ensuring that the by-law supports sustainable, inclusive, and resilient development. Insights from this feedback will inform the next draft of the Zoning By-law, aligning it with the community's needs and the goals of the Official Plan.

Summary of Key Metrics

- **Points of Contact:**
 - **Emails:** 850 comments and questions from the public.
 - **Meetings:** Over 2300 people attended various meetings.
- **EngageOttawa:**
 - **Total Visits to EngageOttawa:** 80,000



- 640 Engage Ottawa subscribers
- **Engagement Activities:**
 - **Virtual City-Wide Open House:** 1 session – 354 attendees
 - **Virtual Ward-Specific Meetings:** Conducted for all 24 wards in 5 sessions.
 - **In-Person Workshops:** 5 sessions.

Working Groups and Advisory Committees

New Zoning By-law Sponsors Group

The new Zoning By-law Councillor Sponsor Group (CSG) was established to support and champion the project. The 2022-2026 Term of Council members include Councillors Jeff Leiper, Glen Gower, Laine Johnson, David Hill, and Catherine Kitts. City membership comprises the General Manager of the Planning, Development and Building Services Department, along with relevant members of the new Zoning By-law team. From July 2024 to February 2025, the team met seven times with the CSG to provide updates on key issues and public consultation strategies.

Key issues discussed included those previously reported to the Council in IPD reports submitted to the Planning and Housing Committee in September 2024 and December 2025. Additional issues presented to the CGS include:

- Maximum building heights in Neighbourhood Zones (N1 and N2)
- Density modeling
- Distribution of N3 and N4 zones on the zoning map
- Building height transitions
- Public engagement

FCA-GOHBA Working Group

From June to December 2024, the Zoning team engaged in a series of consultations with representatives from the Federation of Citizens Associations (FCA) and the Greater Ottawa Home Builders Association (GOHBA). These consultations focused on five key topics: Rural Provisions, Suburban Provisions, Infill Development, High-Rise Buildings, and Hubs and Corridors. The main themes and feedback from these discussions have been incorporated into the second draft of the Zoning By-law.



Rural Provisions

Discussions centered on rural areas' unique needs, including commercial permissions, minimum lot sizes, and driveway dimensions. Both organizations emphasized the need to differentiate between serviced and unserved lots, leading to clarifications in Draft 2. Updates to rural zones aim to make the by-law easier to navigate by reordering and consolidating zones.

Suburban Provisions

Key issues included site constraints for suburban residential development, such as yard setbacks, landscaping requirements, and parking needs. Both FCA and GOHBA supported expanding permissions for communal parking. Concerns about restrictive driveway widths led to adjustments in Draft 2, setting a maximum driveway width of 50% of the lot width for suburban properties.

Infill Development

FCA highlighted the importance of stormwater management, while GOHBA suggested modifications to shared driveway parking requirements. Draft 2 reflects these inputs by adjusting hammerhead turnaround requirements and omitting specific building articulation measures.

High-Rise Buildings

Consultations focused on height transition frameworks for high-rise buildings adjacent to low-rise areas. FCA stressed adequate rear yard setbacks, while GOHBA provided insights on common tower heights and site requirements. These discussions informed the height transition framework in Draft 2.

Hubs and Corridors

Meetings addressed concerns about lot depths limiting building heights and densities. GOHBA emphasized maintaining current development rights. Feedback led to the removal of minimum ground floor height requirements in certain zones and a reduction in others, allowing greater flexibility for ground floor uses.

Ambassadors Working Group

The project team met for a second time with the Ambassadors Working Group, a body representing 11 traditionally underrepresented equity and inclusion communities established originally during consultation for the new Official Plan. This group provides Planning staff advice and insight to address key topics on equity in land use planning. For Draft 1, discussions with members focused on rural, walkable communities and mobility accessibility concerns.



Planning Advisory Committee

Staff presented to the Planning Advisory Committee PAC on December 17, 2024. No formal feedback was received by PAC



As We Heard It Report


To kick-off consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a city-wide virtual information session has held on June 20, 2024 from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. This session presented an overview of key concepts of the proposed by-law and what to expect in future engagements. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a zoning by-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- An overview of the Industrial, Transportation, Institutional, Greenspace, Recreation and Special District zones
- An overview of the rural provisions

There was a total of 325 participants who attended the City-wide Information.

The following includes comments provided during the meeting as well as the submission of written comments after the meeting.

Attendance Based on Wards:





Index – Question Themes

	Theme	Page No.
1	15-Minute Neighbourhoods	2
2	Mixed-use	5
3	Neighbourhoods	11
4	Parking	26
5	Trees	29
6	Rural Zones	30
7	Secondary Plans	30
8	Energy	32
9	Floodplains	33
10	Other Topics	34

1) 15-Minute Neighbourhoods

Comment:	<p>N5 zoning allows some limited commercial uses, while N4 and lower do not. N4 zones allow for considerable density, and without permitting these limited commercial uses, it is likely that these areas will not have the local shops, cafes and restaurants needed to support 15-minute neighborhoods.</p>
Response:	<p>The N5 zones are proposed for mid-rise buildings, while the N6 zones are for high-rise. The non-residential "conditional" uses permitted for N5 and N6 zones are a successor to, and consolidation of, similar non-residential permissions in the R5 subzones of the existing Zoning By-law 2008-250 (intended for mid- and high-rise buildings).</p> <p>Other zones in the new Zoning By-law draft are intended to contemplate permissions for non-residential uses within the Neighbourhoods designation. An example is the "-c" or "neighbourhood commercial suffix", in Section 804 of the draft By-law and would apply to any property with the "-c" suffix.</p> <p>As part of work on the new By-law Draft 2, Staff are looking at options for introducing permissions for non-residential uses (which may include via the -c suffix or NMU zone) on more sites in residential neighbourhoods, in line with the Official Plan direction to support 15-min neighbourhoods.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>What is the difference between Mainstreet Corridors and Transit Corridors? How does that affect proposed zoning and other policies? For example: All Hazeldean is a Mainstreet Corridor, but only part of it is a Transit Corridor.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan speaks of corridors in two senses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit corridors, in Schedule C2, speaks mainly to transit routing and which streets are expected to receive dedicated bus lanes or similar infrastructure. • Corridors as a land use designation, in Schedules B1-B8, will be the determinant for what kind of zoning applies to those lands. <p>While some streets may not be indicated as transit-priority corridors, they could be designated as Corridors in the land-use sense, which means they are slated for some commercial and mixed-use development.</p> <p>Transit corridors and “land-use corridors” will frequently overlap since the OP aims to align development with existing and planned infrastructure. However, from a policy-interpretation standpoint, heights, setbacks, and permitted uses will be tied specifically to the latter.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Given constraints such as parking, why are small businesses (e.g., bakeries) being encouraged to locate in residential homes near places where people gather, such as schools?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Policy 4 in Section 6.3.1 of the Official Plan states in part:</p> <p><i>"The Zoning By-law and approvals under the Planning Act shall allow a range of residential and non-residential built forms within the Neighbourhood designation, including: [...] d) To provide for a range of local services and promote the emergence or strengthening of 15-minute neighbourhoods, the Zoning By-law may permit compatible and complementary small-scale non-residential uses and services (including retail, service, cultural, leisure and entertainment uses) that primarily serve residents within walking distance [...]"</i>.</p>



Comment:	I've observed that local, small, privately owned food stores have closed to make way for residential towers. How can this issue be mitigated through the 15-minute community plan?
Response:	Making 15-minute neighbourhoods is a matter of allowing the city to evolve naturally: we create a framework flexible enough to accommodate retail, services, and amenities, as well as the residential densities sufficient to support them. As the area matures, infrastructure, services, and street design improvements follow.

Comment:	When you spoke about 15-minute neighbourhoods, you spoke of walking, cycling and public transit. Are cars considered in the 15-minute calculations?
Response:	<p>In the new Official Plan, 15-Minute Neighbourhoods are described as: <i>“Compact, well-connected places with a clustering of a diverse mix of land uses where daily and weekly needs can be accessed within a 15-minute walk...”</i></p> <p>It is proposed to replace minimum parking ratios with a choice-based approach that gives property owners and developers the flexibility to provide the amount of parking they require, aligning parking supply and demand.</p> <p>Elimination of parking requirements will encourage more efficient use of land and create more comfortable walking environments. The increased densities and permissions for a mix of land uses will help bring local services and amenities closer to where people live, decreasing reliance on private vehicles.</p> <p>Removing minimum parking ratios does not mean new developments built in Ottawa will not have on-site parking. Nor does it mean that the number of parking spaces provided will necessarily be lower in the short-term. By shifting away from minimum parking ratios towards a choice-based approach, in the long-term this will assist with the creation and enhancement of more-transit supportive, walkable neighbourhoods in the city.</p>



Comment:	Will you include a definition of "walking distance" like other cities? Walking distance cannot correspond to aerial distance.
Response:	While not specifically defined in our draft zoning by-law, we do use the term in certain sections. Where a term is used that is not defined, it has its everyday meaning. Rest assured, we understand the difference between the linear, aerial distance and the distance one is generally able to walk along paths, rights-of-way, and sidewalks. Where necessary to differentiate between the two measurements, it has been included in the provisions of that section.

2) Mixed-use

Comment:	If Hubs and Corridors are distinct designations, why is a Hub allowed to overlap a Corridor?
Response:	<p>Hubs and Corridors are designated under Part 6 the City's Official Plan and on the transect (B-series) Schedules.</p> <p>Corridors are broken down into two sub-types under the Official Plan - Mainstreets and Minor Corridors - and the designation applies to specified streets where a greater degree of density, mix of uses and higher-level transit service are combined.</p> <p>Hubs, on the other hand, are areas surrounding planned or existing rapid transit stations and/or frequent transit stops. Hubs are intended to concentrate a diversity of land uses, higher density development, a greater degree of mixed uses and greater transit connectivity than other designations. As per Section 6, Policy 6.1.1(6) of the Official Plan, where corridors intersect with Hubs, the building height policies applicable to Hubs will prevail over the corridor policies.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>In the new proposed provisions, does it speak to the replacement for angular plan transitions between high- and low-rise areas?</p>
<p>Comment:</p>	<p>I am concerned that more density, especially along Main Street Corridors and Hubs, will cast shadows on nearby residential areas and cause privacy issues despite required setbacks and vegetation buffers.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan requires that the new Zoning By-law include height transition requirements between a Hub or Corridor and surrounding low-rise Neighbourhoods by <i>“providing a gradual change in height and massing, through the stepping down of buildings, and setbacks from the low-rise properties, generally guided by the application of an angular plane.”</i></p> <p>Height transition provisions are in MS1 and MS2 zone provisions tables. The proposed approach is a series of graduated height permissions that increase with distance from any abutting low-rise neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Corridor lands that permit high-rise development will be subject to an on-site transition framework based on graduated rear- and interior-yard setbacks, such that feasible building heights increase on deeper lots as distance from abutting low-rise areas increases. Where a proposed development can meet required tower setbacks, it is anticipated that a maximum height of 25 storeys will accommodate most “ordinary” high-rise building developments, such that zoning by-law amendments for height will be limited to proposals for exceptionally tall buildings.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>How are sites selected for greater permitted heights?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan sets out policies concerning maximum building heights that are permitted in the Hub, Mainstreet Corridor, Minor Corridor and Neighbourhood designations in the Official Plan. These policies are included in Section 5 of the Official plan and are summarized in Table 7 on page 3 of Section 5. Policies for maximum building height vary, depending on which designation and transect a property is located in.</p>



Comment:	Is the 45-degree plane the only factor that is considered for gradual height transitions?
Response:	Angular planes are still relevant and applied judiciously to ensure good design. However, they are not the only factor considered for gradual height transitions. Policy 4.6.6.2) of the Official Plan provides direction concerning angular planes and zoning, "2) Transitions between Mid-rise and High-rise buildings, and adjacent properties designated as Neighbourhood on the B-series of schedules, will be achieved by providing a gradual change in height and massing, through the stepping down of buildings, and setbacks from the Low-rise properties, generally guided by the application of an angular plane as may be set in the Zoning By-law or by other means in accordance with Council-approved Plans and design guidelines."

Comment:	What are the height considerations when near a transit hub versus on a main street corridor? What are the implications if the Mainstreet corridor is NOT a transit corridor? Should that not impact density and height?
Response:	<p>Detailed policies on the maximum building heights permitted in the Hub and Mainstreet Corridor designations are found in the Official Plan Section 5. The policies differ depending on which transect the Hub or Corridor is located in.</p> <p>For example, in the Inner Urban transect, the maximum building height in a Hub designation is up to 40 storeys for areas within a 300-metre radius or 400 metre walking distance of an existing or planned rapid transit station.</p> <p>For areas further away from the transit station, the maximum building height is up to 40 storeys where the parcel is of sufficient size to allow for a transition in built form and massing storeys.</p> <p>Along Mainstreets in the Inner Urban transect, permitted building heights are as follows, subject to appropriate height transitions, setbacks, and angular planes:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) On sites that front on segments of streets whose right-of-way (after widening requirements have been exercised) is 30 metres or greater as identified in Schedule C16 for the planned street context, and where the parcel is of sufficient size to allow for a transition in built</p>



form massing, not less than two storeys and up to high-rise (40 storeys);

b) On sites that front on segments of streets whose right-of-way is narrower than 30 metres, generally up to nine storeys except where a secondary plan or area-specific policy specifies different heights; and

c) In all cases:

i) The wall heights directly adjacent to a street, and the heights of the podiums of high-rise buildings, where permitted, shall be proportionate to the width of the abutting right of way, and consistent with the objectives in the urban design section on mid-rise and high-rise built form in Subsection 4.6.6, Policies 7), 8) and 9); and

ii) The height of such buildings may be limited further on lots too small to accommodate an appropriate height transition.

Buildings taller than 40 storeys may be permitted through secondary plan policies. On parcels that are within a designated Hub but not covered by a local plan, high-rise buildings are only permitted on parcels of sufficient size to allow for a transition in built form and massing, and their height will be lowest at the outer edge of the Hub and tallest at the centre of the Hub and near a rapid transit station.

The Official Plan refers to corridors in two senses. The first, transit corridors, is depicted on Schedule C2 and speaks mainly to transit routing and which streets are expected to receive dedicated bus lanes or similar infrastructure. The second, corridors as a land use designation, on Schedules B1-B8, and will be the determinant for what kind of zoning applies to those lands.

Transit corridors and “land-use corridors” will frequently overlap since the Official Plan aims to align development with existing and planned infrastructure. But from a policy-interpretation standpoint, heights, setbacks, and permitted uses are tied specifically to the latter.



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>A higher density of residents without the necessary services nearby to support them results in more people driving to access these services elsewhere. How will this be mitigated in the new zoning by-law?</p>
<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Is the new Zoning Bylaw going to include more mixed-use development, and promote a more car free City?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Neighbourhoods that are higher-density, and have higher populations, are generally able to support the establishment of businesses. These businesses can provide local services and amenities close to where people live, decreasing reliance on private vehicles.</p> <p>The Official Plan introduced the Minor Corridor designation in neighborhoods throughout the city. The new Zoning By-law introduces a new CM - Minor Corridor zone, to implement the policies for the Minor Corridor designation and introduce new permissions for the retail stores and services needed for the day-to-day needs of residents.</p> <p>There are other zones drafted for the new Zoning By-law that are intended to contemplate permissions for non-residential uses within the Neighbourhoods designation. One such example is the "-c" or "neighbourhood commercial suffix", the provisions of which are detailed in Section 804 of the draft By-law and would apply to any property with the "-c" suffix at the end of its zoning designation.</p> <p>The new NMU - Neighbourhood Mixed-Use Zone carries forward a simplified set of the current LC – Local Commercial and GM – General Mixed-Use Zones. These zones are located within the Neighbourhood designation and provide services and stores that serve the day-to-day needs of residents. This new zone is discussed below in Part 9 – Mixed-Use Zones.</p> <p>Mid-rise and high-rise buildings in the Neighbourhood designation zoned N5, which permits mid-rise buildings five to nine storeys, and N6 which permits high-rise buildings that are ten storeys and higher, will be permitted to have a range of non-residential uses subject to those uses being limited to the ground floor or basement of a building, including artist studio, bank, community centre, day care, instructional facility, medical facility, personal service business, recreation and athletic facility, retail store and restaurant.</p> <p>The new Zoning by-law draft expands permissions for home-based businesses, including those selling low-risk foods. This will make it easier and</p>



	<p>more convenient to access goods and services locally, as well as provide economic opportunities for small businesses, which contribute to healthy and thriving communities.</p> <p>In addition, as part of Draft 2, Staff are reviewing potential additional sites that can be zoned to allow for a greater range of non-residential uses more generally. This will be through use of either the Neighbourhood Commercial "-c" suffix or the Neighbourhood Mixed-Use (NMU) zone.</p> <p>For a detailed consideration of this topic, you may also refer to the Land Use Strategy Discussion Paper, found here: https://engage.ottawa.ca/zoning#folder-147135-28049</p>
--	---

Comment:	What is the difference in density for areas near transit hubs versus Main Street corridors?
Response:	All Hub areas (except for Tallwood and Knoxdale, Jeanne d'Arc, and Trim) are Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSAs). The minimum residential requirement for Hubs can vary between 150 to 350 dwellings per net hectare, based on Table 3a in the Official Plan, or what is specified in the respective Secondary Plans. For Mainstreet Corridors, the minimum residential density requirement in the Official Plan is 120 dwellings per net hectare. The draft Zoning By-law must implement zoning provisions that permit these minimum density requirements in the Official Plan.

Comment:	Where in the new Zoning By-law can we find provisions for the new NMU zone (formerly GM and/or LC zone)?
Response:	The new Neighbourhood Mixed-use zone (formerly GM zone) is in Part 9 - Mixed-Use Zones, Section 907 of Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law.



3) Neighbourhoods

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Staff highlighted to the Planning and Housing Committee the City's commitment to equity in addressing zoning designated priority neighbourhoods with lower incomes. How is the draft zoning bylaw addressing this commitment through neighbourhood zoning?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The new Zoning by-law will advance the Official Plan's healthy and inclusive communities policies in many ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will support the evolution of the overall walkability of neighbourhoods in the urban area and villages. Housing is central to fostering a sense of stability, security, and well-being. • It will help contribute to addressing Ottawa's housing supply and affordability challenges by aiming to increase peoples' access to a wider range of housing types, forms, and affordability. This includes zoning that will allow for more housing units on lots as well as more forms of housing such as multi-unit housing forms, recognizing that many kinds of housing can be compatible together. • It will serve to mitigate discriminatory "people zoning", where zoning rules have the effect of excluding housing that meets the needs of particular groups of people, such as people living on a low income, in group settings, or in alternative housing forms, from communities. <p>Elimination of parking requirements will encourage more efficient use of land and create more comfortable walking environments.</p> <p>The increased densities and permissions for a mix of land uses will help bring local services and amenities closer to where people live, decreasing reliance on private vehicles. This will help make it less expensive for people to move around the city by reducing the combined cost of housing and transportation, easing financial pressures on households, and leaving more money for other essentials.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>The boundaries of the evolving neighbourhood overlay are very ambiguous, represented by a blob and cluster of dots on the Official Plan map (Schedule B series). Where can we find information about the exact boundaries, (i.e., which lots or streets)?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan provides more explicit direction as to the intended extent of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO). Policy 1 of Section 5.6.1 states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The Evolving Neighborhood Overlay will be applied generally to the properties that have a lot line along a Minor Corridor; lands 150 meters from the boundary of a Hub or Mainstreet designation; and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station.”</i></p> <p>In the first draft of the New Zoning By-law the ENO policies are implemented via assigning higher-density primary Neighbourhood zones to areas considered to be located within the overlay. For example, in the case of the Outer Urban transect, a R1-zoned property within the ENO as described in Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan would generally be proposed to be zoned N3 in the draft zoning, whereas it would be generally proposed to be zoned N2 where the property is outside the ENO.</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: https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178621</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>The rear yard setbacks in neighbourhood zones are 25% or more of the lot depth. Would this be reduced if the building has a green roof?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Yard setbacks in the Neighbourhood zones are intended to be applied the same way regardless of the type of roof or presence of a green roof.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Has access to commercial services been considered in these higher density residential zones? Has there been consideration to permit commercial activity in N4 zones as is the case in N5 zones? Why are there so few areas zoned N5?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The non-residential "conditional" uses permitted for N5 and N6 zones are intended as a successor to, and consolidation of, similar non-residential permissions found in the current R5 subzones of Zoning By-law 2008-250, which are intended for mid- and high-rise buildings. These are consequently intended to be used for the mid-rise N5 and high-rise N6 zones.</p> <p>There are other zones drafted for the new Zoning By-law that are intended to contemplate permissions for non-residential uses within the Neighbourhoods designation. One such example is the "-c" or "neighbourhood commercial suffix", the provisions of which are detailed in Section 804 of the draft By-law and would apply to any property with the "-c" suffix at the end of its zoning designation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that as part of work on the 2nd draft of the new By-law, Staff are looking at options for introducing permissions for non-residential uses (which may include via the "-c" suffix or NMU zone) on a greater number of sites within residential neighbourhoods, in accordance with the direction in the Official Plan to support 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>The story map photos (https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/8a6d5bfc8ff040958b22aeaba4c272a5) make it look like there would not be much increase in density of buildings, just the number and size of the dwellings. If so, how can this be called intensification?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan prescribes that zoning for Neighbourhoods shall provide for a range of housing options in a context-sensitive form. The Neighbourhood zones are intended to provide for generally more dwelling units than the corresponding residential zones in Zoning By-law 2008-250. In many cases, this translates to an increased number of units permitted within a comparable built form to what zoning currently permits.</p>



Comment:	<p>Why does the N1 zone include a decrease in the maximum height? There is no reason to be decreasing building maximums in the suburbs. Setbacks and height limits should be significantly relaxed throughout the city, especially in suburbs.</p>
Response:	<p>The N1 and N2 zones in Draft 1 propose an 8.5 metre height limit, as these represent a consolidation of existing R1 and R2 zones, many of which do limit height to 2 storeys (8 or 8.5 metres).</p> <p>That said, Staff acknowledge that this would represent a decrease in the maximum permitted height in some R1 and R2 zones in the suburban transect, where a 3-storey (11 metre) height is presently permitted. As part of the work on Draft 2, Staff will be looking at options to further refine the Neighbourhood zone provisions including height permissions, which may include carrying forward permissions for 11 metre building heights in zones where they presently exist (so that there is no reduction in the permitted building envelope from present requirements).</p>

Comment:	<p>Will inclusive affordable housing also pertain to senior and retirement homes, as it should?</p>
Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law is moving away from typology-based zoning, focusing instead on building form. This direction begins with the premise that housing is where people live, and that housing is compatible with other kinds of housing. For a detailed consideration of this topic, you may refer to the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Discussion Paper: (https://engage.ottawa.ca/zoning#folder-147135-28048).</p> <p>Due to this new direction, Subsection (1), Section 705 – Retirement Homes and Residential Care Facilities is proposed to permit a retirement home or a residential care facility in any zone where a residential unit is permitted.</p> <p>In Section 705, Subsections (1) and (3) – are new provisions to implement policies in Section 4.2 of the Official Plan. The policies in that section direct that the Zoning By-law will permit alternative, cooperative or shared accommodation housing forms serving individuals for whom an entire dwelling unit is unnecessary, unaffordable, or inappropriate.</p>



Comment:	Is development capped in a particular neighborhood when the units per ha is reached?
Response:	The units per hectare limits are intended to be applied on a per-lot basis. The maximum density restriction controls how many units can be built on an individual site and is not dependent on how many other sites in the same neighbourhood have redeveloped, nor what density other lots have previously developed to.

Comment:	Based on the shape & 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 & wider for a coach house sewer connection.
Response:	<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>Comment:</p>	<p>Busy roads are noisy, dangerous, and polluted places. Pushing the highest densities of people onto the busiest roads would be discriminatory towards lower income residents. Are there proposed dense residential areas away from busy roads?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Yes, the intent of the new Zoning By-law is to zone for greater density and affordable forms in diverse areas, rather than just around major traffic hubs.</p> <p>Regarding intensification, work on the new Zoning By-law aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide diversity and affordability of housing choices. The OP calls for “diversity in unit sizes, densities and tenure options within neighbourhoods... to provide the widest possible range of price, occupancy arrangements and tenure.” (Policy 4.2(1)) • Provide for intensification in Neighbourhoods. Density targets in Neighbourhoods will require zoning to permit a variety of ground-oriented dwelling types (including in R1 and R2 zones); (Policy 3.2.(12) and Table 3b) • Provide permissions for “Missing Middle” low-rise infill apartments (of generally up to 12 units) in areas affected by the Evolving Overlay; (Policy 5.6.1.1 and Policy 6.3.1 (4)(b)) <p>The climate and housing crises are the central drivers of the new Neighbourhood zoning. To that end, the Official Plan calls directly for zoning to allow higher densities, and to allocate those densities to support healthy, complete, walkable and transit supportive neighbourhoods. Lands currently zoned R1, R2 or R3 will generally be zoned to allow densities equal to or greater than what they currently allow, based on their urban context.</p>



Comment:	Certain Inner Urban areas that were previously given new zoning standards via the R4 zoning review are proposed to be upzoned further in the draft Zoning By-law. How is this appropriate, it seems to remove potential for family accommodation and current missing middle walk-up housing?
Response:	In general, areas zoned R4 in the current By-law are proposed to be zoned N4 in the draft By-law, which permit development of up to four full storeys. Staff will review and refine this mapping as part of subsequent drafts, which may include R4 areas subject to the recent R4 zoning review in 2018-2020.

Comment:	How do you ensure that existing infrastructure (water and sewer, stormwater) can handle the intensification for up to 4 units in certain residential zones?
Comment:	Are the density targets/allowances reduced in areas without infrastructure?
Comment:	Rear yard parking often increases the amount of impermeable surfaces, which is a concern for climate change and communities without storm sewers. Will rear yard parking be prohibited in areas lacking storm sewers?
Response:	<p>Section 201 (Adequate Services and Stormwater Management) of the draft Zoning By-law contains regulations concerning adequacy of servicing and stormwater management, to ensure adequate infrastructure servicing has been addressed. These are carried over from the current Zoning By-law, however they have been strengthened and will be supported by programs to be initiated through the Infrastructure Master Plan. New provisions to require on-site stormwater management have been added to permit development, regardless of whether it is subject to site plan control. This is to provide on-site stormwater management where there is an increase in impermeable surfaces.</p> <p>Neighbourhoods without access to municipal water and sewer (i.e., on private wells and septic systems) are proposed to be limited in terms of number of dwelling units permitted to what they are permitted in the current By-law, and it is not proposed to permit up to four (or more) units in these areas.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>How can I calculate how many dwellings are permitted on my lot?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood (N1-N6) zones use a “units per hectare” (UPH) provision to limit the maximum density permitted on a given residential lot. The N1, N2, and N3 zones in particular limit the maximum density on a per-lot basis to 80, 150, and 250 UPH respectively.</p> <p>To calculate the UPH density of a given building on a given lot, this can be determined by dividing 10,000 sq m (1 hectare) by the lot’s area in square metres, and then multiplying the result by the number of units in the building. The density would not be permitted to exceed the maximum permitted in the primary zone.</p> <p>Alternatively, the maximum number of units permitted on a given lot can also be determined by multiplying the maximum permitted UPH by the lot area in square metres, dividing the result by 10000 square metres, and rounding to the nearest whole even number.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>The average rate of change seems to be misleading as half of the lots develop faster and half slower than the average.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The average change in a neighbourhood is just that - an average - and indeed some neighbourhoods will turn over at a rate above that average. However, the presentation illustrates "average" change to demonstrate that even where above average, a neighbourhood would not turn over in its entirety within the life of the Official Plan, even where zoning is more permissive in terms of permitted density. In addition, where turnover does occur, the intent with the new Zoning By-law for the Neighbourhood zones is generally that new development where it occurs is context sensitive, such that its built form is compatible (particularly in the interiors of neighbourhoods) and any undue adverse impacts are contained on the subject property of a given development to the extent possible.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>In the lowest density residential zone, will semis and towns be allowed or just buildings consisting of 4 apartment units? For instance, the R1 zones currently do not allow semis and towns but buildings consisting of 3 units. Permitting construction of units that can be severed (semis and towns) will help in achieving housing goals. Not everyone wants to build/own/buy apartment buildings. Apartment buildings are also very expensive and not affordable for most to build or buy.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>While the permitted densities of the Neighbourhood zones are intended to be scalable based on the size of the lot, such that the maximum number of units permitted increases the larger a given lot is, the N1 zone is generally intended to contemplate a maximum of four dwelling units in most cases.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Why is the N3 including an increase in the minimum front yard setback? Shouldn't we be reducing restrictions to allow for more housing on a single lot and increase density?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The primary zones regulate density and building height. The subzones regulate elements of character, namely lot widths and yard setbacks. The A subzone is the most “urban” character, the F subzone is the most “suburban” character. Subzones A through F are introduced to the primary Neighbourhood zones to reflect this range of existing characteristics in accordance with Official Plan direction.</p> <p>Front yard setbacks are a contributing factor to the character of a neighbourhood, with smaller front yard setbacks typical of a compact, urban character, and larger setbacks typical of suburban character. Front yard setbacks are a way to ensure sufficient space for soft landscaping, which is necessary for the retention and growth of front yard trees and street trees. This helps to mitigate the urban heat island impacts of climate change, improves air quality, and gives people exposure to greenness, which contributes to well-being.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Did the city consider a 4 storeys as-of-right policy as recommended by the province's task force?</p> <p>In summary, how do our commitments under the federal Housing Accelerator Fund relate to the new Zoning By-law?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Planning Act, as amended by Bill 23 in 2022, requires municipalities in Ontario to permit at least three dwelling units on any serviced residential lot. This requirement has already been implemented in the current Zoning By-law. In the new Draft Zoning By-law, it is proposed to permit at least four dwelling units on each lot, in accordance with the changes to the Planning Act as well as the City's commitments to CMHC's Housing Accelerator Fund.</p> <p>For proposed zoning by-law provisions around this topic, we suggest referring to the following in the Draft 1 document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 •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. •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).



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>How are the distinctions between the Inner and Outer Urban Areas of Ottawa reflected in the draft zoning bylaw? Looking at the Interactive Map, there seems to be no discernable difference in the permissions afforded to these two very different areas.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The proposed Neighbourhood zones in the first draft of the Zoning By-law are dependent on transect and whether a property is in the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay as designated in the Official Plan but are also based on what they are currently zoned. This is true for both the primary zone (N1-N6) but also the subzone (A-F).</p> <p>For example, as there is a greater direction to shift to a more urban character and form of development, the "urban" (A-C) subzones are used more frequently in the Inner Urban and Downtown Core transects compared to the Outer Urban transect, which uses the (D-F) subzone more frequently even where the primary zone allows for greater density.</p> <p>For more detail on the methodology behind the proposed application of the Neighbourhood zones, Staff suggest referring to Document 10 of the Draft 1 report: https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178621</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Will the new bylaw permit more commercial uses, like corner stores and small grocery stores, in low-density neighbourhoods to reduce driving for daily essentials?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The new Zoning by-law draft expands permissions for home-based businesses, including those selling low-risk foods. This will make it easier and more convenient to access goods and services locally, as well as provide economic opportunities for small businesses, which contribute to healthy and thriving communities.</p> <p>In addition, as part of Draft 2, Staff are reviewing potential additional sites that can be zoned to allow for a greater range of non-residential uses more generally. This will be through use of either the Neighbourhood Commercial "-c" suffix or the Neighbourhood Mixed-Use (NMU) zone.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>If 4 storeys cannot ruin the character of heritage districts, why aren't 4 storeys permitted in every suburb throughout the city? 4 storeys are not a significant change for any neighbourhood in this city. There are plenty of beautiful 4 storey homes in the Centertown area. Why is density restricted to major corridors?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Neighbourhoods policies of the Official Plan (Section 6.3) set out that the Zoning By-law shall have regard for “local context and character of existing development”. This is further discussed in transect policies in Section 5, which generally state that 4-storey heights in Neighbourhoods are to be allowed “where appropriate”. As such, many locations, particularly neighbourhood interiors outside of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, are proposed to get 2-3 storey heights in accordance with the policies.</p> <p>Staff are looking at refining the proposed regulations on heights as part of Draft 2 of the New Zoning By-law, including but not limited to where three storey heights and taller may be applied.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>In your example on new neighbourhood zones, it was indicated that, in the urban transect, former R1 properties will be upzoned to N2 and N3, but in suburban zones, R1 properties will be rezoned as N1. Why the difference? Shouldn't upzoning be consistent and equitable across all transects? As well, shouldn't upzoning be gradual in nature, therefore not move from R1 to N3?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan Section 5.6.1 policies direct that: "The Evolving Neighborhood Overlay will be applied generally to the properties that have a lot line along a Minor Corridor; lands 150 meters from the boundary of a Hub or Mainstreet designation; and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station." This is implemented in the new Zoning by-law draft.</p> <p>Areas within the overlay as would generally result in a higher category N zone being applied compared to areas not within the Overlay (e.g., in the case of a R1 zone in the current By-law, the proposed zone would be a N3 zone as opposed to N2 for lands not within the overlay).</p>



Comment:	<p>What about heights of coach houses? Currently, only 1 storey above ground is allowed (even when 2 storeys are allowed for the main building), unless it is half a storey on top of a garage. Will the maximum height of a coach house match the maximum height of the zone?</p>
Response:	<p>The applicable policy for coach houses, which the new Zoning By-law must be consistent with, is addressed in Section 4.2.1, policy 3 of the Official Plan. It states in part that <i>“The Zoning By-law shall limit the coach house to a height of one storey for lots in the urban area”</i>.</p> <p>The policy more generally sets out conditions for which additional height may be considered through a Minor Variance application via the Committee of Adjustment. However, to remain in accordance with the Official Plan, the height limit currently proposed for coach houses in the urban area is a single storey.</p>

Comment:	<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>
Response:	<p>In Section 199 of Draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law, lot width is defined as the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“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.”</i></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>Comment:</p>	<p>How can part of a small neighbourhood fall into multiple categories (e.g., Half of Whitehaven is designated “evolving neighbourhood”)</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan provides more explicit direction as to the intended extent of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO). Policy 1 of Section 5.6.1 states in part:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The Evolving Neighborhood Overlay will be applied generally to the properties that have a lot line along a Minor Corridor; lands 150 meters from the boundary of a Hub or Mainstreet designation; and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station.”</i></p> <p>Areas within the overlay as would generally result in a higher category N zone being applied compared to areas not within the Overlay (e.g., in the case of a R1 zone in the current By-law, the proposed zone would be a N3 zone as opposed to N2 for lands not within the overlay). As a result, this may result in different areas of neighbourhoods proposed to be zoned to different N-zones compared to their current zoning.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>What is meant by housing choice?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Everyone deserves dignified and affordable housing. This includes less conventional forms such as rooming houses and transitional housing, and emergency options such as shelters. But there aren’t enough homes or enough variety to offer dignified, affordable choices.</p> <p>Given this policy direction, the intent of the Neighbourhood zones is to permit a full range of housing options, which may include but not necessarily be limited to multiple unit dwellings, group homes, and rooming houses.</p> <p>In accordance with the new Official Plan and moving forward with the new Zoning By-law, allowing for the construction of more housing will be considered the top priority. All forms of housing can co-exist in the same neighbourhood.</p>



Comment:	Are some districts near the core (e.g., Rockcliffe) being treated differently from others.
Response:	<p>Because there is a greater direction to shift to a more urban character and form of development, the "urban" (A-C) subzones are used more frequently in the Inner Urban and Downtown Core transects compared to the Outer Urban transect, which uses the (D-F) subzone more frequently even where the primary zone allows for greater density. The Official Plan directs that local character and context be addressed in the new Zoning By-law; with this in mind, neighbourhoods with less traditionally "urban" characteristics, such as larger lot patterns and larger yard setbacks, may continue to get the D-F subzones even within the Inner Urban transect to address these neighbourhood-specific contexts.</p> <p>For more detail on the methodology behind the proposed application of the Neighbourhood zones, Staff suggest referring to Document 10 of the Draft 1 report: https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178621</p>

Comment:	Do 4 storeys include the basement in N1 and N2 zones?
Response:	<p>While the height permissions generally correspond to a certain number of storeys in each Neighbourhood zone (e.g., 2-3 storeys for N1-N2, 3 storeys for N3, 4 storeys for N4) the height limits proposed are expressed in metres and are measured above average grade. For example, in the N2 zone, the height of the building, including any portion of the basement above average grade, could not exceed 8.5 metres. The height limits proposed for the N1-N3 zones generally contemplate 2-3 storey buildings, and not 4 storey buildings.</p>



4) Parking

Comment:	A future N-zone lot currently has 1 driveway with access to the street. How many driveways would be permitted with 6 ADUs?
Response:	Under both the current Zoning By-law and the New Zoning By-law draft 1, the number of driveways permitted on a lot is not based on the number of units on a lot. Sections 604 and 606 of draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law contain provisions for the location of parking, as well as access to one to three parking spaces on a lot. This also includes provisions concerning driveways.

Comment:	If you do not have parking minimums for new buildings, parking will be pushed onto the nearby streets. Additional cars on the streets -many with no sidewalks- will counteract efforts to encourage more walking and biking and create safer, 15-minute neighbourhoods.
Response:	<p>Removing minimum parking space rates from the Zoning By-law does not mean that no parking will be provided with new developments. Rather, it gives property owners, businesses, and developers the ability to choose how many spaces to provide in accordance with need. The Zoning By-law will continue to regulate the minimum number of visitor parking spaces associated with a residential development. It is expected that in the short-term there will not be a drastic reduction in the number of parking spaces available. In the mid to long-term though, there may be a reduction in the number of parking spaces city-wide. Note that the removal of minimum space rates does not guarantee this. Elimination of parking requirements will encourage more efficient use of land and create more comfortable walking environments. The increased densities and permissions for a mix of land uses will help bring local services and amenities closer to where people live, decreasing reliance on private vehicles.</p> <p>In summary: By shifting away from minimum parking ratios towards a choice-based approach, in the long-term this will assist with the creation and enhancement of more-transit supportive, walkable neighbourhoods in the city.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Would the City consider parking of camping trailers on private driveways year-round?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The parking of trailers or recreational vehicles is subject to the provisions in Section 612 of Draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law (Pages 147-149). These provisions have been modified, but largely carried over, from the provisions in Section 126 of the Current Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Please note there are no seasonal restrictions proposed in Section 612, nor any in the current Section 126 concerning the parking of recreational vehicles/trailers on a lot. Note that this assumes the lot in question is zoned residential currently/proposed to be zoned neighbourhood in the New Zoning By-law. Please see Table 612 in draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law, as the parking of recreational or heavy vehicles is zone dependent.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Why is a bylaw change proposed for RV trailers in driveways? For example, the interpretation of the new bylaw infers that property owners cannot load/unload their trailers for trips. Furthermore, I don't see the issue with having a well-maintained RV in my driveway. It does not move my vehicles onto the roadway.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The parking of trailers or recreational vehicles is permitted in the current Zoning By-law under Section 126. The draft provisions in Section 612 of Draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law have been modified but largely carried over from the provisions currently in place.</p> <p>Loading or unloading a trailer would be permitted provided the parking space for the heavy or recreational vehicle is permitted under the Zoning By-law. The parking of recreational or heavy vehicles is zone dependent.</p>



Comment:	Where in the Official Plan does it mention legalizing all the illegal pre-2007 front yard parking spaces? Why are no conditions being considered on the legalization of these existing illegal spaces? Is this consistent with the goals set out in the official plan?
Response:	<p>Staff acknowledge that there is concern with regards to front yard parking and are considering additional conditions as part of draft 2.</p> <p>While the OP does not provide specific direction with regards to front yard parking, it is something we must manage against other things the OP directs us to provide for (e.g. tree canopy coverage).</p>

Comment:	Will elimination of parking minimums affect existing oversized parking lots? For example: could we in the future build street front housing, shops, and other amenities for a more human scale?
Response:	The elimination of parking minimums may result in some parking lots around the city being either fully or partially re-developed, but this is not guaranteed. Removing minimum parking space ratios gives property owners, developers, and businesses the option to provide the number of parking spaces they need. Accordingly, some property owners may choose to re-develop their parking spaces to build housing or other uses.

Comment:	I am concerned about street parking. We have witnessed increased density on Woodroffe without adequate parking leading to increased use of street parking without any controls on adjacent streets. Is there a plan here that would see a permitting system like downtown?
Response:	Currently, staff are examining the potential to expand on-street permit parking. At this time, on-street permit parking may be considered through a petition process. For further information, please visit: https://ottawa.ca/en/city-hall/council-committees-and-boards/get-involved-local-government/submitting-petition-council



Comment:	Will parking camping trailers on private driveways be permitted year-round?
Response:	<p>Heavy and recreational vehicle parking provisions can be found in Section 612 of Draft 1 of the New Zoning By-law. These provisions have been modified, but largely carried over from the provisions in Section 126 of the current Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The parking of a heavy or recreational vehicle is zone dependent. Please note that there is no time limit to the parking of a heavy or recreational vehicle on a lot (i.e., the Zoning By-law does not provide restrictions or permissions on a seasonal basis).</p>

5) Trees

Comment:	For required soft landscaping, developers will likely not plant trees given bushes and smaller planting are cheaper and easier to implement. How will the city ensure that trees will be planted, given how important this is for climate change? Through tax incentive, perhaps?
Comment:	The city should require that one tree be planted on every lot (on the part of the lot that is owned by the city). Our streets typically have a tree planted in front of each house. Given the reality of climate change, why would we now defer the decision to plant a tree to the owner or developer?
Response:	Zoning cannot directly require that trees be planted on a property; it can require that landscaped areas be provided which can be used to support tree planting and growth. To that end, the Neighbourhood zones (for example) propose to include aggregated soft landscaping requirements in both front and rear yards, so that sufficient vegetative space can be provided and configured in such a way as to ensure the ability to plant trees on-site.



6) Rural Zones

Comment:	Are there separate density overlays for areas outside the green zone?
Response:	There are density targets within the urban boundary, but none outside of it. No Village Secondary Plans currently have density targets.

Comment:	Does the new Zoning By-law allow splitting/severing rural lots to build more homes for family members? (For example, on a 2-acre RU zoning lot, Rural Countryside Zone)
Response:	Severances are already allowed in the RU Zone, provided that the 0.8-hectare lot area set out in the Official Plan for unserviced lots can be met. As the new Zoning By-law must conform to Official Plan policies, no reductions in the minimum lot area are proposed. Many unserviced zones in the current Zoning By-law have lot areas below the Official Plan requirements and staff are exploring changes to these provisions for the second draft.

7) Secondary Plans

Comment:	When will site-specific exceptions be reviewed?
Response:	Exceptions are currently a carry-forward from the current Zoning By-law 2008-250. Staff are reviewing exceptions as part of work on Draft 2 of the New Zoning By-law. Accordingly, exceptions may be subject to change over the coming 18-months, as the new Zoning By-law will be going to Council for adoption in Q4 2025.



Comment:	Will there eventually be secondary plans across the City of Ottawa in built-up areas to dictate maximum heights?
Comment:	What is the process to request a Secondary Plan for a neighbourhood that has none?
Response:	The creation of Secondary Plans is outside of the scope of the New Zoning By-law project and are handled by the Planning Policy Team within the Planning, Development and Building Services Department.

Comment:	Will new secondary plans (e.g., Vanier) as directed by Council amend proposed zoning?
Response:	The new Zoning By-law is required to conform to Secondary Plans. Accordingly, new zoning within the area subject to the Vanier Secondary Plan will align with both the Official Plan and the Vanier Secondary Plan.

Comment:	Our area has a great secondary plan. However, the developer is asking for amendment and therefore is not following it anyway.
Response:	Property owners have the right, under the Ontario Planning Act, to submit an Official Plan Amendment application (which can be utilized to amend the Official Plan or a Secondary Plan) for a proposed development. The establishment of a new Zoning By-law to implement the Official Plan approved by City Council in 2022 does not negate that right. If the City receives an Official Plan Amendment application for a proposed development, that application is reviewed by City Staff and a recommendation by Staff is put forward to City Council. Ultimately though, City Council makes the decision to approve or deny a development application submitted by a property owner.



8) Energy

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Has a need to include community distributed energy resources been included in the bylaw (i.e., community microgrids)?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The image below illustrates different types of distributed energy resources (i.e., solar panels, batteries, wind turbines). ‘Distributed’ means the energy comes from different sources, not just from the centralized electricity grid. DER help reduce reliance on the grid for energy, can lower costs, and provide energy security / resiliency during extreme weather events such as storms and heat waves. Autonomy from the central grid, or microgrid, is gaining momentum. The siting of DERs through zoning will be to enable use types as both principal and subordinate or supportive uses.</p> <p>Staff are working to bring a report specifically on one type of DER, known as 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. 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.</p> <div> <p>Source: fortresspower.com</p> </div>



9) Floodplains

Comment:	Will floodplains be incorporated into the new Zoning Bylaw?
Response:	<p>Section 34 of the Planning Act provides for zoning to be used to prohibit development in flood plains and in natural features and areas. Work on the new Zoning By-law aims to support the resiliency of communities and the health of residents living in the 1 in 100-year flood plain by continuing to prohibit development in flood plains in accordance with policies in Official Plan and by continuing the program of continuous updates to the flood plain mapping in the Zoning By-law underway since 2014.</p> <p>As the Official Plan includes policies to restrict development in the flood plain, both the current Zoning By-law 2008-250 and the draft Zoning By-law include provisions to prohibit new construction and limit the size of additions to existing buildings.</p> <p>Accurate flood plain mapping is key to ensuring development is prohibited in the 1 in 100-year flood plain and to preparing municipal emergency response plans for communities. To ensure the flood plain mapping in the Zoning By-law is up-to-date and accurate, a program of continuous updates has been underway since 2014 in partnership with the three Conservation Authorities having jurisdiction in the City. These updates are planned to continue in the new Zoning By-law as new mapping becomes available.</p>

Comment:	How does neighbourhood zoning address flood plains?
Response:	As with the current Zoning By-law 2008-250, the draft Zoning By-law prohibits development on a vacant lot that is located in the flood plain. For properties with development that occurred prior to implementing prohibitions on development through zoning, such as in historic neighbourhoods, small additions are permitted to existing properties. Properties in the Neighbourhood zone that are in the flood plain were not upzoned to permit increased density.



10) Other Topics

Comment:	When will site-specific exceptions be reviewed?
Response:	Exceptions are currently a carry-forward from the current Zoning By-law 2008-250. Staff are reviewing exceptions as part of work on Draft 2 of the New Zoning By-law. Accordingly, exceptions may be subject to change over the coming 18-months, as the new Zoning By-law will be going to Council for adoption in Q4 2025.

Comment:	Are density targets based on units or number of people living in an area?
Response:	The density targets in Table 3B of the Official Plan are measured in "units per hectare" (UPH).

Comment:	Will the threshold for site plan control be changed for residential developments?
Response:	As a result of changes to the Planning Act made by Bill 23, Site Plan Control can no longer be required for buildings that contain ten or fewer dwelling units.

Comment:	<p>The current zoning is a big reason for our affordability crisis. Is the new zoning proposed mostly simplifying the existing regulations? How does the new zoning help with affordability?</p> <p>Inclusive affordable housing should be equitably distributed throughout the city and suburbs. Will the zoning by-law ensure that intensification around the LRT includes inclusive affordable housing?</p>
-----------------	---



Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law will help contribute to addressing Ottawa’s housing supply and affordability challenges by aiming to increase peoples’ access to a wider range of housing types, forms, and affordability.</p> <p>This includes zoning that will allow for more housing units on lots as well as more forms of housing such as multi-unit housing forms, recognizing that many kinds of housing can be compatible together. It will serve to mitigate discriminatory “people zoning”, where zoning rules have the effect of excluding housing that meets the needs of particular groups of people, such as people living on a low income, in group settings, or in alternative housing forms, from communities.</p> <p>Elimination of parking requirements will encourage more efficient use of land and create more comfortable walking environments. The increased densities and permissions for a mix of land uses will help bring local services and amenities closer to where people live, decreasing reliance on private vehicles. This will help make it less expensive for people to move around the city by reducing the combined cost of housing and transportation, easing financial pressures on households, and leaving more money for other essentials.</p>
------------------	--

Comment:	<p>Will there still be a process whereby developers can request zoning amendments and Official Plan amendments?</p>
Response:	<p>Yes. When the new Zoning By-law comes into effect, property owners will still have the right under the Planning Act to apply for an Official Plan and/or Zoning By-law amendment if they wish to develop a property in a way that is not permitted by the Official Plan or Zoning By-law.</p>

Comment:	<p>Will the number of resources (hospitals, schools, etc.) in an area be considered when zoning lands?</p>
Response:	<p>School Boards consider the changes in population in communities when they are planning service levels in schools. This is a responsibility that is outside the jurisdiction of the municipality. However, as entirely new communities are</p>



planned as suburban development, School Boards are involved in the process of planning those communities and land set aside for new schools to be built. The provincial government coordinates delivery of health care services to support cities as they grow. The Zoning By-law takes its direction from the Official Plan designations in terms of where land uses may be permitted. Large-scale institutional uses, such as hospitals, are subject to policies in the Official Plan and are normally established through site-specific development applications that consider detailed planning considerations such as built form, landscaping and trees, water and sewer services, access and egress to the site, parking arrangements and transportation implications.

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Elmvale has a transit station, yet there is a height restriction based on this map.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Elmvale Transit Station is within the boundary of the Elmvale Acres Secondary Plan, which guides the re-development of the Elmvale Acres Shopping Centre. Section 4 and Schedule A of the Secondary Plan inform the land use designations and height permissions for the area. Please note that generally, heights may be impacted by documents such as Secondary Plans, which may prescribe height minimums and maximums that differ from the Official Plan.</p>

<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Are there any considerations built into zoning that incentivize developers to build for what people want, vs what makes them the most money?</p> <p>(Thinking of Europe, where multi-generational living via whole floor apartments is more common, and would be great for densification)</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The draft Zoning By-law provides provisions to implement the intent of the Official Plan by providing permissions for a range of development options. The decision about what to build is made by the property owner based on what they think will sell, at the price they think a prospective buyer would be willing to pay. The Zoning By-law provides choices. However, it does not incentivize one form of development over another, beyond not permitting uses that are not contemplated in the Official Plan.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Please address in detail how heritage conservation district plans will be addressed. How will the new Zoning By-law be connected to heritage bylaws?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Development within a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) as designated under Part V of the Heritage Act is subject to a heritage permit. This process provides an opportunity for Staff to review development and additions within a HCD and in particular whether or not they meet the direction and policies of the associated HCD Plan, and in the case of substantial additions or redevelopments, is subject to a public process that must be reviewed by Planning and Housing Committee.</p> <p>Given this rigorous design review process and the protections against demolition under the Heritage Act, provisions in the Heritage Overlay in the current Zoning By-law that freeze the height and massing of designated buildings are not proposed to be brought forward in the new By-law. It is instead proposed to focus heritage provisions in zoning on providing relief from certain “design-related” requirements normally applicable to a new building where redevelopment involves retention of an existing building designated under the Heritage Act, to encourage retention of these buildings as part of redevelopment wherever possible. Specific zoning designations proposed in HCDs will be reviewed internally as part of subsequent drafts.</p>



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. 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"> ▪ Intensification might not leave enough greenspace in neighborhoods to regulate city temperature and help wellbeing. ▪ Concern about overbearing existing infrastructure. ▪ Concerns about light pollution, noise pollution, privacy, ambiance, character, and over-all quality of life ▪ Caution against general inconveniences in neighbourhoods due to increased construction



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worries about increased crime and reduced neighborhood cohesion after intensification. ▪ Projection of property values diminishing due to lot severances nearby. ▪ 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. ▪ 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.
<p>Missing Middle Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Suggestion to permit a minimum of four storeys city-wide to allow for more livable space and more dwelling units. ▪ Doubling density will likely eliminate any family-sized accommodation anywhere in neighbourhoods as is the likely result in new developments. ▪ 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.
<p>Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worry that the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) in some cases appears to extend too far into Neighbourhood Zones. ▪ 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. ▪ 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.



<p>Neighbourhood Built Form Standards (Setbacks, Height, Design Standards, Yard Requirements)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Proposed front yard setbacks should generally align with existing setback patterns. ▪ Concern about the excessive minimum lot width required (18m) for Neighborhood Subzone E ▪ 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. ▪ The need for more appropriate or measurable direction to protect the residential rear yard semi-private realm. ▪ Concern that multiple entrances in the front wall or façade of a building could represent a detriment to streetscape or neighbourhood character.
<p>Neighbourhood Site Functional Standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ 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.
<p>Comments about Specific Areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Request that the area around Dundonald Park should be reflected in the new zoning by-law as a heritage zone. ▪ 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.
<p>By-law Wording</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.
--	---

2) Mixed-Use Zones

Theme	As We Heard It
Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Call to require separation distances between shelters and sensitive uses (schools, daycare, and residences). ▪ Request to reconsider maximum number of rooming units in a building (24) – this is a very large number.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Support for density around transit hubs and having more mixed-use zoning.
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ 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. ▪ 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.



Height	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30m maximum building height is too high for a minor corridor. 45-degree angular plane or any required setbacks seem to be missing. ▪ Concern that future high-rise development near residential areas might affect the viability of solar panels. ▪ 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.
Private Service Enclaves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

3) Parking

Theme	As We Heard It
Parking Minimums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced parking minimums can cause parking shortage and increased traffic congestion. ▪ 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. ▪ Support for removal of parking minimums. ▪ Suggestion that minimum parking should be required in areas outside of the urban core.
Parking Maximums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ 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. ▪ Concern that there does not seem to be any lower parking maximums in Hubs than there is in the N zones.



Garages and Carports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that if on-site garages are minimized, there will be an effect on EV battery charging efficiency during the winter months. ▪ 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.
Bike Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request to require a minimum of two bike parking spaces per unit where no to little parking is provided.

4) Driveways

Driveways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request to increase options for more driveway space to support transit usage increase goals. ▪ 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. ▪ 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.
------------------	---

5) Trees

Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request for more clarity on how by-law requirements for soft landscaping will be increased to leave room for trees. ▪ Emphasis on requiring sufficient space for a mature canopy tree to flourish in the rear yard of every lot. ▪ 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.
--------------	---



6) Rural Zones

<p>Rural Zones</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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). ▪ 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.
--------------------	---

7) Stormwater Management

<p>Stormwater Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Section 201 - Adequate Services and Stormwater Management - page 65: Exemptions (b) says that any addition in any zone that is less than 55 m² is exempt. This is a very large addition.
------------------------------	--

8) Public Consultation

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



Questions – Key Themes

Question:	How would this new zoning draft affect maximum permitted driveways?
Response:	<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 (https://engage.ottawa.ca/28126/widgets/119508/documents/131758).</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>
Question:	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?
Response:	<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>



Question:	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?
Response:	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.
Question:	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?
Response:	<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>
Question:	Can you please let me know if any new maximum parking rates are proposed for employment uses such as manufacturing, warehousing, etc.
Response:	Maximum parking space rates can be found in Section 602.



<p>Question:</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>Response:</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>Question:</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>Response:</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>



Question:	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.
Response:	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.

Question:	Could you please share the methodology that was used to determine which streets would get "Minor Corridor" designations?
Response:	<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 (https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/documents/files/section6_op_en.pdf).</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: https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178597.</p>



<p>Question:</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>Response:</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>Question:</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>Response:</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. 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.

Question:	Where can I find the new zoning By-law that would allow you to build 4 units?
Response:	<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"> • 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 • 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.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
--	--

Question:	Why are some neighbourhoods being divided into two or more zones?
Response:	<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>Question:</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>Response:</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>Question:</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>Response:</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>Question:</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>Response:</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"> •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. •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.
<p>Question:</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>Response:</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>Question:</p>	<p>What considerations of property values have been taken into account in the new Zoning By-law?</p>
<p>Response:</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>Question:</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>Response:</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>Question:</p>	<p>Based on the shape & 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 & wider for a coach house sewer connection.</p>
<p>Response:</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>Question:</p>	<p>Will the new Zoning By-law regulate e-bike charging?</p>
<p>Response:</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>Question:</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>Response:</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>Question:</p>	<p>Can you explain the implementation process for applying Evolving Neighbourhood overlays?</p>
<p>Response:</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: https://pub-ottawa.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=178621.</p>



<p>Question:</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>Response:</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>



As We Heard It Report – Wards 14 and 22

Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Ward 14 and Ward 22 was held on July 31, 2024, from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a zoning by-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 14 Somerset – Councillor Ariel Troster	2
	a. 15 Neighbourhoods	2
	b. Development Review Process	3
	c. Other Topics	3
	d. Public Consultation	3
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	4
2	Ward 22 Riverside South-Findlay Creek – Councillor Steve Desroches	8
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	8



Ward 14 Somerset

Overview of Topics

a) 15 Minute Neighbourhoods

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advocacy for more intensification in suburban areas to alleviate pressure in the downtown core.
Services and Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Call for more public amenities and essential services such as grocery stores and hardware stores closer to residents as currently there is a strong need for them which is not being met. ▪ Concern that new provisions for small scale non-residential uses in residential areas will be abused by using these spaces for commercial uses that do not support the needs of residents, as this is something that we have had issues within our ward. ▪ Advocacy for the necessary amenities to make intensified communities healthy and livable such as schools, recreation centers, parks, accessible well-maintained walkways, and medical facilities.
Walking and Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worry that shopping is difficult to do by walking. ▪ Call for making walkways more accessible and paying attention to accessibility issues in neighbourhoods. ▪ Concern that walkability and accessibility issues in the downtown will make it challenging for senior citizens to live there.



b) Development Review Process

Driveways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worries that much of the development review and planning process is in favor of developers and leaving out community concerns. ▪ Concern about Bill 185 removing the requirement for development public consultations. ▪ Support for the alignment of the Zoning By-law with the Official Plan to reduce exemptions and regulation amendments.
------------------	--

c) Other Topics

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Call for a vacant land tax to deter land speculators holding land development for many years which increases the cost of buildings and dwelling units. ▪ Advocacy for harmonizing the upcoming CMHC housing catalogues with municipal building regulations to avoid lengthy development reviews.
--	---

d) Public Consultation

Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The need for specific information about what some zoning concepts mean and what the implications are for where people live specifically. ▪ Concern that issues brought to attention by the community association are not being heard despite the high population of the community. ▪ Frustration from the community considering their concerns are seemingly not being heard. ▪ Call for ward-specific sessions to include more detailed information relevant to the wards in question.
----------------------------	--



Questions and Responses

Comment:	Concern that planning regulations including the Official Plan and current zoning by-law are not being respected in many cases due to frequent exemptions and amendments. Height exemptions on Catherine Street for example. There is also concern that the new Zoning By-law will further fuel that due to more lenient regulations.
Response:	Work on the new Zoning Bylaw aims to consider the planning framework of the Official Plan and Secondary Plans and align with it as much as possible to reduce the need for amendments. This is why the framework of zones has been further simplified, to ease interpretation and increase predictability.

Question:	Are there plans to change the maximum building heights proposed for neighborhood zones?
Response:	<p>The way that height limits are proposed to be structured in the draft By-law is through a maximum permitted height in meters, which is intended to correspond to a certain number of storeys. The N1 and N2 are generally proposed to permit up to two storeys, while N3 permits up to three storeys, and N4 permits up to four storeys. The N5 zone is intended to contemplate mid-rise buildings, and the N6 zone is proposed to permit high-rise buildings.</p> <p>The Neighbourhoods policies of the Official Plan (Section 6.3) set out that the Zoning By-law shall have regard for “local context and character of existing development”. This is further discussed in transect policies in Section 5, which generally state that 4-storey heights in Neighbourhoods are to be allowed “where appropriate”. As such, many locations, particularly neighbourhood interiors outside of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, are proposed to get 2-3 storey heights in accordance with the policies.</p> <p>Staff are considering the issue of permitting higher construction in low-rise areas very carefully and are looking at refining the proposed regulations on heights as part of Draft 2 of the new Zoning By-law, including but not limited to where three storey heights and taller may be applied.</p>



Question:	<p>How will zoning ensure that small scale non-residential uses in residential areas add value to the community?</p>
Response:	<p>Policy 4 in Section 6.3.1 of the Official Plan states in part:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"The Zoning By-law and approvals under the Planning Act shall allow a range of residential and non-residential built forms within the Neighbourhood designation, including: [...] d) To provide for a range of local services and promote the emergence or strengthening of 15-minute neighbourhoods, the Zoning By-law may permit compatible and complementary small-scale non-residential uses and services (including retail, service, cultural, leisure and entertainment uses) that primarily serve residents within walking distance [...]"</p> <p>Proposed provisions to permit small scale non-residential development in residential areas are generally limited in terms of size as well as permitted land uses to avoid development which is incompatible with residential uses.</p> <p>An example of provisions which work on limiting negative impacts of non-residential uses on residential areas are those in Section 804 - Neighbourhood Commercial Suffix (c). The provisions restrict the location of such uses to the ground floor and basement of a residential use building. In addition, the floor area of non-residential uses in a building generally must not exceed a gross floor area of 100 square metres. Finally, no parking spaces are permitted in association with a non-residential use.</p>

Comment:	<p>Request to remove the Minor Corridor designation from Lyon Street due to a concern that commercial expansion to Lyon will limit residential uses. There is also a concern that existing businesses on Elgin will be negatively affected as a result and Elgin depopulated.</p>
Response:	<p>Proposed street designations in the Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law are based on the Official Plan and secondary plan street designations. Staff note this issue as there is opportunity for refinement of zoning permissions which will be reviewed for upcoming drafts.</p>



Comment:	Concern that walkability and accessibility issues in the downtown (e.g., poorly maintained sidewalks) will make it challenging for senior citizens to live there.
Response:	<p>The zoning by-law is the City’s main tool for controlling what is built in the city and shape the way it grows. The Provincial Planning Act allows zoning by-laws to regulate, among other things, the use of land and the size and location of buildings and structures. The zoning by-law is also informed by the new Official Plan policies, adopted by Ottawa City Council on October 27, 2021. The zoning by-law sets out what is permitted to be developed on a given property e.g. the interior use of a building, setback requirements from property lines, location of parking.</p> <p>Methods to ensure new development comes with amenities to support a community’s needs (i.e. development charges) are out of scope of this new zoning by-law project. The same is true for infrastructure maintenance and ensuring that the necessary services for a neighbourhood such as parks and schools are built. Work on the new Zoning By-law so far has placed great emphasis on permitting the necessary land uses to allow a variety of services in neighbourhoods in accordance with the Official Plan intent to create walkable 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p>

Question:	Is it possible to impose time limits on development approvals, i.e. that an approval will expire within a certain period of time?
Response:	There are existing timelines associated with the site plan control process. In terms of development applications that involve changing the zoning of the site, the Planning Act would likely not permit that.

Comment:	Comment about the need to allow more height within Ontario Building Code Part 9 to promote more affordable unit construction.
Response:	The building code is set by the provincial and federal levels of government rather than the municipal.



Comment:	Request for more explanation on how the Minor Corridor designation applied to certain streets in Ward 14 impacts development and surrounding areas, as well as the impact of the proposed Minor Corridor provisions on street trees.
Response:	<p>The Minor Corridor (CM) designation is proposed to permit a mix of uses to support the day-to-day needs of residents in accordance with policy 6.2.2 of the Official Plan which permits and encourages compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development along Minor Corridors. The subzones vary in terms of the front yard setback and maximum building height permitted.</p> <p>For Ward 14, CM1 provisions would apply to Minor Corridors as the ward is in the Downtown Core Transect. The provisions in CM1 are loosely similar to those in the Traditional Mainstreet (TM) zone in Zoning Bylaw 2008-250 with some changes to reflect the intent of Official Plan policies for Minor Corridors.</p> <p>Policies in Section 5 and Table 7 of the Official Plan set out maximum building heights for Minor Corridors to be “up to high-rise” subject to abutting a wide right-of-way and having sites large enough for appropriate built-form transition. For the CM1 subzone, maximum building heights of nine storeys are permitted in keeping with Table 7 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>For more information on provisions for the CM zone, please refer to Section 906 (pages 190-195) of the new Zoning By-law Draft 1 text available here: https://engage.ottawa.ca/28126/widgets/119508/documents/133163</p> <p>Zoning cannot directly require that trees be planted on a property; it can require that landscaped areas be provided which can be used to support tree planting and growth. To that end, the Neighbourhood zones (for example) propose to include aggregated soft landscaping requirements in both front and rear yards, so that sufficient vegetative space can be provided and configured in such a way as to ensure the ability to plant trees on-site.</p>

Question:	How will affordable housing, especially rentals, be protected in this process?
Response:	Staff note this and will take it into account when planning next drafts of the new Zoning By-law. Please note that the Zoning By-law determines what uses are permitted on a lot and cannot directly prevent building demolitions.



Ward 22 Riverside South-Findlay Creek

Questions and Responses

Question:	What would be the impact of the airport on zoning and on growth in the area?
Response:	<p>The impact of the Ottawa International Airport on surrounding development growth is controlled in the new zoning by-law through the Airport Influence Area Overlay and the Ottawa International Airport Economic District zone.</p> <p>Airport Influence Area Overlay</p> <p>The current provisions in Zoning By-law 2008-250 for Airport Operations in Section 70 – Protection of Airport Operations are being carried forward. Schedule 6 of the current Zoning By-law will be displayed as an overlay – The Airport Influence Area Overlay (Section 503 of Draft1 text).</p> <p>The Airport Influence Area Overlay applies development restrictions to reduce the impact of noise from aircraft operations, bring awareness of possible exposure to noise, and to protect airport operations from potential conflicting uses. Changes to airport operations may increase aircraft noise in these areas. Official Plan policies relating to these zones are detailed in Section 10.2.2 – Protection of airport and aircraft operations.</p> <p>In other words, the overlay, also illustrated on Schedule C14 of the Official Plan, ensures that development of new noise-sensitive land uses such as residential land uses is restricted near the airport. The overlay is also used to separate heavy industry uses from the airport to avoid adverse effects of airport operations on sensitive industrial uses and to protect the long-term economic viability of industrial uses and major facilities. The Development Reserve Zone and the Industrial and Logistics Zone are applied to Ward 22 lands within the Airport Operating Influence zone to reserve the lands for non-sensitive uses.</p> <p>EDA - Ottawa International Airport Economic District zone</p> <p>The MacDonald-Cartier International Airport, currently zoned T1A – MacDonald-Cartier International Airport Subzone, has been designated as the Ottawa International Airport Economic District under the Official Plan. Section 6.6 of the Official Plan provides policies for the seven, city-defining Special Districts and Economic Districts and provides guidance to the development approvals processes and policies regarding improvements to</p>



	<p>the public realm. A new zone (Part 12, Section 1206) has been created to reflect the new designation, the EDA - Ottawa International Airport Economic District zone.</p> <p>The purpose of the Ottawa Airport Economic Zone is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize the Ottawa International Airport (YOW) as a major economic generator of the region. • Permit uses that serve employees, travellers, airport operations, and those that are part of the goods movement network. • Prohibit uses that have the potential of interfering with the safe operation of the airport.
--	---

Question:	Why are we focused on electric vehicles when they have not been tested in Canadian winters?
Response:	<p>The draft Zoning By-law takes its direction from a number of city planning policy documents, among them is the Climate Change Masterplan. There is a general emphasis in the climate change master plan on transitioning to electric power, as well as transitioning away from carbon-based power to lower GHG emitting forms of energy generation and emissions associated with transportation. There are also federal targets to have electric vehicles be the predominant form of transportation in Canada by certain dates. The Zoning By-law only provides permissions to have them in place to aid in achieving these goals. The new zoning by-law also does not require electric vehicle charging infrastructure to be provided unless parking spaces are provided.</p>

Question:	I am concerned about how residents in our ward can heat their homes during power outages, considering the distance from the urban area. Will we still be able to get gas?
Response:	<p>The Zoning By-law does not prohibit any form of energy generation and generally does not regulate utilities such as natural gas pipelines, yet it recognizes and permits them. The Zoning By-law does not have jurisdiction under the Planning Act to regulate utilities such as natural gas.</p>



Question:	What would be the square footage permitted for each dwelling unit?
Response:	There are minimum unit size requirements outlined in Section 708 of the Draft 1 Zoning By-law depending on the location and the type of development. In the case of a mid-rise or high-rise building containing dwelling units, at least 5 per cent of dwelling units must have at least three bedrooms, or a minimum gross floor area of at least 80 square metres. In the case of a low-rise residential use building on a lot of 450 square metres or greater zoned N1-N6 - Neighbourhood, at least 15 per cent of dwelling units must have at least three bedrooms, or a minimum gross floor area of 80 square metres.

Question:	Will the 15-minute Neighbourhoods concept limit freedom of movement for residents?
Response:	No, it will not. Residents will have freedom of movement. The Zoning By-law does not apply in the right of way. The Zoning By-law only applies within the lot line. Therefore, zoning cannot limit mobility.

Question:	Maximum densities are introduced in the new Zoning By-law draft. Where are maximum densities specified in the official plan? Why in many instances are the maximum densities in the new Zoning by-law draft significantly higher than the target densities in the official plan?
Response:	The Official Plan sets density targets for Neighbourhoods to be achieved over a 25-year period. Increased density is a way to meet the Official Plan's goals to achieving more affordable housing options and healthy, complete communities. The draft Zoning By-law takes its cue for density regulations from the directions in Tables 3A and 3B in Section 3 of the Official Plan. Table 3A outlines density requirements for Hubs and Mainstreet Corridors, while Table 3B has density targets for the Neighbourhood designation.




The maximum densities proposed for the N1 through N3 zones are higher than the density targets set out in the Official Plan by transect, and significantly higher in the case of the N3 zone. Higher density maximums on a per lot basis are necessary in zoning (which applies at the level of the individual lot) so that, in aggregate, neighbourhood-level densities can meet the [minimum density targets](#) in Table 3b of the Official Plan by 2046. The minimum density targets are a targeted average. To achieve the target average, a portion of redevelopment must therefore be greater than the target density.

On average only a small number of properties in the city, approximately 1 per cent, are redeveloped each year. Further, when that redevelopment occurs, the density of that development will vary depending on decisions made by the property owner. One single detached dwelling may be replaced by another single detached dwelling, with no increase in overall density on the lot, or the single detached dwelling may be replaced by a three-unit or six-unit building.

The diagrams below provide further explanation.


The diagram below shows a hypothetical neighbourhood block one hectare in size, composed of 22 lots, each lot with one detached dwelling on it. Each of the lots is 450 square metres. This block has a density of 22 units per hectare.




The maximum densities permitted in the proposed N1 through N3 zones exceed the targets for Neighbourhoods in Table 3b of the Official Plan. This is to account for the fact that the average area-wide increases to density will be lower than the maximum permitted. For example, it is relatively common to see a detached dwelling replaced by a two, three or four-unit building, instead of a six-unit building. For these reasons, it is necessary to permit densities that are higher on a per-lot basis than the transect-wide targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan.



Lot Level




Density	Min. Units
22 units per hectare	1




Density	Min. Units
130 units per hectare	6

Block Level



Density	Min. Units
22 units per hectare	22



Density	Min. Units
49 units per hectare	49

Neighbourhood Level



Density	Min. Units
60 to 80 units per hectare	60

The above diagrams illustrate the flow of density levels and the number of units at the lot, block, neighbourhood level for low-rise zones (N1-N4).

At the block level, a hypothetical neighbourhood block one hectare (10,000m²) in size, composed of 22 lots, each lot with one detached dwelling on it, has a density of 22 units per hectare. The diagram shows three lots being redeveloped, with one six-unit building, having a density of approximately 130 units per hectare, and two 12-unit buildings having a density of 260 units per hectare.



	<p><i>This increases the number of units on the block from 22 units to 49 units, with a density of 49 units per hectare. This scenario illustrates why the per lot densities permitted in the primary zones need to be higher than the targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan, if those minimum targets in the Official Plan are to be met by 2046.</i></p> <p>In summary, the minimum units-per-hectare Official Plan targets and Neighbourhood zone maximums are, despite both using “units per hectare”, measuring two different things at two different scales:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum density <i>targets</i> 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 40-60 units per hectare target prescribed in the Official Plan for Neighbourhoods in the Outer Urban transect is an average that applies across the entirety of that transect. • The units-per-hectare <i>maximums</i> 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. For example, if an individual 15 m x 30 m lot contains a detached dwelling (1 unit), that lot has a density of 22 units per hectare. 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.
--	---

Question:	Will we be able to have another gas station at Riverside south at some point?
Response:	Gas stations are a permitted use in the Ottawa Airport Economic District, in some Industrial and Transportation zones, in some mixed-use zones, and in the Hub zones in the suburban transect. As such, it is a matter of whether a business decides to locate where there is a permission for a gas station use.

Question:	Will multi-unit dwellings be permitted?
Response:	Multi-unit dwellings will be permitted in varying heights based on the location.



As We Heard It Report – Wards 7, 8 and 9 Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Wards 7, 8 and 9 was held on August 21, 2024, from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a Zoning By-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 7 Bay – Councillor Theresa Kavanagh	2
	Summary of Comments Received	2
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses.....	3
2	Ward 8 College – Councillor & Deputy Mayor Laine Johnson	21
	Summary of Comments Received	22
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	22
3	Ward 9 Knoxdale-Merivale – Councillor Sean Devine	31
	Summary of Comments Received	32
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	32




Ward 7 Bay

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the lag between increased density and the provision of services and amenities for residents. ▪ Seeking clarity on the definition of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay. ▪ Concern with increased density in Neighbourhoods, especially above Official Plan targets. ▪ Clarifying the permitted heights and densities in N1-N3 zones.
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioning how transportation issues are factored into the proposed density targets and permissions.
Future Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questions on the future of development applications such as Zoning By-law Amendments and Minor Variances and if the new Zoning By-law will reduce these applications or change the process. ▪ Seeking clarity on the interaction of Secondary Plans and the Zoning By-law.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>What is the reason for proposing that most of the lots along Holly Acres Rd. be zoned N3D? These houses do not front Holly Acres Rd.</p> 
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The upzoning of these lots along Holly Acres Rd. is due to their proximity to Carling Avenue (designated Mainstreet Corridor in Schedule B3 of the Official Plan) and the western edge of the Bayshore hub. This means that these areas lie within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, as seen in Schedule B3. Staff will review and refine this for subsequent drafts of the new Zoning By-law to ensure the intent is applied appropriately.</p>



Question:

At peak hours, especially in the winter, traffic on Carling Avenue and Richmond Road is slow. Moreover, increased traffic creates noise pollution for residents. Are transportation issues factored into densification decisions in the new Zoning By-law?



Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law does not determine where density and height should go, instead follows Official Plan directions. The Zoning By-law provides specific regulations that apply to new development and sets out what is permitted to be developed on a given property e.g. the interior use of a building, setback requirements from property lines, location of parking.</p> <p>The new Zoning By-law proposes mostly low-rise zoning in neighbourhoods, while mid-rise and high-rise are limited to Hubs, Mainstreets, and Minor Corridors. This is to implement the Official Plan which provides for higher densities in the Neighbourhood designation in strategic growth areas that are adjacent to Corridors, Hubs and near rapid transit stations. As such, the transit system is intended to support intensification and help divert some traffic.</p> <p>Height transitions are also proposed in accordance with the Official Plan policies. Development is proposed to be required to step down towards residential areas, this would further have a limiting effect on the number of units permitted.</p> <p>In addition, on average only a small number of properties in the city, approximately 1 per cent, are redeveloped each year. Further, when that redevelopment occurs, the density of that development will vary depending on decisions made by the property owner. One single detached dwelling may be replaced by another single detached dwelling, with no increase in overall density on the lot, or the single detached dwelling may be replaced by a three-unit or six-unit building. This indicates that zoning changes will not immediately overload the transportation system.</p> <p>While the Zoning By-law is concerned with the built form, work on the Transportation Master Plan considers the transportation projects required to accommodate the growth adopted by council in the Official Plan.</p> <p>Regarding parking, removing minimum parking space rates from the Zoning By-law does not mean that no parking will be provided with new developments. Rather, it gives property owners, businesses, and developers the ability to choose how many spaces to provide in accordance with need. The Zoning By-law will continue to regulate the minimum number of visitor parking spaces associated with a residential development.</p> <p>Ending regulations on parking requirements will encourage efficient use of land and create more comfortable walking environments. The increased densities and permissions for a mix of land uses will help bring local services and amenities closer to where people live, decreasing reliance on private vehicles.</p>
------------------	--



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Only N1, N2, and N3 zones have both maximum heights and densities specified. On a 50 by 100 foot lot, N2 maximum densities would allow 6 units on a lot with 1 unit today. In N3, 11 units would be allowed. It is hard to imagine 11 units in 3 storeys or less. What built form will be permitted in N2 & N3 zones?</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Is the permitted height limited to 8.5 metres in N2 and 11 metres in N3, or will these built form standards be superseded by the maximum density allowed?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The primary zones set out the density and height, so both regulations apply. For example, on a 50 foot by 100-foot lot, the N2 would allow you up to 6 units. The N2 also has a height limit of 8.5 metres. The property's built form is required to stay within the 8.5m height, and how the permitted 6 units can fit within that height is up to a property owner/builder.</p> <p>Every primary zone also has a subzone that controls lot size and setbacks. As such, all standards apply and are not superseded in any way by density.</p> <p>In addition, lots often are not developed to the permitted maximum density. The density that gets built on a lot depends on market factors. For example, there is a stronger market for ground-oriented units than for stacked multi-unit dwellings. This is because there is a high demand for ownership, which requires a plan of condominium for multi-unit dwellings.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>There is always lag time between growth and services to accommodate it, e.g. schools, parks, recreation. Are there clear policies to reduce and prevent that this time? This is what makes densification a problem in many cases. Can approval of projects also be conditional on services being adequate to accommodate increased population?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Zoning By-law is the City’s main tool for controlling what is built in the city and shape the way it grows. The Ontario <i>Planning Act</i> allows Zoning By-laws to regulate the use of land and the size and location of buildings and structures. The Zoning By-law is also informed by the new Official Plan policies. The Zoning By-law sets out what is permitted to be developed on a given property e.g. the interior use of a building, setback requirements from property lines, location of parking.</p> <p>Methods to ensure new development comes with amenities to support a community’s needs (e.g. development charges) are out of scope of this Zoning By-law review project. The same is true for infrastructure maintenance and ensuring that the necessary services for a neighbourhood such as parks and schools are built. Work on the new Zoning By-law so far has placed great emphasis on permitting the necessary land uses to allow a variety of services in neighbourhoods in accordance with the Official Plan intent to create walkable 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Where can we find the definition of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The definition can be found in Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan defines the extent of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay will be applied generally to the properties that have a lot line along a Minor Corridor; lands 150 metres from the boundary of a Hub or Mainstreet designation; and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station.”</i></p> <p>The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) policies of the Official Plan are proposed to be implemented in the new Zoning By-law via the application of higher-density Neighbourhood (N) zone designations.</p> <p>For example, where a currently R1-zoned neighbourhood in the Outer Urban transect is generally proposed to be zoned N2 in the draft By-law, areas subject to the ENO would instead be proposed to be zoned N3, which would permit a greater level of density. The same applies to subzones, as there is direction in the ENO policies to gradually shift development towards a more “urban” character compared to the interior of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>To establish which properties would be subject to the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) policies in the draft Zoning By-law, a network analysis was performed using available GIS data for existing pedestrian facilities to measure the walking distances for properties from the Hub and Mainstreet designations and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station. The purpose of using a network analysis is to recognize that there may be cases where the actual walking distance from a Mainstreet/Hub/transit station to a given lot may be significantly greater than its “as-the-crow-flies” distance in the above policy, such that it may not be appropriate to zone it for higher density because the walking distances is much further than the distances contemplated in the policies.</p>



Staff interpreted the above policy to determine walking distances for the network analysis, as follows:

- Minor Corridor: properties with a lot line that has frontage on a Minor Corridor;
- Hub: properties that are within 150 m of the boundary of Hub – equating to a 400 m walk (approx. 5 minutes);
- Mainstreet Corridor: properties that are within 150 m of a road designated Mainstreet Corridor – equating to a 400 m walk (approx. 5 minutes); and
- Rapid Transit Station: properties that are within a 400 m radius of the centre of a Rapid Transit Station – equating to a 600 m walk (approx. 10 minutes).

Following the network analysis, any property that met one or more of the above criteria was determined to be located within the ENO. Further, where 75% or more of a block (i.e. the same street) was deemed to be within the ENO, all parcels within that block were deemed to be part of the ENO to maintain continuity. Parcels considered to be within the ENO were subsequently proposed to be zoned to a higher density Neighbourhood (N) zone in the first draft of the By-law (e.g. a R1 zoned lot in the ENO might be proposed to be zoned N3 where it would otherwise be proposed to be N2).

The following primary zone conversions (from current 2008-250 zoning to Draft 1) were used for each transect for the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay:

Downtown Transect

	Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
	R1	N4	N3
	R2	N4	N3
	R3	N4	N4
	R4	N4	N4
	R5	N5/N6	N5/N6



Inner-Urban Transect

Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
R1	N3	N2
R2	N3	N3
R3	N4	N3
R4	N4	N4
R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

Outer-Urban Transect

Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
R1	N3	N2
R2	N3	N2
R3	N4	N3
R4	N4	N4
R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

Suburban Transect

Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
R1	N2	N1
R2	N3	N2
R3	N3	N3
R4	N4	N3
R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

Staff are open to looking at how the Overlay is being applied in the new By-law as part of subsequent drafts, to ensure that it is being implemented in a consistent and clear manner. Staff acknowledge that the policy with respect to the ENO can be difficult to implement in a consistent manner that makes sense for every neighbourhood, particularly when factoring in street patterns (e.g. cul-de-sacs) and actual walking distances.



Question:	Are the existing site-specific exceptions all being carried forward? If they are, are they being reviewed in their entirety to remove any redundancy or to ensure they are in line with the intent of the new Zoning By-law provisions?
Response:	Staff are carrying out a more detailed review of the exceptions as part of the second draft by-law. That will include deciding whether to carry forward exceptions, and in some cases modifying them to be more up to date with the structure of the new bylaw. This could also include the removal of some in accordance with the proposed new Zoning By-law changes.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>How do the Secondary Plans and Height Strategy map override the proposed new Zoning By-law zones?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Secondary plans set out more specific policies that may have an impact on things like the permitted density of an area, or the permitted primary zone or building height of an area.</p> <p>For example, there are some secondary plans that may designate certain Mainstreet or Minor Corridors as low-rise corridors. This would mean that even though it may still be appropriate to get a Corridor zoning such as the Mainstreet or the Minor Corridor, the Secondary Plan might dictate a lower height and that would need to be reflected in the zoning.</p> <p>As that relates to the Secondary Plans that are currently in progress such as Lincoln Fields and Pinecrest Queensview Secondary Plans, there may have to be changes and refinement to the proposed zoning as part of the policies that come into force from the secondary plan. This is to ensure that the Zoning By-law aligns with the policy that comes from those secondary plans. Further regarding the relationship of those two secondary plans to the new Zoning By-law, there will be zoning also put forward, but only for specific areas. For Lincoln fields, the teams providing the zoning for the RioCan site are only implementing the zoning for the Hub designation. That is generally along Queens view drive to the end of Lyon Street and past where there is the OC transport maintenance. The zoning team will then look at the zoning outside of those areas and implement the new Zoning By-law as best fits with the secondary plans that Council adopted.</p> <p>Regarding the Height Strategy, which deals with permitted heights in Hubs and Mainstreets abutting neighbourhoods, it is a visual representation of how the height limits are intended to work in these zones. For example, in the provisions for the MS-2 zone for Mainstreets, the height permissions vary based on the distance from an abutting neighbourhood zone (N1 to N4). The farther away a lot is from a nearby neighbourhood, the taller the height permitted on it. Therefore, the full height is intended to be permitted at the furthest distances away from the neighbourhood zones and on the deepest lots where there can be more separation of the tallest heights. As such, the height strategy map reflects the permitted height provisions proposed in the new Zoning By-law Draft.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Will McKellar Park remain as it is?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The proposed zoning for residential lots in the McKellar Park area is generally N2 and N3. This depends on whether a lot lies in the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay in the Official Plan or in the neighbourhood’s ‘interior’. The N3 zone is generally proposed for lots near the Hub at the intersection of Carling Ave. and Woodroffe Ave., and lots close to Carling Ave. and Richmond Road.</p> <p>This is in accordance with Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan, which provides more direction as to the intended extent of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO). Policy 1 of Section 5.6.1 states in part:</p> <p>“The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay will be applied generally to the properties that have a lot line along a Minor Corridor; lands 150 metres from the boundary of a Hub or Mainstreet designation; and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station.”</p> <p>In the first draft of the New Zoning By-law the ENO policies are implemented via assigning higher-density primary Neighbourhood zones to areas considered to be located within the overlay. For example, in the case of the Outer Urban transect, a R1-zoned property within the ENO as described in Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan would generally be proposed to be zoned N3 in the draft zoning, whereas it would be generally proposed to be zoned N2 where the property is outside the ENO.</p> <p>Regarding existing parks, the new Zoning By-law general approach is to zone them as Greenspace Zone or Recreation Zone, which correspond to the current Open Space & Leisure Zones in Zoning By-law (2008-250).</p> <p>McKellar Park is proposed to be zoned Recreation Zone, Subzone 1 (REC1), which corresponds to the current Community Leisure and Facility Zone (L1). The current Community Leisure Facility Zone (L1), Major Leisure Facility Zone (L2) from Sections 173 and 175 of the Zoning By-law 2008-250 and subzones L1A and L2B are condensed to one section - Recreation Zone.</p> <p>For information about the REC Zone provisions in Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, please refer to section 1102 (page 215) of the Draft 1 text, found here: https://engage.ottawa.ca/28126/widgets/119508/documents/133163</p>




<p>Question:</p>	<p>Why is the density proposed to be increased drastically? (Example: R1 = 1 unit, now N2/N3, = 6/12 units)</p> <p>When 1 building gets replaced with 12 with no on site parking, the parked cars will be pushed into the street.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>The Official Plan has target per lot densities specified in Table 3b. Planning is proposing an omnibus change in the Official plan that recommends the per lot densities be applied as area-wide densities. Then the Zoning By-law draft lists maximum densities for N2 and N3 zones which are in the order of double to four times the targets in the Official Plan.</p> <p>With actual population tracking below Official Plan forecasts, can you explain quantitatively what has changed to make these huge changes in allowed housing density in neighbourhoods?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan sets density targets for Neighbourhoods to be achieved over a 25-year period. Increased density is a way to meet the Official Plan's goals to achieving more affordable housing options and healthy, complete communities.</p> <p>The draft Zoning By-law takes direction for density permissions from Tables 3A and 3B in Section 3 of the Official Plan. Table 3A outlines density requirements for Hubs and Mainstreet Corridors, while Table 3B has density targets for the Neighbourhood designation.</p> <p>The maximum densities proposed for the N1 through N3 zones are higher than the density targets set out in the Official Plan by transect, and significantly higher in the case of the N3 zone. Higher density maximums on a per lot basis are necessary in zoning (which applies at the level of the individual lot) so that, in aggregate, neighbourhood-level densities can meet the minimum density targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan by 2046. The minimum density targets are a targeted average. To achieve the target average, a portion of redevelopment must therefore be greater than the target density.</p>



On average only a small number of properties in the city, approximately 1 per cent, are redeveloped each year. Further, when that redevelopment occurs, the density of that development will vary depending on decisions made by the property owner. One single detached dwelling may be replaced by another single detached dwelling, with no increase in overall density on the lot, or the single detached dwelling may be replaced by a three-unit or six-unit building.

The diagrams below provide further explanation.


The diagram below shows a hypothetical neighbourhood block one hectare in size, composed of 22 lots, each lot with one detached dwelling on it. Each of the lots is 450 square metres. This block has a density of 22 units per hectare.




The maximum densities permitted in the proposed N1 through N3 zones exceed the targets for Neighbourhoods in Table 3b of the Official Plan. This is to account for the fact that the average area-wide increases to density will be lower than the maximum permitted. For example, it is relatively common to see a detached dwelling replaced by a two, three or four-unit building, instead of a six-unit building. For these reasons, it is necessary to permit densities that are higher on a per-lot basis than the transect-wide targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan.



Lot Level




Density	Min. Units
22 units per hectare	1




Density	Min. Units
130 units per hectare	6

Block Level



Density	Min. Units
22 units per hectare	22



Density	Min. Units
49 units per hectare	49

Neighbourhood Level



Density	Min. Units
60 to 80 units per hectare	60

The above diagrams illustrate the flow of density levels and the number of units at the lot, block, neighbourhood level for low-rise zones (N1-N4).

At the block level, a hypothetical neighbourhood block one hectare (10,000m²) in size, composed of 22 lots, each lot with one detached dwelling on it, has a density of 22 units per hectare. The diagram shows three lots being redeveloped, with one six-unit building, having a density of approximately 130 units per hectare, and two 12-unit buildings having a density of 260 units per hectare.



	<p><i>This increases the number of units on the block from 22 units to 49 units, with a density of 49 units per hectare. This scenario illustrates why the per lot densities permitted in the primary zones need to be higher than the targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan, if those minimum targets in the Official Plan are to be met by 2046.</i></p> <p>In summary, the minimum units-per-hectare Official Plan targets and Neighbourhood zone maximums are, despite both using “units per hectare”, measuring two different things at two different scales:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum density <i>targets</i> 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 40-60 units per hectare target prescribed in the Official Plan for Neighbourhoods in the Outer Urban transect is an average that applies across the entirety of that transect. • The units-per-hectare <i>maximums</i> 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. For example, if an individual 15 m x 30 m lot contains a detached dwelling (1 unit), that lot has a density of 22 units per hectare. 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.
--	---

Question:	Can you speak to the ability to rezone after this plan is in place?
Response:	The new Zoning By-law will not change whether a property owner can apply for a Zoning By-law Amendment. However, it is intended to make Zoning By-law Amendments less necessary by implementing the policies of the Official Plan. Zoning By-law Amendments will continue to be reviewed in accordance with the relevant Official Plan policies once the new Zoning By-law has been adopted.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Between the new Sherburne and New Orchard LRT stations there is a lot of densification occurring north of Richmond Road, but little to nothing on the south side of Richmond Road/Byron Avenue. Do you believe that there will be a push to have densification on the south side.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Richmond Road from the New Orchard to Sherburne LRT stations is designated as a <i>Mainstreet</i> in the Official Plan. That would apply to properties on both sides of Richmond Road. The Official Plan directs some of the highest building heights and development intensities to Mainstreets, so you can expect new development on both sides of Richmond over time.</p> <p>Byron Avenue and the neighbourhoods to the south of Richmond, are designated 'Neighbourhood' in the Official Plan. Neighbourhoods are also expected to change and intensify, but the scale (up to 4 storeys) and intensity of development, are directed in the Official Plan to be much lower. Parts of Neighbourhood-designated areas close to Mainstreets and transit Hubs are expected to change and densify at a faster rate than the interior of neighbourhoods (directed by the Official Plan through the 'evolving overlay'). In the draft Zoning By-law increased development potential is being provided to this area south of Byron, through new Neighbourhood zones. Given the area is close to transit and the commercial services permitted on the Richmond Road (and Woodroffe) Mainstreet, as directed by the Official Plan, you can expect developments over time in the area taking advantage of new Neighbourhood zoning and these nearby services.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Given the significant changes in zoning that will impact neighbourhoods in the inner urban transect and which include evolving overlays due to proximity to transit hubs, would the City consider providing those neighbourhoods with focused consultation sessions, once the applicable secondary plans have been approved? I am specifically referring to the Lincoln Fields and Pinecrest-Queensview Secondary Plans.</p> <p>I would certainly find it useful to have the various zoning changes explained, with reference to maps, preferably in an in-person session. The City held an extremely valuable open house on these two secondary plans, which could serve as a model.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>As you may know, the Lincoln Fields and Pinecrest-Queensview Secondary plans are separate from the new Zoning By-law review project. Consultation on the secondary plans have concluded.</p> <p>Regarding zoning, it is important to note that zoning is ultimately the implementation of the Official Plan and the Secondary Plans. Secondary Plans take precedence over the Official Plan, so the application of zoning and the appearance of the zoning map for these areas will align with the policies outlined in the Secondary Plans.</p> <p>For a detailed understanding of why the zoning map looks the way it does, we recommend referring to the policies in the Secondary Plans. These documents provide comprehensive explanations of the zoning changes and their intended outcomes.</p>



Question:	What will the new Zoning By-law mean with respect to applications to the Committee of Adjustment for minor variances, especially in relation to the proposed maximum height limits?
Response:	<p>A property owner has the right under the <i>Planning Act</i> to file an application for Minor Variance to the Committee of Adjustment, which can be granted if, in the Committee's view, all four tests under Section 45 of the <i>Planning Act</i> are met. These tests include whether or not an application meets the underlying intent of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan.</p> <p>For example, with respect to height restrictions in the Neighbourhood zones, the intent of the N1 to N4 zones is that they permit low-rise heights (4 storeys or fewer), in accordance with Official Plan policy which designates Neighbourhoods as being low-rise. Variances from these restrictions would generally need to demonstrate that the building as varied would remain within this intent, and is still compatible with surrounding context.</p>

Question:	Is this zoning map on the screen the most up to date or is the online draft 1 interactive map the most up to date? I understand that many of these properties with a height suffix of 61 metres are no longer showing as having that height limit on the interactive map.
Response:	<p>The most up-to-date proposed new Zoning By-law map is the one available on the online interactive map: Maps and zoning City of Ottawa</p> <p>Staff continue to review existing Height suffixes and are updating the zoning map accordingly.</p>

Question:	Can you please speak to the timing of the Lincoln Fields and Pinecrest Queensview Secondary Plans and its process?
Response:	We anticipate that the Lincoln Fields Secondary Plan and the Pinecrest Secondary Plan will be going to Committee and Council in Q4 2024.



Ward 8 College

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioning why Draft 1 proposes allowing 4 units as of right on serviced lots, whereas the province recently permitted 3 units as of right. ▪ Seeking clarity on the definition of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay. ▪ Seeking clarity on the future development of Minor Corridors and what this increased density might look like. ▪ Confirming the number of rooming units permitted per building. ▪ Seeking clarity on the density threshold for requiring a Site Plan Control application.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the differences between Neighbourhood zones and justification for their application in specific locations. ▪ Concern about light pollution and shadowing impacts due to new development. ▪ Seeking clarity on the purpose of Secondary Plans.
Greenbelt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking information on any changes to the designation or size of the Greenbelt.
Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need to use simple language for public consultation material. ▪ Confirming the status of the draft by-law and what changes are still possible to the content.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>What is a Secondary Plan, and would you please provide an example?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>A secondary plan is a comprehensive planning document that provides detailed policies and guidelines on how to manage growth and development within a specific area, known as a Secondary Plan Area. These plans often include a schedule that divides the secondary plan area into various designations, such as Neighbourhood designations or Corridor designations.</p> <p>Each designation in the secondary plan has policies tailored to the specific characteristics and needs of that area. These policies may differ from those in the Official Plan to better address local circumstances. For instance, a neighbourhood designation in a secondary plan will have distinct policies specifically designed for that neighbourhood, while a corridor designation will have its own set of policies suited to that type of area.</p> <p>Directions and policies outlined in a secondary plan are typically informed by public consultations, ensuring that the plan reflects the community's input and concerns. This makes the secondary plan a crucial tool for guiding development in a way that aligns with the needs of the local population.</p> <p>As an example, the Pinecrest-Queensview Secondary Plan is expected to be circulated for public review and feedback in Q4 2024.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>If a development is planned to exceed the height and servicing requirements of a coach house (the height exceeds one storey and the building is serviced separately), would the development need to go through site plan control?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Recent changes to the <i>Planning Act</i> under Bill 23 have introduced new limitations on municipalities' ability to apply site plan control. Specifically, developments of 10 units or fewer are no longer subject to site plan control, which is a significant regulatory process that can be costly. This means that developers could choose to limit their projects to 10 units to avoid the expensive and complex site plan control process. However, once a development exceeds 10 units, the project becomes subject to site plan control under current rules, significantly increasing the costs and regulatory requirements. This change is likely to influence the size and scope of new developments in Ontario.</p> <p>Regarding coach houses, they are additional units allowed in the rear yard of a lot, separate from the buildable area typically defined by the lot's setbacks. For example, if a homeowner intends to keep their existing bungalow on the lot, there may not be sufficient space to add another building behind it unless it is a single unit like a coach house. The feasibility of adding multiple units depends on factors such as lot orientation, size, and zoning provisions. Even though a zone might permit up to 12 units, the lot's dimensions and setback requirements might make it impossible to achieve that maximum density.</p>



Question:	What kind of changes to the draft Zoning By-law are possible at this stage?
Response:	<p>The primary zone that has been selected for an area, along with its boundaries, can still be reviewed. The new Zoning By-law is intended to implement the designations from the Official Plan, such as Hub zones, which correspond to specific policies in the Official Plan. However, zoning can be very detailed, allowing for adjustments and refinements. For example, suffixes can be added to zone codes to reflect specific characteristics, like a height suffix to preserve the existing character of a neighbourhood.</p> <p>If a neighbourhood is predominantly made up of bungalows that are only 1 or 1.5 storeys tall, but the current zoning allows for buildings up to 11 metres in height, it might be appropriate to add a height suffix that limits the height to 8.5 metres. This would better align with the existing built form of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>These are the types of changes that you can certainly provide feedback on. We will review your comments and make efforts to revise the Zoning By-law to better reflect the character and needs of the community.</p>

Question:	Will the new Zoning By-law reduce or remove the Greenbelt areas?
Response:	<p>The approach to zoning in the Greenbelt has been to carry forward the existing rights. This means that where lands are designated as Rural or Environmental Protection areas, those protections remain in place. New zones have been created to implement policy directions from the Official Plan, but these do not result in any loss of land in the Greenbelt. Instead, they may add additional permissions, such as recognizing existing uses or allowing for research and development on NCC lands. To be clear, lands in the Greenbelt are not proposed for redevelopment—the new by-law essentially proposes a continuation of the current protections.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>According to the Secondary Plan, our street is identified as an Evolving Neighbourhood. What does that mean?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay policies are included in the Official Plan. If you look at the B-series schedules in the Official Plan, you will see the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay represented by small purple speckles overlaid with a lighter purple color. These areas are typically located near busy corridors or hubs, and the Official Plan directs that higher-density forms of development should be considered and permitted in these zones.</p> <p>The role of the new Zoning By-law team is to translate these policy directions into the Zoning By-law, allowing for additional development opportunities in the areas identified by the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay. That is why the higher density zones are focused in these specific areas—it's a direct result of the overlay's guidelines.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>The Planning Act required three units to be permitted per lot. Why does the new zoning propose four units as of right, rather than making gradual changes?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Province's amendment to the <i>Planning Act</i> does mandates that municipalities must allow three units per lot on serviced properties. The four unit proposal is to implement the agreement made by the City with the Federal government as part of the Housing Accelerator Fund. This fund is a federal initiative through which the City is receiving over \$170 million in funding for affordable housing.</p> <p>As part of this commitment, the City agreed to consult the public on the possibility of increasing the minimum to four units per lot. Right now, three units are required by the <i>Planning Act</i>, which always overrides Zoning By-law if there is a conflict. City Council has agreed to explore the option of permitting four units, which is why this has been included as a provision in the draft.</p> <p>The current City of Ottawa's Zoning By-law was brought into alignment with the <i>Planning Act</i> to acknowledge the three unit permissions in 2023.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Are there provisions in the zoning regulations for light abatement (i.e. light pollution) and for shadows cast by large buildings for those who are using solar power?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Zoning By-laws under the <i>Planning Act</i> do not have the authority to regulate lighting—that falls under site plan control. Unfortunately, zoning cannot address every issue, it is primarily concerned with the size and location of buildings.</p> <p>Regarding solar panels, the City’s legal position is that there is no "right to light" under the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p> <p>While there are permissions for solar panels on roofs and in certain city locations, it is important to recognize that cities evolve. Taller buildings are permitted in some areas, which can lead to changes in building heights and potential shadowing impacts. In such cases, mitigation strategies, like relocating solar panels to another side of a roof, might be necessary to maintain sunlight exposure.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>What were the criteria used to upzone properties on a street like Abingdon to N3D? The threshold seems very low. I could end up next to a 12-unit building if my neighbour sells to a developer.</p>
<p>Question</p>	<p>In Queensway Terrace South Ridgeview for example, we have a mix of N2 and N3 Zones on lots that are all 50x100 feet. Why are they proposed to have two different zone codes?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>One can refer to the primary zones in Table 801A. A conversion table is available on the project’s Engage Ottawa page which clearly outlines how the zones have been converted. The process is based on whether a lot lies in the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay or in the interior of a neighbourhood.</p> <p>For example, if the property is in the interior of a neighbourhood and was previously in an R1 zone, it is proposed to be converted to N2. If the lot was in an R2 zone, it is proposed to be converted to N3. However, in areas covered by the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay—where policies direct increased density near Mainstreet Corridors and Hub designations—the zone code increases by one level to reflect those policies in the Official Plan. So, if a property was in an R2 zone near a Minor or Mainstreet Corridor, instead of moving to R3, it would be upzoned to R4 to accommodate the additional density.</p> <p>This conversion process is straightforward and directly tied to the Official Plan policies for the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay. If you need more details, we encourage you to visit the zoning Engage Ottawa page. The staff report from April 29th, particularly Document 10, explains this methodology in detail with diagrams and tables. The report provides comprehensive information on how staff transitioned the current R zones into the new neighbourhood zones.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Is the current Single Occupancy Room limit at 7 units without need for variance permit, going to change to more units?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan has a policy directing the Zoning By-law to permit rooming houses across all Neighbourhood Zones and, more broadly, in urban zones throughout the city. This is a new requirement reflected in the draft Zoning By-law, as mandated by the Official Plan.</p> <p>The policies do not permit the Zoning By-law to establish restrictions, including minimum separation distances or caps, whose effect is to limit the opportunity to provide such housing forms. Section 4.2.3 of the Official Plan, states the following with respect to rooming house uses:</p> <p><i>“1) The City recognizes that many individuals may not constitute nor form part of a household and may rely on long-term housing other than the traditional dwelling unit. The City shall enable the provision of housing options for such individuals through the implementing Zoning By-law, as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Permitting, in any zone where residential uses are permitted, alternative, cooperative or shared accommodation housing forms serving individuals for whom an entire dwelling unit is unnecessary, unaffordable, or inappropriate including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) <i>Rooming houses;</i> ii) <i>Retirement homes;</i> iii) <i>Residential care facilities;</i> iv) <i>Purpose-built student housing;</i> v) <i>Group homes; and</i> vi) <i>Other long-term housing forms that serve the needs of individuals not forming part of a household.</i> b) <i>Further to Policy a), the City shall not establish restrictions, including minimum separation distances or caps, whose effect is to limit the opportunity to provide such housing forms.”</i>



In accordance with the Official Plan policies, the draft Zoning By-law permits a rooming house in any zone where residential uses are permitted.

- No more than one rooming house is permitted in a building in a residential zone.
- A building containing a rooming house in a residential zone may contain no more than one dwelling unit.
- A rooming unit may not contain more than one bedroom.

The draft By-law regulates residential land uses based on the maximum number of dwelling units permitted on a lot and/or based on the size of the building permitted on the lot (the maximum height and minimum setbacks from lot lines).

In the case of a rooming house, two rooming units are considered equivalent to one dwelling unit. So, in the example of a N1 zone, which is proposed to permit up to four dwelling units on a lot, this means a rooming house located in a N1 zone would be permitted a maximum of eight rooming units (bedrooms) as-of-right. This is roughly the same number of bedrooms as a four-unit building with two bedrooms in each dwelling unit.

To summarize, the intent of the draft Zoning By-law is to generally permit this use in zoning, subject to the provisions set out under Section 707 of the first draft of the new By-law.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Are there example pictures of what type of buildings would be on a Mainstreet Corridor? Specifically, I'm interested in how Iris Street near the new LRT station will develop in the future.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Iris Street is designated as a Minor Corridor in the Official Plan and falls within the Pinecrest-Queensview Secondary Plan area. There are specific policies related to how development will be managed on this Minor Corridor, including maximum building heights. However, staff cannot fully answer this question at this moment because the final version of these policies is not available yet, and those policies will shape the zoning for the area.</p> <p>If the current zoning does not align with the final policies, it will be revised accordingly. Minor Corridor zones are somewhat based on the Traditional Mainstreet Zones in the current Zoning By-law (2008-250), which means that development in this area is expected to be in the four- to six-storey range. The Secondary Plan will likely provide more details on what this should look like, including requirements for lot depth to ensure proper height transitions from a six-storey building to a low-rise neighbourhood.</p> <p>At this stage, the draft zoning provisions for Minor Corridor Zones do not include these height transition provisions, but they will be added in the second draft. Regarding Iris Street, which currently has a CM3 zone (a Minor Corridor subzone 3), there may be additional details once the Pinecrest-Queensview Secondary Plan is finalized.</p>



Ward 9 Knoxdale-Merivale

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that a four-storey building next to existing homes would significantly affect privacy. • Concern that in N3D zones, which can permit up to 15, 20 units per lot, is a drastic change and unfair for people who have moved away from densely populated areas. • Support for increasing building heights in N zones and removing caps at 2 storeys. • Concern about locating incompatible businesses, such as auto repair shops or body shops, in residential neighbourhoods. • Questioning if a new Zoning By-law will reduce the need for excessive Minor Variance applications, especially in residential areas.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggesting that there be a term of reference or definitions document for key terms in the Official Plan that have been used in the Zoning By-law. It would help average person to get more involved and for understanding the bylaw better without having to go between the two already complex documents.



Questions and Staff Responses

Comment:	Suggestion to redesignate the properties along Northview Road and Eleanor Drive between Greencrest Place and Farlane Boulevard from N3D to N2E, similar to the zone to the south. These properties are mid-block and exceed the 400-metre distance rule from transit stops (at least in walking distance), which was a principle used in the zoning decisions based on the presentation given in June.
Response:	<p>Staff will examine this further as part of review of the zoning map for subsequent drafts of the new Zoning By-law.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the proposed higher density zoning in this case is proposed as a result of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) as designated in the Official Plan. Section 5.6 of the Official Plan notes multiple criteria that can result in a property or street being included in the ENO, one of which is being within 400 metres of a rapid transit station. However, Staff note that there are other conditions that can result in a property being included in the ENO, including being within 150 metres of a designated Hub or Mainstreet (e.g. Baseline Road or Merivale Avenue).</p>

Question:	A lot of the residential areas in the ward are zoned N1 or N2 where building height is capped at 8.5 metres which is about two storeys. This seems fairly low, especially if the intent is to have infill and building greater densities in residential areas. What's the logic behind locking the vast majority of the zoning in the residential areas to having a high restriction of two storeys (or 8.5 metres)? Is there a specific reason for that?
Question:	Concern that limiting most residential buildings to 8.5 metres (about two storeys) hinders progress as allowing 3 to 5-storey buildings wouldn't drastically change the neighbourhood's character. With low turnover rates, the City is expecting about 0.5%, only a small percentage of houses would reach the maximum height over the next 20 years. This moderate increase in height to 3 to 5 storeys would support the development of 15-minute neighbourhoods in areas outside of hubs as envisioned in the Official Plan, without significantly impacting the neighbourhood's character.



Response:	<p>While the Official Plan allows up to 4 storeys citywide, the current approach to zoning and height assignment varies. One philosophy behind the eight-and-a-half-metre height limit is to reflect existing neighbourhood conditions, promoting context sensitivity in new developments. The proposed changes to neighbourhood zoning are more focused on reducing friction and eliminating the hidden complexities in the Zoning By-law, rather than universally expanding building envelopes. That's not to say a more aggressive policy approach couldn't pursue the full four storeys allowed by the Official Plan, but there are differing opinions on this. The emphasis on two-storey developments largely stems from the expectation that new buildings respect neighbourhood character and context.</p>
------------------	--

Comment:	<p>You are allowed to build a minimum of four storeys throughout the city, is that correct?</p>
Response:	<p>In Section 6.3 of the Official Plan on neighbourhoods, the general rule is that building heights are capped at four storeys, with the exception of pre-existing structures that exceed this limit. These buildings, constructed before the current Zoning By-laws, are legally grandfathered in.</p>

Question:	<p>Have the City done any sort of surveys on how people feel about 4-storey houses compared to their two-storey house? Is there any data like that?</p>
Response:	<p>From a zoning team's standpoint, not particularly. However, one thing that people should keep in mind is that the whole business of planning and city transformation is incremental. One of the key things, particularly in a city the size of Ottawa, is making sure that intensification is happening in places where the city is prepared to service it and is prepared to manage it. The whole business of building up around transit corridors is extremely important. In a place like Ward 9, the transit corridor along Baseline Road, where there has been discussion for some time and planning for some time around installing BRT along Baseline, will need some density to support it.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>In Fisher Heights, the draft Zoning By-law shows N3D which allows a maximum density of 250 dwellings per hectare. Given that most lots are around 7,500 square feet (approximately 700 square metres), rounding up to 1,000 square metres, you could potentially have less than 25 units per hectare after accounting for setbacks. This represents a significant change for an area predominantly consisting of single-family homes, as the new Zoning By-law could allow for lots to be developed with 15 to 20 units each.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Technically, the zoning allows for up to 250 units per hectare, so in theory, a 1,000 square metre lot, which is a tenth of a hectare, could yield 25 units. However, zoning is about setting limits, not issuing building permits. We draw lines to ensure compatibility with public expectations for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>While the density ceiling is set at 250 units per hectare, several factors constrain what's actually possible. For instance, side yard setbacks, which are more generous here than in areas like Centretown or the Glebe, limit the buildable area. Landscaping requirements, the percentage taken up by the rear and front yards, and building code and architectural requirements must also be taken into account.</p> <p>While 25 units might be theoretically possible, it doesn't mean every lot can achieve that density or fully reach the density ceiling. Moreover, the rate of neighbourhood turnover is relatively low—around 0.5% per year city-wide—so even if one in 100 lots turns over every two years, not all will be prime for maximum development. The goal is for any additional density to be achieved in a controlled way that meets all requirements, making that extra density a win.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>In an N3D neighbourhood, what does that mean? Does that mean the maximum height is three storeys? What does the D represent?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The first two characters of the zoning code, the 'N' and the '3', provide key information. The 'N' indicates that it's a neighbourhood zone, specifying the permitted uses. The '3' doesn't directly refer to the number of storeys but rather to the density allowance, up to 250 dwellings per hectare, though there are practical constraints. It also relates to the permitted height, which in this case is 11 metres, allowing for three storeys.</p> <p>The 'D' in the code typically refers to setbacks. As you move closer to the city core, you'll see more 'A' and 'B' subzones, which indicate buildings are situated closer to their neighbours with tighter lot configurations. As you move outwards towards the suburbs, the zoning shifts down the alphabet, with 'E' and 'F' representing more suburban settings, and 'C' and 'D' corresponding to mid-century, post-war development. The idea is that while we may increase building permissions, the overall rhythm of yard sizes and setbacks should remain consistent.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Originally, minor variances were meant for situations like when a house was built too close to the property line, and neighbours were okay with it. With the new Zoning By-law redesign, will minor variances be used less frequently and return to their original purpose?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>People will always have the right to apply for a minor variance, as provided by the <i>Planning Act</i>. The goal of the new Zoning By-law is to close the gap between the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law, making them more consistent. Another aim is to streamline the by-law by cleaning up the areas that commonly trigger minor variances and reducing the need for such variances in the future.</p>



Comment:	There are concerns about bringing businesses like auto repair shops, body shops and daycares into residential neighbourhoods rather than putting them in industrial or downtown areas – this would significantly reduce the quality of life for residents.
Response:	A daycare is a conditional use in the R5 successor zones N5 and N6. Otherwise these uses are not permitted in Neighbourhood zones, with the exception of home-based daycares, which are largely already permitted in the current Zoning By-law.



As We Heard It Report – Wards 1, 2, 11, and 19 Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Wards 1, 2, 11 and 19 was held on August 27, 2024, from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. It is noted that only that areas in the Suburban Transect for Wards 1 and 19 were covered in this session. The remaining areas in the Rural Transect will be discussed in a later meeting. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a zoning by-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 1 Orléans East-Cumberland (suburban) – Councillor Matthew Luloff	2
	Summary of Comments Received	2
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses.....	3
2	Ward 2 Orléans West-Innes – Councillor Laura Dudas	14
	Summary of Comments Received	14
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	15
3	Ward 11 Beacon Hill-Cyrville – Councillor Tim Tierney	18
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	19
4	Ward 19 Orléans South-Navan (suburban) – Councillor Catherine Kitts	24
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	25



Ward 1 Orléans East-Cumberland (suburban)

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Turnover Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the methodology for establishing the citywide turnover rate. ▪ Wondering about a situation in which no one in a neighbourhood wants to develop their property and the turnover rate is 0%.
Minor Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggesting the need for great soft landscaping requirements for Minor Corridors. ▪ Comments in support of permitting residential uses in Minor Corridors.
Hubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the definition of Hubs and the criteria for establishing the locations of Hubs. ▪ Seeking clarity on the location of Hubs in Ward 1. ▪ Support for greater development around the 10th Line Road Hub.
Future Development Applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the process to alter the Zoning By-law once the new by-law has been approved by Council. ▪ Wondering about the flexibility of the by-law to respond to changing conditions following its implementation.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the minimum densities prescribed through the Official Plan and the maximum densities in Neighbourhoods proposed in the draft Zoning By-law.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>If the Official Plan allows the density targets to be exceeded, why is there a need to establish maximum densities?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Table 3b in the Official Plan (OP) establishes residential densities targets for Neighbourhoods and Minor Corridors per transect. Higher density maximums on a per lot basis are necessary in zoning (which applies at the level of the individual lot) so that, in aggregate, neighbourhood-level densities can meet the minimum density targets in the OP by 2046. The minimum density targets are a targeted average. To achieve the target average, a portion of redevelopment must therefore be greater than the target density. On average only a small number of properties in the city, approximately 1 per cent, are redeveloped each year.</p> <p>Further, when that redevelopment occurs, the density of that development will vary depending on decisions made by the property owner. One single detached dwelling may be replaced by another single detached dwelling, with no increase in overall density on the lot, or the single detached dwelling may be replaced by a three-unit or six-unit building.</p> <p>Maximum density permissions are provided in order to provide some certainty on future development and to allow for incremental growth in Neighbourhoods.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>What happens if no homeowners wish to re-develop their lots in a neighbourhood?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>If no one wants to redevelop the lots, there are certain estimates of how often blocks are redeveloped. People can do whatever they need to do with their lots so if they choose to redevelop that is their choice. Turnover rates can vary but Staff are trying to adequately predict it based on what's available.</p>



Question:	Did you consider the cost of labour and materials in your density targets?
Response:	It appears that this aspect was not considered, but it is typically evaluated during the development stage. At that point, the cost and feasibility of development would be assessed.

Question:	How can you predict that an average of three lots will be redeveloped on each block?
Response:	That is the average that has been used to create policies thus far. An average is the best estimate of what will happen so we cannot guarantee that it will be three (3) lots on each block but that is the average that has been used in policies, the Official Plan and the new Zoning By-law.

Question:	Is the new policy on the conversion of offices, hotels, and institutional buildings to affordable housing carried over in the new Zoning By-law?
Response:	Those policies are being worked on in other departments, but those realities are recognized as ones that will happen through the new Zoning By-law. The Zoning By-law is something Staff is working to be more permissive in terms of what's permitted in the actual zones, allowing for more uses as directed by the Official Plan. Uses being permitted more widely would allow for those things to be built.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>It is my understanding that the Official Plan designates both existing and future Hubs, does the new Zoning By-law cover both existing and future Hubs?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Based on Schedule B8 in the Official Plan shows the one Hub within the ward boundary which is the Orleans Town Centre Hub. The new Zoning By-law will designate areas based on the designations found in the Official Plan, thus the lands around Orleans Town Centre will be zoned Hub in the new Zoning By-law.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>The description of a 15-minute neighbourhood describes an area that is accessible by walking, cycling and transit. When we look at that 15-minute in comparison to the 600-metre limit of height density from transit station, there seems to be confusion or irregularity. It should include 15-minutes for walking and cycling.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>With respect to the new Zoning By-law, Staff is implementing what the Official Plan directs. As such, Policy 1c) in Subsection 4.1.2 of the Official Plan states that 15-minutes is equivalent to a radius of 900 metres or 1,200 metres on the pedestrian network.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Could you outline the process for an individual who, despite the passing of the new Zoning By-law with Council amendments, disagrees with the zoning regulations? Specifically, if an individual believes they have a viable project that exceeds or differs from the current zoning of a parcel of land, what procedures are available to them to seek a change or proceed with their project?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>When examining the Zoning By-law, there are two primary types of planning applications used to modify it: a Zoning By-law amendment and a minor variance.</p> <p>Minor variances are typically employed for smaller modifications. For example, if you wish to extend a deck closer to the rear-yard setback, you will apply for a minor variance to allow the deck to encroach further into the backyard.</p> <p>For larger-scale developments, taller structures, or changes that do not conform to the existing zoning code (such as converting an institutional property to residential), a Zoning By-law amendment is required. This amendment considers both the property's zoning and the Official Plan. To proceed, the proposed development must demonstrate alignment with the Official Plan policies.</p> <p>If a proposed development does not align with the Official Plan, an Official Plan amendment is necessary. These amendments are less common than Zoning By-law amendments. However, with recent changes to the Zoning By-law, Staff anticipate fewer applications due to increased permissions that do not require zoning code changes.</p>



Question:	In the event of changing circumstances, such as the addition of a transit stop or increased density along a transit line that enhances the walkability of a neighbourhood, what flexibility does the policy provide to accommodate these scenarios?
Response:	<p>Future amendments can occur at the city-level. For instance, an Official Plan amendment may be initiated by the City to accommodate changes such as the addition of a new transit station. These amendments must go through Council, except for minor variances, which are handled by the Committee of Adjustment. This committee meets bi-weekly and is responsible for approving various planning applications.</p> <p>While other planning applications also go through the Committee of Adjustment, new Zoning By-law amendments and Official Plan amendments must be approved by Council.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Upon reviewing the definition of a Hub in the by-law, I understand that a Hub is a section of the city that integrates services, restaurants, food, work, and the various uses of a neighbourhood or community. I reside near 10th Line Road, and when I observe the area at the top of the hill at 10th Line/St. Joseph/Innes, it is densely developed with services, recreation, and housing. Why is this area not considered a Hub?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Hubs designated in the Official Plan (OP) were determined based on various considerations. These Hubs are defined within the OP, and the zoning by-law reflects these designations. The rationale behind selecting specific areas as Hubs is something the OP team would need to address. However, Section 6.1 of the OP provides insight into the intentions behind these provisions:</p> <p><i>Hubs are areas centred on planned or existing rapid transit stations and/or frequent street transit stops. The planned function of Hubs is to concentrate a diversity of functions, a higher density of development, a greater degree of mixed uses and a higher level of public transit connectivity than the areas abutting and surrounding the Hub. Hubs are also intended as major employment centres.</i></p> <p><i>Hubs are identified as Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSAs) for the purposes of the Provincial Policy Statement.</i></p> <p><i>Appropriate development densities shall create the critical mass essential to make transit viable. They will lead to reduced revenue-cost ratios and help provide cost-effective high levels of transit service. For these reasons, the City is pursuing a strategy that would ensure the implementation of more compact, higher-density and mixed-use communities around transit stations.</i></p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>When examining the location of Hubs and the amenities currently available within them, it is evident that many are not yet well-developed, such as the area off 10th Line Road. It appears that the designation of a Hub is not necessarily based on its immediate development but rather on a long-term vision, with the expectation that development will occur over the next 10-15 years. This is the case with Hubs that have not yet begun significant development.</p> <p>In contrast, the Hub at 10th Line Road is already established and expanding. It should be encouraged to continue its growth, but this is not currently being prioritized. Why is that?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The portion of the Hub that abuts 10th Line Road, where the zone codes present are Hub Zone 3 (H3). H3 zone is intended to acknowledge non-residential uses in areas historically occupied predominantly by residential uses. This zoning designation recognizes the area's residential history while reflecting its designation as a Hub in the Official Plan (OP) and the new Zoning By-law. Consequently, the permissions in the new Zoning By-law for this area are likely to be less permissive than those in H2 or H1 zones, as it acknowledges the area's predominantly residential past.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Although I have not reviewed the current zoning details, I would like to highlight that there is a Hub in this area that requires further development and transportation expansion. The Hub already has the necessary infrastructure, amenities, water, and sewer systems in place. Therefore, I believe it should be expanded, particularly in terms of rapid transit.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>With respect to what the Zoning By-law can do within the Hub, there are two zone codes for the portion along 10th Line Road. The proposed zone code, which is open to feedback, is Hub Zone 3 (H3). The H3 zone, particularly along 10th Line, is unique as it acknowledges the surrounding residential use. Consequently, development in this area will be more restrained compared to an H2 zone.</p> <p>As for aspects outside of zoning, such as transportation, these are being addressed in the master plans currently being developed, as mentioned in the city-wide presentation. There is a recognition that all these factors contribute to the overall development of the lands. The Zoning By-law must reflect the Official Plan (OP), as mandated, and Staff are doing so by applying the appropriate zone code and acknowledging the intended Hub designation for these lands.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>I would like to address specific properties in my vicinity. I reside at the intersection of 10th Line and Innes Road, on the west side of 10th Line and north of Innes. Directly behind my residence, there are six houses fronting onto 10th Line. Among these, one is a group home, and four are single-detached homes occupied by senior citizens who are beginning to sell their properties. The sixth house was sold last year, and its previous owner is the owner of Sterling Ford car dealership.</p> <p>I have observed that this area has been designated as a Minor Corridor (CM). Given the substantial size and length of these lots, they present significant redevelopment potential, especially considering the current affordable housing crisis. Therefore, I am curious as to why this area has been designated as a Minor Corridor rather than being zoned to permit residential development.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The area mentioned has been proposed as Minor Corridor Subzone 4 (CM4), which is intended to apply to properties within the suburban transect, recognizing the distinct character differences in built form within this transect.</p> <p>This CM4 subzone aims to implement the policies of the Official Plan (OP), which designates the area as a Minor Corridor. The zoning must reflect this designation and ensure that the permitted building heights, as outlined in Section 5, Table 7 of the OP, are respected. These height regulations are specified within the Minor Corridor subzone.</p> <p>Typically, residential areas are designated as Neighbourhoods, which have different height requirements and policies under the OP. Given the location on 10th Line and its designation as a Minor Corridor, the CM4 zoning code was assigned accordingly. However, residential development is permitted along Minor Corridors.</p>



Question:	Upon reviewing the soft landscaping requirements for the CM zone, I found them to be somewhat ambiguous. It appears that many of the requirements primarily address streetscape improvements, with less emphasis on rear yards and adjacent residential properties. Am I interpreting this correctly, and if so, is there any recourse to address this issue?
Response:	While there are provisions in the draft Zoning by-law, they are more tailored to Neighbourhood zones. Staff are open to comments and suggestions if there is a particular interest in enhancing soft landscaping requirements for Minor Corridors. Additionally, there are soft landscaping provisions related to parking, ensuring green buffers around parking lots. However, specific examples directly corresponding to Minor Corridors may be limited. This is an area that can be further explored and considered for future revisions.

Question:	What provisions exist within the Zoning By-law regarding the potential for residential units above commercial buildings on these Minor Corridors? Would such developments be permissible, provided that the height and setback requirements are adhered to?
Response:	<p>Permitting a broader range of uses on these lots is generally allowed in many cases. However, a detailed review of the specific zone codes is necessary to determine the exact locations where such uses would be permitted or restricted. The Official Plan (OP) emphasizes the importance of mixed-use development in corridor designations, encouraging residential units above commercial spaces at grade. This approach supports the concept of 15-minute neighborhoods, where essential services and amenities are within a short walking distance.</p> <p>Developers have the discretion to decide how they build, but there are provisions in place to ensure that commercial uses are prioritized at street level, with residential units above. This strategy aims to create vibrant, street-facing commercial spaces, such as grocery stores or other essential services, enhancing the overall functionality and appeal of the corridor.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Regarding the zoning designation MS2 on Innes Road, west of 10th Line, does the list of permitted uses include residential development? Specifically, does it allow for a single-family home, or does it permit broader residential development?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Nearly all mixed-use zones in Part 9, including Mainstreet Zone 2 (MS2) as on Innes Road, permit residential uses.</p> <p>Because the new Zoning By-law puts less emphasis on the distinctions between various types of dwelling (i.e. semi-detached vs. apartment vs. detached) the inclusive and general-purpose term “dwelling unit” is used in the list of permitted uses. For information on this, please see Section 124 in Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law.</p> <p>A “dwelling unit” is defined in the draft Zoning By-law as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Dwelling Unit means a residential unit that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>is used or intended for use as a residential premises by one household and not more than three roomers or boarders; and</i> 2. <i>contains no more than four bedrooms. (un logement)</i>



Ward 2 Orléans West-Innes

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Secondary Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wondering if the Orléans Corridor Secondary Plan has been implemented in the proposed zoning.
Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the transportation implications and requirements for corridor designations.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the electric vehicle parking spot requirements. ▪ Concern with the amount of EV parking spaces available and their capacity. ▪ Concerns with street parking capacity in residential areas.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the difference between the Official Plan (OP) density targets and the maximum densities proposed in Draft 1. ▪ Concern with the infrastructure and greenspace needs to permit the density proposed in the OP Draft 1.
Mineral Extraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns with the expansion of an existing asphalt plant and updating the Mineral Extraction zone.
Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the permissions for battery energy storage systems facilities and solar panels.



Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	Has the secondary plan been incorporated into what we're seeing today? Do you anticipate a lot of changes from what we're discussing today, or will it be fairly similar?
Response:	<p>The Orléans Corridor Secondary Plan is currently under appeal. In the meantime, Staff have generally implemented its provisions and conducted a zoning code conversion to align current area designations with the draft Zoning By-law. However, additional work remains to be done. Once the secondary plan is fully in effect, Staff will review all policies to ensure they are accurately reflected in the new Zoning By-law.</p> <p>It is necessary to assess the specific changes required. While Staff are on track with most of the work, there may be particular adjustments needed in the denser zones, especially concerning the implementation of height changes.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Regarding the mineral extraction zone highlighted in your presentation, why has it not been updated? We are increasingly aware of the pollution emanating from the expansion of the asphalt plant, which is situated in close proximity to schools and residences. It is imperative to update the plan or zoning for that property to restrict such uses.</p> <p>To clarify, there is no complaint about the mineral extraction itself, which has been a known and longstanding operation. The concern pertains specifically to the expansion of the asphalt plant, which is a distinct issue from mineral extraction.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Typically, when an existing use is recognized by the current Zoning By-law it will be carried forward into the new Zoning By-law. It is understood that this mineral extraction operation has been established for many years, with urban development occurring around it. Staff are currently exploring options to assess how any potential zoning changes might impact the operation.</p> <p>This matter involves a specific and technical aspect of zoning that is not frequently encountered, needing a thorough assessment by the Zoning Team to evaluate potential impacts. Even if the zoning is amended, the operation would retain legal non-conforming rights under the Planning Act, allowing it to continue extraction activities. However, changes in zoning could influence the terms of the license and the permissible activities on the property. Further research, consultation with the ministry, and a detailed analysis will be required to determine the potential effects of any zoning modifications on the operations.</p>



Question:	The Official Plan and the Zoning By-law use terms such as "mainstreet" and "minor corridors," which are frequently associated with transportation and transit. My question is whether these terms denote actual significance for vehicle and transit movement, or if they are just land use designations intended to permit varying housing densities without any substantial transportation or transit implications.
Response:	<p>The Mainstreet Corridor designation is closely tied to transportation, as the aim is to have the highest densities along these corridors due to their strong transit service. Similarly, Hubs follow the same principle. The Official Plan also uses terms like "transit priority corridor" to describe transportation levels of service, which can sometimes be confusing.</p> <p>To clarify, "Mainstreet Corridor" in the Official Plan is a land use designation that reflects both density and building height. Its designation is linked to transit service, with the goal of having the densest developments in areas with the best transportation options.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>The standard for EV charging in North America is changing from J1772 to J3400, so you might want to update that in the definitions. I read the section on recharging and want to confirm my understanding: this applies only to new developments or major refits, right? So, every new residential development would have to be EV ready for every designated parking spot, but not for visitor spots?</p> <p>For commercial properties, you require 30% of parking spots to be EV ready. Does this apply to grocery stores as well?</p> <p>In the short term, there's an issue with charging availability, and 30% seems like a high requirement for commercial properties. For retail properties, there might not need to be a by-law requirement, but more fast charging is needed in areas like Blackburn where people lack home charging access. Long-term, Level 2 charging is less important as residential spots will eventually have these facilities, similar to how block heater plugs were common in the past.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Yes, that's correct – every designated parking spot would be EV ready, meaning the conduit is there but it doesn't have to be powered up. The 30% of parking spots that have to be EV ready apply to industrial and office uses. Commercial retail can offer it if they choose (this includes grocery stores).</p> <p>All zoning restrictions city-wide have been eliminated, allowing fast charging in parking lots associated with businesses. While this isn't an incentive, it does remove barriers and permits this use.</p>



Question:	The single Level 2 charging station in Blackburn is heavily used, with residents of nearby apartment buildings relying on it. With 200 new apartment units under construction that won't be covered by the current by-law, there's a pressing need for more charging options. When the Level 2 charger is unavailable due to events or malfunctions, it causes significant inconvenience. Additionally, with waived parking minimums, new units in the neighbourhood lack on-street parking, leading to overflow issues on nearby streets. This is compounded by unreliable public transportation, increasing the number of cars parked on city streets. How will the city address this growing parking problem?
Response:	The Zoning Team is reviewing the on-street parking permit program to evaluate its implementation and potential expansion. They are identifying priority areas with current or anticipated parking demand issues. Additionally, they are exploring ways to allow parking in areas where it is not currently permitted, such as utilizing underutilized surface parking spaces for other uses.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Are the area-wide targets of 30-60 units per hectare in Outer Urban and Suburban areas actually in the Official Plan, or are the targets on a per lot basis, which is different? In the presentation, the example shows three units per existing lot in the Official Plan for zoning N2 neighbourhoods increasing to six per lot. Why are we not following the Official Plan?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The density targets are outlined in Table 3B of the Official Plan, which is found in Section 3. This table assigns density targets to different areas of the city, such as 40 to 60 units per hectare in the Outer Urban and Suburban transects, with increasing densities for the Inner Urban and Downtown transects. These are area-wide targets, which explains why individual lots may have higher densities. Since overall area densities are currently below target, higher densities on certain lots need to be permitted to meet the city-wide goals by 2046, as set out in the Official Plan.</p> <p>Additionally, the impact of Bill 23 should be noted. This provincial legislation has amended the Planning Act to allow up to three units on any serviced lot, thereby overriding municipal Zoning By-laws. This amendment is now in effect across Ontario. In the case of semi-detached buildings, which can accommodate two units side-by-side or front-to-back, this means that up to six units are permissible on a single lot, as each half can contain three units. Bill 23 has significantly altered how municipalities manage dwelling unit permissions and densities.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>My questions focus on the transition to increased density in my single-family dwelling area near the Greenbelt. At what point is the density too much for the existing infrastructure, and who decides this? How will parking be managed if there are up to four units on a lot but limited parking space, especially during winter? How will EV charging be handled for additional units when there's limited driveway space?</p> <p>Regarding mini malls, what is the plan for their transition, considering the current parking issues? For example, visitors are already parking in mini malls due to insufficient street parking. How will the transition ensure the preservation of parks and green spaces, especially with higher density and more cars?</p> <p>Lastly, what is the current situation with vacant land in our ward, and how will the transition be affected by neighbouring wards in terms of roads, transit, and parking?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan provides the framework, and the Zoning By-law serves to implement those policies.</p> <p>For example, in terms of servicing, we ensure there's adequate sewer and water capacity for new developments. Our Infrastructure Master Plan (IMP) and engineering teams monitor the larger systems, such as trunk sewers and water mains, and they've indicated that, so far, there is sufficient capacity to support intensification in neighbourhoods. The new Zoning By-law will strengthen these checks by requiring proof of capacity for sewer, water, and stormwater management before a building permit is issued. Developers will need to incorporate on-site stormwater management, such as underground tanks or rooftop reservoirs, to ensure stormwater runoff is controlled and doesn't overwhelm the system after heavy rainfall.</p> <p>Regarding parks, there will be no changes to lands currently zoned for park use, so these areas are protected from redevelopment. For trees, we're introducing new soft landscaping requirements to support urban greenery. When it comes to parking, we've been discussing on-street parking permit systems to better manage parking demand. Developers are also mindful of parking needs, especially based on a project's location and proximity to transit. Many have learned that it's difficult to sell units without adequate parking, and they adjust their plans accordingly to balance parking with the local market demands.</p>



Question:	There should be a ban on installing new natural gas facilities or appliances, as we need to stop burning fossil fuels immediately to protect the planet. Section 2.13, item three, restricts the size of the BESS facilities, which seems unnecessary and lacks rationale.
Response:	The reason for these limits on battery energy storage systems stems from provincial policy. In certain areas of the city, particularly agricultural resource areas, the land is highly fertile and designated for food production. Provincial policy mandates that this land be preserved for that purpose, which is why there are size restrictions on non-agricultural uses like battery storage in these areas.

Question:	In agricultural resource areas, while it's important to preserve highly fertile land for agriculture, there are some lands not suitable for farming that should still be available for other facilities, right? The current restrictions seem to limit this potential use. Are there any provisions that limit these installations?
Response:	For personal use, if you want to install a wind or solar device, there are currently no restrictions. You can have them on your roof or elsewhere on your property, but they may be subject to accessory building and structure provisions. This means, for example, that you can't place a large solar panel in your front yard—it would need to go on your roof, in the rear yard, or side yard.

Question:	I see a number of zoning violations in established neighbourhoods and in brand new subdivisions. What provisions will be made to ensure properties conform to these rules after they are built?
Response:	Part of the aims of the new Zoning By-law is to provide clear rules that are enforceable. Under the current Zoning By-law (2008-250), the rules can often be convoluted and difficult to understand. We expect that it will be much easier in the new Zoning By-law for residents to follow zoning regulations and by-law enforcement staff to ensure conformity.



Question:	On the topic of Natural Gas, what provisions are being made to encourage new developments to use CCASHP and Hybrid Hot Water systems instead of natural gas?
Response:	Zoning cannot dictate or favour what sort of heating/cooling systems are used in developments. What zoning can do is regulate the location of the equipment and structures used in such systems. So long as the system being installed meets the rules around accessory structures or permitted projections, zoning would permit it.

Question:	Are there any plans to create parking garages for dwellings without parking capacity, e.g. storage unit warehouses? I am not advocating for this but as our density increases in the Ward are such things envisaged?
Response:	There are no plans to create or permit principal-use communal parking garages for dwellings constructed with no accessory private parking and zoned Neighbourhood.



Ward 11 Beacon Hill-Cyrville

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Coach Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiring about any updates to coach house provisions and emphasizing the important of this housing option. • Clarifying if 2 storey coach houses are permitted.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns about lot consolidation to build larger buildings in residential areas. ▪ Seeking clarity on as-of-right height and density provisions and the impact on community input. ▪ Seeking clarity on high-rise development adjacent residential areas.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>We're in Pineview, under the N2D zoning. As a homeowner of a single house on a larger lot, I'm interested in the idea of coach houses. While densification up to six units isn't feasible for most people, a coach house might be. Currently, there are restrictions requiring coach houses to be attached to the main house for services. Is it being reconsidered to allow building coach houses that don't need to be serviced by the main house, to support families or provide rental income?</p> <p>I'm concerned that current restrictions on coach houses might be too limiting for families like mine and might discourage families from adding them for economic reasons. Building a coach house is more realistic for us than tearing down our house to build six units, which would be separately serviced. This intensification could change the neighbourhood, but we prefer to keep our property as is. It's important to consider that not only big developers but also existing families might want to benefit from intensification, whether for their children or aging parents. Understanding the options is crucial, as some might prefer building six condos over a single coach house due to these limitations.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The coach house provisions have not change significantly from the current zoning by-law. A coach house is permitted along with three units on a lot, with one unit potentially in a coach house. It is possible to have two units in the main dwelling and one in the coach house.</p> <p>Regarding servicing, typically, there is one service connection per lot, meaning the coach house would usually need to be serviced through the main house.</p>



Question:	We're in a neighbourhood proposed to be zoned N2F. Can you please clarify what the F means?
Response:	<p>The F is the subzone which sets out performance standards. This includes lot width, front, side, and exterior side yard setbacks, and a maximum building width of 22 meters, which rarely applies. The minimum yard setback is 28% of the lot depth, with a minimum of six meters for rear yard setbacks. For N2 zones, the built form in terms of height and setbacks remains similar to current standards, but more units are permitted if desired.</p>

Question:	Are there any expected changes to the coach house by-law? I thought the by-law allowed for a two-storey if there was a garage on the ground floor of the coach house.
Response:	<p>Currently, that section has undergone substantial changes. The Official Plan provides clear direction on maintaining the height of coach houses to one storey, with any additional storey requiring a minor variance. This variance process is public, allowing for neighbor engagement. Two-storey coach houses, in particular, raise privacy concerns that are less significant with one-storey structures.</p> <p>These provisions are expected to remain largely unchanged. Ottawa lacks a significant number of alleyways, which are more common in other cities and facilitate the construction of coach houses. Generally, a fairly large lot is required to build a coach house. In rural zones, certain allowances can be made through the minor variance process, even if not permitted by default. This process is common and provides flexibility in rural areas.</p>



Question:	How much sway do your neighbours have in that consultation process and the minor variance process?
Response:	<p>Members of the public are able to submit their concerns or questions to the planner on file for a development application. As well, prior to the approval of any zoning by-law amendment, a public meeting is required. These occur at the Planning and Housing Committee for applications within the urban area and at the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee in the rural areas. Members of the public are able to provide written submissions to committee or attend the meeting to provide verbal submissions.</p> <p>Generally, neighbours are not permitted to appeal minor variance applications to the Committee of Adjustment (COA), the body that hears minor variance applications. However, they may attend and speak to a minor variance application at the COA.</p>

Question:	If a developer is able to put together enough adjacent larger lots to make up one hectare lot, can they really build 150 units in an end-to-be zoning area right in a typical neighbourhood?
Response:	In theory, it would be possible to consolidate lots to construct a two-storey building. However, such developments are exceedingly rare and not typically economical. Typically, lot consolidation is more prevalent for larger or taller buildings, rather than for smaller, low-rise structures.

Question:	With the various as-of-right provisions, would that make it easier to build low-income housing with fewer opportunities for objections from neighbours based on NIMBY ideas?
Response:	Zoning regulations don't consider income or type of tenure. The Zoning By-law provides clear guidance on building heights, typically near transit, where rezoning isn't usually required. Outside these areas, two-storey buildings are uncommon. The by-law aims to make higher density development more feasible in locations identified in the Official Plan, providing predictability without necessarily allowing large-scale development everywhere.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Is there a possibility of mid or high-rise developments along Innes, especially between Blair and Cyrville, including the Apple Saddlery area and Stonehenge Crescent, anytime soon?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Mid or high-rise buildings would be permitted under Mainstreet zoning (specifically MS2) along Innes Road, especially between Blair Road and Cyrville Road, but this depends on lot depth. Lots need to be quite deep, and buildings must transition towards neighbourhoods. In that area, the transition isn't necessarily to residential neighbourhoods, depending on the direction. High-rise buildings must be about 30 meters away from a neighbourhood zone. Existing height allowances on some properties would generally be carried forward.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Will the Ontario Land Tribunal still be able to override zoning restrictions?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Zoning By-law will still be subject to appeal. However, recently Bill 185 has limited appeal rights for Zoning By-law amendments to prescribed persons, mostly organizations. This legislation has significantly constricted who can appeal decisions to the Ontario Land Tribunal.</p>



Ward 19 Orléans South-Navan (suburban)

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expressing the need for better transportation options and expanding capacity for future development.
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern for transitions between new high-rise development and existing low-rise neighbourhoods.
Mixed-Use Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request for more mixed-use development in established neighbourhoods.
Sustainable Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with lowering carbon emissions of new housing developments.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Are there criteria in terms of planning for transportation that meets or exceeds the capacity for all of this future development. Right now, most of our main corridors are already at or over capacity, or not meeting the capacity requirements for transit for user base for these areas. I'm concerned about all this planned development that's going to be coming up. What is the criteria to expand these existing corridors, for example, Brian Coburn or Innes, to meet the demand with the growing population?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Zoning puts in place permissions for development. The Official Plan provides the framework for where the growth would go and the zoning is just implementing that at a finer level of detail. However, it does not necessarily mean that developments permitted through the Zoning By-law will all be built out.</p> <p>The timing of services with the development remains to be seen, but the City has not yet received applications for the development that's being proposed in the zoning. The permissions provided through the Zoning By-law help drive and guide the future infrastructure that goes into servicing planned development, including transportation options.</p> <p>A separate process through the development and updating of the Transportation Master Plan identifies future transportation projects citywide.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Innes Road is predominantly parking lots, big box stores, and plazas. Based on the density and height strategies, there's potential of up to 40 stories along Innes. A lot of older Ward 19 abuts those lands and our single detached two-storey homes. Do you envision conflict regardless of if the transition is respected? How can the community expect that change?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Lot depth is a key determinant of a site's ability to provide height transition to adjacent low-rise areas. Corridor lands that permit high-rise development will be subject to an on-site transition framework based on graduated rear- and interior-yard setbacks, such that feasible building heights increase on deeper lots as distance from abutting low-rise areas increases. Where a proposed development is able to meet required tower setbacks, it is anticipated that a maximum height of 25 storeys will accommodate a majority of "ordinary" high-rise building developments, such that zoning by-law amendments for height will be limited to proposals for exceptionally tall buildings.</p> <p>Based on recent examples in Ottawa, the conversion of large commercial plazas has been incremental. Although permissions for high-rise development will be provided along Minor and Mainstreet Corridors, development will be limited by a developer's willingness to construct these projects based on market conditions and their ability to occupy the residential and retail spaces in the building.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Ward 19 south of Innes is in desperate need of mixed-use. What can the Zoning By-law do to facilitate more development like that? As well, does the new Zoning By-law support neighborhood business designation in Ward 19 to address this issue?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Where appropriate, Minor Corridor designations have been applied to facilitate mixed-use development. Those designations are limited south of Innes Road, but that's not the only way mixed uses are being introduced to neighborhoods.</p> <p>Staff are also exploring the use of the c- suffix, which can be added to a Neighborhood zone to signal it is appropriate for mixed-use development. This was done in a limited manner in Draft 1 where mostly existing cases were carried forward. Through Draft 2, Staff are working to establish a systematic method of expanding those permissions. Some of the potential considerations for applying the c- suffix are proximity to a park, school or other community feature that draws public interest, or if the site is at the corner of two collector roads. These higher-traffic locations in Neighbourhoods could potentially support a doctor's office or a coffee shop. Feedback on locations for these uses is always welcome.</p> <p>Staff have also looked at liberalizing home-based businesses in Neighbourhoods to move towards 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>How much can the new Zoning By-law help the housing sector to reduce emissions? Do we consider solar panels in design?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Zoning By-law can influence the energy efficiency of the built environment, primarily through aspects such as increased density and optimized land use. These measures can contribute to reduced emissions by promoting more efficient energy use and supporting sustainable urban development.</p> <p>However, for more specific and impactful energy performance standards, the High Performance Development Standards (HPDS) are a more effective tool. The HPDS uses site plan control to ensure that new developments meet high energy efficiency criteria. Staff are working on a report to bring to Council on the development of HPDS in 2025.</p> <p>There are currently no restrictions on installing solar panels on your property for personal use. They can be located on your roof or elsewhere on your property, but they may be subject to accessory building and structure provisions. This means, for example, that you can't place a large solar panel in your front yard—it would need to go on your roof, in the rear yard, or side yard.</p>



As We Heard It Report – Wards 12, 13 and 15

Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Wards 12, 13, and 15 was held on August 29, 2024, from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a Zoning By-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 12 Rideau-Vanier – Councillor Stéphanie Plante	2
	Summary of Comments Received	2
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses.....	2
2	Ward 13 Rideau-Rockcliffe – Councillor & Deputy Mayor Rawlson King	11
	Summary of Comments Received	13
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	13
3	Ward 15 Kitchissippi – Councillor Jeff Leiper	28
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	29



Ward 12 Rideau-Vanier

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Shelter Capacity and Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with shelter capacities and overcrowding. ▪ Support for a shelter cap in Ward 12 and locating shelters citywide.
Safety and Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the safety and security implications surrounding increased density.
Density and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with significant increases in density in neighbourhoods. ▪ Concern with how density targets are calculated. ▪ Desire to be involved in the planning process for future developments.

Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	We see a lot of renovations of rooming houses so they could be turned into student housing. So we just keep losing our housing as a result. And I'm wondering if the zoning, especially with the densities and on these small lots is taking that into account?
Response:	<p>One of the conditions leading to renovations is a limited land supply which can create a bottleneck for supplying sufficient units to meet demand. This is a citywide issue and Staff are investigating ways to respond to the enormous housing demand facing Ottawa.</p> <p>Beyond broadening housing permissions to increase housing supply, the topic of renovations is beyond the scope of the Zoning By-law.</p>



Question:	<p>Is there any attempt to address density within shelters, given they're completely overpopulated and dangerous and density requirements could play a role in making them safer for the people who need them.</p> <p>In addition, there's text about it being discriminatory to cap shelters in a ward at four because we have a four shelter cap here. I want to know why it's discriminatory to cap those shelters and how it's equitable to say we're not going to cap your shelters in Ward 12 when you have all the shelters in the first place.</p>
Response:	<p>The issue of overcrowding in shelters is concerning, especially as more people are accessing the shelter system. Draft 1 of the Zoning By-law permits a shelter use in all zones within the Downtown Core, Inner Urban, Outer Urban and Suburban transects in order to support this key aspect of the housing continuum.</p> <p>The potential issue with implementing a cap on the number of shelters per ward is limiting access to these services where they're most needed.</p>



Question:	<p>How will the new Zoning By-law work in tandem with policing and security to ensure that safety is a priority when creating this new intensification? The last speaker brought up some interesting points that are related to my question about security, because we're dealing with intersectional issues.</p> <p>Like you mentioned, housing crisis, density, but there's security as well. If we're going to beautify and allow for new businesses and new types of functions for the main arteries like Montreal Road, MacArthur and Beechwood, how are you going to ensure that that's possible when we have a shelter that's coming in with so many beds that provide new problems in relation to security? All these issues come together in a kind of knot and I have similar concerns to the last question in that how are we going to ensure that the other resources that are necessary are working in tandem with the needs of this new zoning reality?</p>
Response:	<p>The Zoning By-law primarily focuses on land use and the built form. The Zoning By-law doesn't necessarily work in tandem with other programs or initiatives as these are operational issues. While it's beyond the purview of zoning, there does need to be some coordination to tackle issues that may arise from new or existing land uses.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>In terms of the R4 to N4 conversion that staff is proposing. It's been previously said that the new subzones through the R4 zoning review "had done its job" as far as intensification. The doubling that took place just a couple of years ago took us to about 220 units per hectare in most of our neighbourhood. Now the city staff are proposing to again double the R4 to 450 units per net hectare and that is largely being accommodated by increased heights, which will require elevators and will make new builds much more costly and less affordable for many. So that's my first question - why is the city staff not keeping to their plan?</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>The concept of maximum density is added in section 801 of the draft Zoning By-law, but is not aligned with the OP density targets. Are these simple errors or if not a mistake, what is the rationale?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The proposed densities described in the new Zoning By-law are based on targets from the Official Plan. Density is measured as a neighbourhood average, so larger redevelopments will average out other lots that do not turn over in the neighbourhood. A new 12-unit building in a neighbourhood could represent a very localized spike in density, but at the neighbourhood level it would be contributing to the broader density targets.</p> <p>Staff will work on additional communication materials to present the densities proposed through the new Zoning By-law and how these relate to the Official Plan. For more information on neighbourhood density targets, please reach out to newzoning@ottawa.ca.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>In the current Zoning By-law, there is this special regulation that puts separation distances between bars and pubs. This came in 2008 as the result of a moratorium on bars because we were getting too many bars and too many nightclubs. Now, actually it seems like this special regulation has been removed and that bars and pubs have been combined, which means that every restaurant becomes a bar. And of course this applies citywide and it doesn't take into account the fact that the ByWard Market has over 23,000 licensed fees within a four block area. And while I'm sure the city of Ottawa wants to encourage more bars everywhere, it also has a very negative impact on the 15-minute neighbourhood, because basically some neighbourhood retail disappears to make room for bars. I'm just wondering why those regulations are not being kept.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The change to the definition of a restaurant in Draft 1 to include all places where food or beverages are sold is proposed to simplify the distinction between restaurant and bar. The typical bar, as defined under Zoning By-law 2008-250, would already fall into the new Restaurant definition as they have a kitchen and serve food.</p> <p>From a zoning perspective, it can be difficult to draw the distinction between a restaurant and bar as they perform many of the same functions. Continuing to implement separate definitions and land use designations for bar and restaurant and applying a separation distance between these uses could have negative impacts on establishments that fall on the spectrum between a bar and restaurant.</p> <p>Relative to these uses, Nightclub has been kept as a distinctive land use in Draft 1 and the separation distance requirements in the ByWard Market have been carried forward.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>We talk a lot about coordination linked to the densification of the ward, but I want to know is there any consultation plan about the type of development that's going to be following the densification in the neighbourhood. We can see a lot of car dealerships being developed very recently, for example. Are there public consultations so that we can have some input on what type of development we're going to see in the neighbourhood?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Zoning By-law establishes the basic framework for what can be built on a lot, including the building height, the building location, and where parking and amenity areas would be on the site.</p> <p>If a property owner wants to change those permissions, for example the building height or how far the building is located from a lot line, they would have to amend the Zoning By-law which would trigger a consultation process. Residents within 120 metres of the site would be directly notified of the development and, during the consultation period, anyone is able to comment on the proposal.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>What will replace the angular plane?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Staff are still exploring appropriate height transition strategies and policies between higher buildings and adjacent Neighbourhoods.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>What is the evolving overlay and how is it being implemented in the new Zoning By-law?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The definition of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) can be found in Section 5.6.1 of the Official Plan, which defines the extent of the ENO as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay will be applied generally to the properties that have a lot line along a Minor Corridor; lands 150 metres from the boundary of a Hub or Mainstreet designation; and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station.”</i></p> <p>The ENO policies of the Official Plan are proposed to be implemented in the new Zoning By-law via the application of higher-density Neighbourhood (N) zone designations.</p> <p>To establish which properties would be subject to the ENO policies in the draft Zoning By-law, a network analysis was performed using available GIS data for existing pedestrian facilities to measure the walking distances for properties from the Hub and Mainstreet designations to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station. The purpose of using a network analysis is to recognize that there may be cases where the actual walking distance from a Mainstreet/Hub/transit station to a given lot may be significantly greater than its “as-the-crow-flies” distance in the OP policy, such that it may not be appropriate to zone it for higher density because the walking distances is much further than the distances contemplated in the policies.</p> <p>Staff interpreted the above policy to determine walking distances for the network analysis, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Corridor: properties with a lot line that has frontage on a Minor Corridor; • Hub: properties that are within 150 m of the boundary of Hub – equating to a 400 m walk (approx. 5 minutes); • Mainstreet Corridor: properties that are within 150 m of a road designated Mainstreet Corridor – equating to a 400 m walk (approx. 5 minutes); and • Rapid Transit Station: properties that are within a 400 m radius of the centre of a Rapid Transit Station – equating to a 600 m walk (approx. 10 minutes).



Staff are open to looking at how the Overlay is being applied in the new By-law as part of subsequent drafts, to ensure that it is being implemented in a consistent and clear manner. Staff acknowledge that the policy with respect to the ENO can be difficult to implement in a consistent manner that makes sense for every neighbourhood, particularly when factoring in street patterns (e.g. cul-de-sacs) and actual walking distances.

Question:	I notice the proposed Minor Corridor along Murray between King Edward & Parent has not been included in the zoning map. Why designate Dalhousie as CM but not Murray?
Response:	<p>Minor Corridors were assigned and defined through the Official Plan (OP) and the Zoning By-law will work to implement these designations. Murray Street is not designated a Minor Corridor in the Official Plan, so it is not designated this way in the zoning map.</p> <p>Dalhousie Street was designated Traditional Mainstreet in the previous OP and received a Minor Corridor designation through the new OP. These designations are based on the concentration of existing commercial uses on a street and various other considerations, including the transit level of service and existing lot fabric.</p>

Question:	Any thoughts about multigenerational housing. Will it be allowed and promoted?
Response:	Table 2 of the Official Plan provides residential intensification targets, including a specific target for large-household dwellings. These are defined as units with three or more bedrooms to provide housing for families or larger households.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>What are the criteria for assigning a given zoning designation? In particular what makes the difference between N3B and N4B?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Residential zones in the current Zoning By-law were converted to the new Neighbourhood zones in the draft Zoning By-law. The existing average lot sizes and built form were considered in this conversion, as well as proximity to a Hub or Corridor.</p> <p>Each Neighbourhood Zone is comprised of a primary zone (N1-N6) and a subzone (A-F). Tables 801A and 801B set out the zoning standards applicable to each primary zone and subzone, respectively. The primary zones in Table 801A address maximum permitted density (in units per hectare - UPH) and building height. For example, the N3 zone sets out a maximum building height of 11 m (generally three storeys), and a maximum permitted density of 250 UPH. Standards for the A-F subzones are detailed in Table 801B and include requirements for minimum lot width and minimum yard setbacks from property lines.</p>



Ward 13 Rideau-Rockcliffe

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasis that protected heritage property, which may include built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, must be conserved. HCDs occupy a very small area of Ontario and Ottawa, and their conservation does not conflict with the broader objectives of provincial legislation and the Official Plan. ▪ Encourage planning authorities to develop and implement proactive strategies for conserving significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. ▪ Develop strategies for Ottawa’s heritage districts where careful consideration is required and tailored conservation efforts.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion that the area at the end of North River Road zoned NMU could be developed for affordable housing rather than high-rise buildings, such as those at the end of North River Road and Montreal Road; it would exacerbate traffic issues. ▪ Concern about the size of units in Lindenlea, Ottawa's first planned community for returning World War I veterans. The lots and houses were intentionally kept small to be affordable, so allowing many units on these small lots could result in very small units, akin to student housing near universities. ▪ Concern that the new development in Manor Park could potentially triple the population, introducing high-rise buildings located about five kilometres from the nearest transit Hubs. ▪ Concern that the planning does not account for reaching a density limit and then preserving the remaining houses as they are. New zoning seems to allow for increased density on every lot.



<p>Traffic and Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about the juxtaposition of traffic planning with the Official Plan. While Hemlock Road may not be considered a corridor, traffic from Beechwood Avenue funnels onto Hemlock and vice versa. ▪ Concern for the safety of children in the areas near Beechwood Avenue as traffic has increased on residential streets.
<p>Equity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that that lower-income neighbourhoods are bearing the brunt of high-density developments. While these changes in Overbrook are welcomed, it is crucial to ensure fairness across the City of Ottawa regarding residential planning. ▪ Encouraging equity considerations to be prioritized (i.e., mixed-income buildings where some residents paid full market rent and others paid partial rent) which benefits the community by promoting diversity, equity, and better schools. ▪ Concern that increasing the density beyond this balance of low-income and middle to upper-income residents could drive the middle class out, as suggested by sociological studies.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Rockcliffe Park, for example, is designated a national historic site by the federal government, which is one of only 33 in Canada. Its park-like setting and unifying landscape are essential to its heritage character. Therefore, it is imperative to avoid developments that would disrupt its unique attributes.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed Minor Corridor along Hemlock Road is inappropriate, given the heritage district on one side and Beechwood National Cemetery, another national historic site, on the other. We should reconsider this designation to preserve the integrity of these heritage sites.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Regarding the Minor Corridor designation, the Rockcliffe Secondary Plan includes policies that restrict development along the Hemlock corridor to residential uses. The zoning map reflects this, showing no areas zoned for mixed-use or commercial purposes (zones in the purple colour), in alignment with the secondary plan's policies.</p> <p>In terms of heritage protection, both the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan contain strong provisions. Rockcliffe Park, as a designated Heritage Conservation District, benefits from these protections. The zoning codes for the area were established in consultation with heritage staff, ensuring generous yard setbacks and preserving the typical building envelope, including volume, size, dimensions, and height, which characterizes the area.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that Bill 23 introduced changes to the Planning Act, permitting up to three units on a lot regardless of existing municipal by-laws. Consequently, the current density restrictions in Rockcliffe Park's zoning exceptions are no longer in effect and will be removed. Nonetheless, other special provisions that have historically applied to the area will remain in place.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>When it's stated that four units are permitted on a lot, does this refer to multiple units such as townhouses, stacked townhouses, semi-detached houses with secondary dwellings, or a single building with multiple units, such as rental buildings or apartment buildings? In particular how does this affect properties currently zoned designated R1, such as those in Lindenlea and Manor Park.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>As with the current Zoning By-law, certain requirements must be met to permit a severance, including minimum lot width for development. These regulations must be adhered to. The provision allowing a minimum of four units builds on the changes introduced by Bill 23 to the Planning Act, which now supersedes all municipal Zoning By-laws across Ontario and permits a minimum of three units per lot.</p> <p>As part of the City's Housing Accelerator Fund application, the City committed to consulting the public on allowing a minimum of four units, which is why it appears in the draft provisions.</p> <p>If the concern is about the scenario where a semi-detached building could potentially have three units on each side (totaling six units) or that a severed four-unit building could similarly have additional units, that's not the case. The Zoning By-law counts the total number of units on the lot, regardless of whether they are principal or additional dwelling units, as referred to in the Planning Act. It doesn't allow for additional units to be added within each unit like "Russian dolls." The total number of units is capped based on the lot, not per individual unit.</p>



Question:	Could you please demonstrate a specific example of what could be permitted on a typical 60 ft by 90 ft lot in Manor Park West?
Response:	<p>In an N3 zone, a lot measuring 15 metres in width by 30 metres in depth could generally accommodate up to 12 units. However, the building must still comply with the yard setbacks, which are calibrated to match the typical building size within the neighbourhood. The intent is to allow more units within a building while maintaining a structure that aligns with the neighbourhood's existing character.</p> <p>For example, in an N2 zone, a lot of the same size (15 metres by 30 metres) would permit up to six units, replicating the current provisions in an R2 zone that also allows for six units per building. Similarly, in an N3 zone, the maximum would generally be 12 units on such a lot. However, the building housing those 12 units must remain consistent in size, height, and setbacks with what is typical for the neighbourhood. This is how the subzone provisions were designed to maintain the physical characteristics and overall character of the area.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>There's some confusion regarding the map designating Hemlock as a Minor Corridor, highlighted in purple from St-Laurent Boulevard to Beechwood. This aligns with a previous concern, and it is believed that residents of Manor Park share similar apprehensions. Hemlock does not fit the understanding of a corridor, as seen with other streets in Ottawa. There is a desire to preserve the existing zoning and lot sizes in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The city's intentions are unclear. The map's purple designation led to the assumption that there are plans for high-rise buildings along Hemlock, but this may be incorrect. I am seeking clarification on the city's objectives for this area.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>If you look at the map, you'll see that Marier Avenue is designated as Minor Corridor Zone 2 (CM2), and as you follow Beechwood Avenue, the purple zone ends there. Hemlock Road, on the other hand, shows no purple zoning in Manor Park, which aligns with the secondary plan that designates this area as residential.</p> <p>When we applied the Minor Corridor (CM) zone, we carefully reviewed the neighbourhoods, taking into account the detailed guidelines in the secondary plans. Hemlock Road presented challenges for a CM designation. Firstly, the secondary plan explicitly prohibits mixed-use development, which was a key factor. Additionally, while some buildings face Hemlock Road, there are stretches where residential properties back onto the street, making mixed-use impractical. These are a few of the main reasons why we did not apply the Minor Corridor zone to Hemlock.</p>



Question:	What's the height difference between N2 and N3?
Response:	<p>The N2 primary zone permits buildings up to two storeys or 8.5 metres, and the N3 primary zone allows up to three stories or 11 metres. However, in some neighbourhoods, there may be more area-specific height regulations indicated by a suffix in the zoning code. This is often shown as a capital "H" followed by a number in brackets, which specifies the maximum allowable height and supersedes the primary zone's height limits.</p> <p>This approach ensures that the zoning aligns with the specific character of a neighbourhood. In the case of implementing the Minor Corridor designation, we applied a slightly higher-density zone along the corridor to reflect the policies outlined in the secondary plan. This higher primary zone is intended to balance the objectives of the Minor Corridor designation while maintaining the neighbourhood's character.</p>

Question:	Can you please define neighbourhood mixed use (in orange) on the zoning map, specifically the big one near the river?
Response:	<p>The existing local commercial and general mixed-use zones in neighbourhoods have been consolidated into a simplified Neighbourhood Mixed-Use (NMU) zone. The aim was to maintain the same permissions for mixed-use while streamlining them. Instead of having multiple subzones with varying permitted uses, the types of service and retail uses essential for day-to-day needs in residential communities were standardized.</p> <p>The intent of the NMU zone is to simplify regulations while still addressing the needs of residents. Generally, Local Commercial zones in the current Zoning By-law were transitioned to this new NMU zone, with most of the original provisions retained in a more straightforward format. Therefore, if a NMU zone appears on the new map, it is likely replacing a Local Commercial or General Mixed-Use zone from the current Zoning By-law.</p>



Question:	<p>Can the Zoning By-law mandate specific requirements to accompany certain building forms? One concern in the very low-density part of Manor Park is that if a four or six-unit apartment building is constructed, it is unlikely to be owner-occupied and will likely be rented. However, there are no provisions for tenant facilities, such as proper and secure bicycle storage. Residents are unlikely to park their commuter bikes or children's bikes outside, chained to a pole. They require storage lockers.</p> <p>Therefore, can the Zoning By-law require developers to provide such amenities if they are to construct these types of buildings? Outdoor racks are insufficient, as they do not meet the needs of residents with commuter or children's bikes. A closed, lockable storage space is essential.</p>
Response:	<p>Long-term bicycle parking is proposed to be required whenever a building contains more than four units. Long-term bicycle parking must be located in a secure enclosure within a building. Short-term visitor bicycle parking will be required for larger residential developments and non-residential uses. However, the Zoning By-law cannot apply retroactively to developments that already exist.</p> <p>The draft Zoning By-law also proposes new provisions to ensure that racks are easier to use by requiring them to support a bicycle at two points and allow a wheel and frame to be locked together.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Referring to the zoning map at the intersection of Donald Street and Lola Street, this area forms a T-shaped zoning configuration, with Lola running north-south and Donald running east-west. The CM2 zoning is evident in this area, following Minor Corridors. The lands fronting Donald and Lola Streets, which are owned by Ottawa Community Housing (OCH) are zoned N2C.</p> <p>Currently, the CM2 zoning applies to these minor collectors, but the lot depths are only about 30 metres. OCH could potentially merge adjacent lots to the south and east, creating 60-metre-deep lots that front the Minor Corridors, and request a CM2 zoning in the future. OCH is expected to redevelop many of their properties within the City.</p> <p>The existing zoning in this area was R1S, which is unusual for Overbrook, and has been changed to an N2C zone, increasing density by one level. Typically, R1 zones transition to N2, R2 zones to N3, and R4 zones remain N4. It is preferred to see N2C zoning on OCH lands, but N4B zoning, similar to the zone to the south, would allow for greater density. This would enable OCH to plan effectively, potentially developing four to six-story buildings along collectors and four-story buildings on inner streets, while also providing parkettes with redevelopment.</p> <p>Has there been any consideration of land ownership or discussions with OCH, or if this is a blanket exercise changing R1S to N2C, rather than considering a transition to N4B or similar zoning?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>As noted in the comment, the proposed zoning of the N2C area southeast of Donald Street and Lola Street is in part based on the current zoning of R1S. Current zoning was among the factors taken into consideration in determining proposed zoning in Draft 1; R1 zones in the Inner Urban Transect not located within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay were proposed to be zoned N2.</p> <p>With that in mind, Staff appreciate this suggestion and will take it into consideration as part of future drafts, particularly given that the existing zoning of surrounding areas is higher in density (e.g. the existing R4 areas to the south of the area in question, which are proposed to be zoned N4B in Draft 1).</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>There is a portion of Rockcliffe, known as the Panhandle, which falls on Beechwood and is the only area in Rockcliffe with R4 zoning. The map indicates this area in purple and includes exemption numbers that set the height limit at 12.5 metres. It is unclear if these exemption numbers can be adjusted to align with the rest of Rockcliffe, where the height limit is 8.5 metres.</p> <p>Additionally, as Rockcliffe is a heritage conservation district with open and green spaces as key attributes, it is perplexing why the area is designated as N2F. While the "F" designation is appreciated for reflecting the suburban nature of Rockcliffe with its generous setbacks, the N2 designation is puzzling. The New Zoning By-law's language on heritage leaves many decisions to Staff discretion. Therefore, how are decisions regarding setbacks, greenscape, and landscaping being made to ensure that streetscapes are not compromised by always adhering to the lowest common denominator?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Staff will review the Panhandle area, noting that it is currently zoned as a Main Street (MS) zone, but it is believed that it should be a residential zone. In regard to the issue of the height suffix, it is recalled that some errors in that area have already been corrected. The MS zoning there will be examined, compared with the current zoning, and necessary adjustments will be made to ensure accuracy.</p> <p>Regarding the N2 zoning for Rockcliffe, the N2 zoning was part of the zone code conversion for the inner urban transect. R1 zones were converted to N2, and Rockcliffe received an F subzone, which provides the most generous yard setbacks. Additionally, the existing exceptions were carried forward, including the maximum lot coverage, which continues to regulate the building footprint. Therefore, while the zone code has changed, the regulations for building size and height remain the same.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Is the Gross Floor Area (GFA) and Floor Space Index (FSI) being carried forward? If there are discrepancies, such as variations ranging from 25% to 33%, or possibly 37%, can uniformity be sought? It is understood that these exemptions are derived from the old Zoning By-law and apply citywide. What is the procedure for modifying these exemptions to ensure consistency with the New Official Plan?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Staff have committed to carrying forward zoning exceptions where possible, provided they align with the Official Plan and do not create conflicts. The Official Plan discussions emphasized maintaining neighbourhood character, which generally means preserving the typical building size. While redevelopment may allow for more units, the overall building size should remain consistent with what is typical in the area.</p> <p>Carrying forward these exceptions ensures that the specific rules defining a neighbourhood are preserved. The zoning codes in Rockcliffe, divided into various exceptions, help maintain the current character of the neighbourhood, and the goal is to continue this practice.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>The recent Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) published by the province calls for 50 units per hectare in designated neighbourhoods. Table 3B of the Official Plan had predicted 60 to 80 units for our neighbourhood, which is often referred to in the context of a four-unit limit. However, the New Zoning By-law proposes 150 units per hectare, equating to 8 to 12 units per lot.</p> <p>An interview suggested that this increase is due to high land prices, with many residents choosing to invest in this neighbourhood instead of purchasing cottages or traveling. This personal choice should not result in a perceived penalty. The proposed increase to 12 units per lot, potentially doubling to 24 units if lots are split, raises concerns about the post-war houses have been built and renovated. Can you explain this difference?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Official Plan, specifically in Table 3b, outlines the target densities for transects on an area-wide basis. These targets are calculated by averaging the densities across an entire transect, which includes a mix of lower-density neighbourhoods (e.g., 22 units per hectare) and higher-density areas (closer to 100 units per hectare). For the inner urban transect, the goal is to achieve an average of 60 to 80 units per hectare by 2046.</p> <p>The area-wide density targets are lower than the per-lot densities we're permitting because most lots in a neighbourhood remain at lower densities, with only a small percentage being redeveloped. Based on building permit data, only about 0.5% of lots in a neighbourhood are redeveloped each year.</p> <p>For example, if a block has 22 lots and 22 buildings, and over 25 years, three lots are redeveloped with six units each, those redeveloped lots may have a density of 120 units per hectare. However, when averaged across the entire block, this only adds a few extra units overall, resulting in a modest increase in the block's density, perhaps to around 27 or 30 units per hectare. This explains why the overall density change happens gradually.</p>



Question:	What will be the cost of implementing these changes to taxpayers, and what will be the overall impact? As a taxpayer and a resident of Rockcliffe Park, where property taxes are substantial, I am particularly concerned about the financial implications. I'm seeking assurance that the project is fully funded through to its completion and that there will be no unexpected additional charges on my property tax bill in the future.
Response:	The project has a total cost of \$8.2 million, with 90% funded through development charges and the remaining 10% coming from the operational budget. This information can be found in the staff report, which dates back to around 2020. Those are the confirmed figures.

Question:	Once this Zoning By-law is set in place, will developments have to stay within the zoning rules or will there still be as much latitude with height and density as we have seen in recent years?
Response:	A key purpose of the new Zoning By-law is to bring Ottawa's zoning regulation in to conformity with the City's new Official Plan. This alignment should result in fewer rezoning applications.

Question:	Will the exceptions remain as it indicated on the map?
Response:	<p>Staff are still reviewing the exceptions of the current Zoning By-law. Exceptions are being removed or modified where possible to streamline with the proposed new Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The review of the exceptions aims to maintain existing rights. It is likely that further review and revision of exceptions will need to continue following the passing of the new By-law in Q4 2025.</p>



Question:	Can a Secondary plan be modified to require trees?
Response:	The <i>Planning Act</i> does not permit trees to be required. Zoning can be used to establish the permissions and requirements necessary for protecting and enabling the growth of trees.

Question:	How will the tunnel effect be avoided on mainstreets, besides stepping back the floors?
Response:	Step-backs are the chief method of preventing the canyon effect on mainstreets. Staff are also developing provisions to provide incentives for increased set-backs at grade to make room for things like landscaping and street furniture.

Question:	Previously there was rules concerning how many employees were permitted to work at a home-based business other than the owner. Will the new rules allow for more people to work out of a property? Will no parking minimums apply to home-based businesses? This will cause a lot of parking issues especially in Manor Park where transit is so poor.
Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law does limit the number of non-resident on-site employees. If located in a Hub, Minor Corridor or Mainstreet Corridor, the maximum is three. In all other zones the maximum is two.</p> <p>There are no parking requirements for home-based businesses. Parking on public streets continues to be regulated by the City's Traffic and Parking By-law.</p>



Question:	How can real estate developers collaborate with your office to provide housing which meets the needs of the community?
Response:	As part of the Draft 1 consultation, the City is working with various stakeholders such as the Greater Ottawa Homebuilders Association, in addition to the Federation of Citizen Associations to receive their feedback on the proposed Zoning By-law.

Question:	Beacon Hill on the east side of Ogilvie is closer to transit (train) and closer to shopping on Shefford and Canotek, yet the area is going to have a lower density than Manor Park. Why is it not the focus is to develop around transit corridors?
Response:	<p>The Official Plan directs where the greatest intensities of development and tallest buildings are to be located, and the new comprehensive Zoning By-law must follow that direction in where it implements densities.</p> <p>Montreal Road is designated a Mainstreet corridor in the Official Plan, and the draft Zoning By-law follows that designation by proposing to zone properties along this stretch of Montreal as MS (Mainstreet Corridor zone). The area around Blair Station is designated a Hub in the Official Plan, and is proposed to carry the H2 zone (Hub Zone 2). Those areas have some of the highest heights and densities permitted in the Official Plan and draft Zoning By-law. The proposed zoning for the area of Beacon Hill east of Ogilvie and South of Montreal varies, with the interior of the neighbourhood receiving N2 zoning, and the areas to the north closer to Montreal being given N3 and N4 zones of increased intensities. The higher density areas around Jasmine Crescent carry N5 and N6 zoning with 6 and 12 storey height permissions, approximately. The N5 and N6 zones are the highest intensity zones outside of Hub or Mainstreet-designated areas in the Official Plan.</p> <p>In the area of Manor Park, particularly north-west of St-Laurent and Hemlock, the lands are covered by an Official Plan-level Secondary Plan, the Manor Park North and South Secondary Plan (here). That Secondary Plan developed through detailed and area-specific study, provides the rationale and support for higher intensities and heights, than this area of Beacon Hill.</p>



Question:	Are the properties along Hemlock from Birch to St. Laurent not going to be zoned Minor Corridor?
Response:	The properties along Hemlock from Birch to St. Laurent are not proposed to receive Minor Corridor zoning but, are instead proposed to be zoned N3B given that Hemlock is a single-loaded corridor with potentially eligible properties only on one side of the street.

Question:	Is there anything in the new zoning to address single family homes being replaced by larger single family homes?
Response:	<p>Larger single-family homes are often larger than neighbouring houses because houses in a given area may not have built entirely into the permitted building envelope.</p> <p>Additional information on the new Zoning By-law and the neighbourhood designation can be found on the project's EngageOttawa page: Ottawa is Ready for a new Zoning By-law</p>

Question:	The draft Zoning By-law does not appear to incorporate the protected views cape (from poet's hill in Beechwood Cemetery to Parliament Hill). How will that be protected if it is not in the Zoning By-law (though it is in the Official Plan)?
Response:	The protected views in the current Zoning By-law are being carried over in the proposed draft Zoning By-law. Updated Schedules will be included in the 2 nd Draft of the Zoning By-law being released in March.



Question:	Why don't the maps show the boundaries of the Heritage Conservation Districts?
Response:	Heritage Conservation Districts will continue to be shown on GeoOttawa when the proposed By-law replaces the current Zoning By-law.



Ward 15 Kitchissippi

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the permitted heights and densities around Westboro LRT station and questioning why they aren't higher. ▪ Concern with permitted density of up to 12 units in N3 and the lack of transit options to support this density. ▪ Seeking clarity if the densities identified for Neighbourhood zones maximums or minimums.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the lack of sidewalks in Highland Park regarding safety and their role in supporting 15-minute neighbourhoods. ▪ Seeking clarity on the permitted heights and density targets for N2 and N3 zones. ▪ Seeking clarity on the removal of the Mature Neighbourhoods Overlay, specifically related to garage size and location requirements. ▪ Concern with loss of access to sunlight for solar panels with increased heights in Neighbourhoods.
Trees and Stormwater Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that new front yard setbacks are too small to support tree planting and stormwater management. ▪ Concern with stormwater management, especially on smaller lots and for infill development.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the removal of parking minimums and the impacts on street parking and snow removal.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>With respect to permitting neighbourhood dwellings at higher densities than the targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan. This "over target" density appears to be to achieve a new area-wide density target renaming per lot targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan as area-wide targets. The presentation in Document 10 appears to describe a N2 one hectare street with 22 houses with the graphic presented tonight showing a dwelling with 6 units. These appear to be on three floors where N2 zoning has a maximum of two. Is it now proposed to allow 3 storey (or more) built form in N2 neighbourhood zones and perhaps more than three storeys in N3 zones? If this is so, what built form zoning standards such as heights will provided to address these "over target" density situations?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The graphic presented in the City's presentation depicted a building that intended to represent two stories plus a basement. The basement units are partially above grade to accommodate windows and egress requirements. In the first draft of the new Zoning By-law, N1 and N2 zones are primarily designated as two-story zones, while N3 zones are designated for three stories. The proposed height limits are 8.5 meters for N1 and N2 zones and 11 meters for N3 zones. The city has received numerous comments regarding building heights and will consider these as the by-law is refined in subsequent drafts.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Highland Park does not have many sidewalks. What is the city's plan to put them in? They are necessary for safety, to make '15 minute neighbourhoods' a reality, and to avoid conflict between street parking and pedestrians.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>While the streetscape or the road profile does contribute to the livability of a neighbourhood, under the <i>Planning Act</i>, the Zoning By-law can't regulate what happens in the right-of-way.</p> <p>Street design largely occurs as part of the design of the broader community, including policies set out in applicable Secondary Plan documents and the standard street profiles at the City. As roads are rebuilt, improvements can be made, such as those described above.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>We are increasingly seeing solar power installations in our neighbourhood. If we are going to invite 4 storey apartments in areas that generally consist of 2 storey buildings, what mitigation measures will be put in place in the by-law to ensure that solar installations are not shaded so as to reduce their effectiveness.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The proposed zoning changes generally designate neighbourhood zones as low-rise areas. While the Zoning By-law does not specifically guarantee a right to light, the Official Plan aims to be mindful of the existing context. This includes ensuring that new developments, such as transitioning from R1 to N2 or N3 zones, are not significantly higher than the current buildings. This approach helps maintain the contextual height and minimizes the impact on existing solar panel installations.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Will builders be required to provide measures to mitigate massing when next to low density residential development? How will impacts on shading and overlook be addressed?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Lot depth is a key determinant of a site's ability to provide height transition to adjacent low-rise areas. Corridor lands that permit high-rise development will be subject to an on-site transition framework based on graduated rear- and interior-yard setbacks, such that feasible building heights increase on deeper lots as distance from abutting low-rise areas increases.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Please explain what the effect of the removal of the mature neighbourhood overlay will be? For instance, will the rules limiting garages to single car be removed to allow more garage space (for example so we can protect cars by placing them indoors that are routinely being stolen from our driveways) and will garages continue to be required to face the street?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Mature Neighbourhoods Overlay (MNO) in the current Zoning By-law sets out the requirement to complete a Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA) in support of new development for any property located within the Overlay. The SCA determines the zoning provisions that apply for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driveway Accesses: whether or not a driveway is permitted on-site, and the width of that driveway • Front Facing Garages and Carports: whether or not the building is permitted an attached garage or carport that faces the street: • Entranceways: whether or not the principal entrance into the building must face the street. <p>The new draft Zoning By-law proposes to remove this Overlay, and the requirement to complete a SCA in support of new development. In place of the MNO, the regulations in the new By-law will shift to a focus on whether there is adequate soft landscaping to support front yard trees and street trees. This shift is also in response to the direction in the Official Plan direction to evolve to a more urban built form in certain parts of Neighbourhoods, particularly within the Downtown Core transect. In place of the SCA, the new Zoning By-law will implement functional standards for Neighbourhoods as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulations for driveways and attached garages are included in the parking provisions of Draft 1. In general, driveway permissions are proposed to be tied to lot width, with the provisions that currently apply in Section 139 of Zoning By-law 2008-250 being carried forward in the draft Zoning By-law, with modifications made. The driveway provisions can be found in Section 606(2) of Draft 1. • Regulations concerning attached front-facing garages can be found under Section 604(7). In particular, attached front-facing garages are proposed to be prohibited in the Downtown Core transect but permitted in all other transects, so long as the entrance to the garage is no closer to the street than the remainder of the building.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One front yard parking space is proposed to be permitted on lots 6 metres in width or greater (found under Section 604(4)), whereas the current Zoning By-law generally prohibits front yard parking. It is noted that front yard parking is proposed to be prohibited in the Downtown Core transect. • The built form standards proposed to apply to the Neighbourhood zones will include requirements for at least one principal entrance to face the street (found in Section 802(9) of the draft provisions).
--	--

Question:	Concerning stormwater management in Hintonburg, where new builds with larger footprints have caused water issues for neighbors. They questioned the proposal to reduce the rear yard setback from 30% to 25% and pointed out that additions up to 55 square meters are exempt from stormwater management requirements, which could significantly increase impervious areas, especially on smaller lots. This is problematic in areas without stormwater drains and on rocky terrain.
Response:	The 55 square meter exemption likely relates to existing rules about when a grading plan is required for building permits. The reduction in rear yard setback is part of an effort to create consistent rules across different city zones, balancing urban and suburban needs. Rear yard setbacks help manage stormwater by preventing significant increases in impervious surfaces. The City is open to refining these rules in future drafts to address specific concerns, such as those raised about smaller lots and areas without stormwater drains.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Concerning stormwater management and tree canopy loss due to infill development in mature neighbourhoods. They highlighted issues such as reduced setbacks, limestone bedrock affecting stormwater infiltration, and the impact of increased impervious surfaces on aging infrastructure and the Ottawa River. The resident emphasized the need to maintain current setbacks for stormwater infiltration, green space, and tree preservation.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The first draft of the new Zoning By-law is open to refinement based on community feedback. The proposal aims to create consistent rules across different city zones, balancing the needs of both urban and suburban areas. However, unique issues faced by neighbourhoods like Kitchissippi, where increased impervious surfaces can exacerbate stormwater runoff and impact aging infrastructure, are recognized.</p> <p>The challenges posed by reduced setbacks and the presence of limestone bedrock, which affects stormwater infiltration, are acknowledged. Maintaining adequate setbacks for stormwater infiltration, green space, and tree preservation is crucial. The input on maintaining the current setbacks for front and rear yards is valuable and will be considered as the by-law is refined. The goal is to unlock development potential in traditionally lower-density neighbourhoods to distribute infill more evenly across the city, while ensuring that this is done thoughtfully to avoid overburdening specific areas. Feedback from residents helps ensure that these concerns are addressed effectively as the Zoning By-law is developed further.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>We support the removal of parking minimums and the flexibility to preserve trees on development lots. They raised two main questions:</p> <p>Why hasn't the density around Westboro LRT station increased significantly in the new plans, despite the emphasis on transit-oriented development? Why do some new zoning regulations, such as setbacks, appear more stringent compared to the old Zoning By-law, potentially limiting density increases?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The intent is to increase density around transit stations, including Westboro, in line with the Official Plan. However, zoning must follow the designations in the Official Plan, which includes a height strategy to ensure a transition between higher-density Hubs and adjacent residential zones. This strategy typically increases building heights further away from abutting neighbourhood zones to balance density with community character.</p> <p>Regarding the comparison between old and new zoning regulations, the goal is not to take away existing development rights. The new Zoning By-law aims to retain current setback requirements unless there is a specific reason for change. Any discrepancies that result in more restrictive regulations will be reviewed to ensure they align with the overall intent to support increased density and development rights.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Why is the Hub zone around Westboro station relatively small, with only one or two properties identified, compared to the typical 600-meter radius seen around other stations. Also, why does the Minor Corridor designation for Parkdale stop at the highway and does not extend south to Carling Avenue to connect with future rapid transit.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The size of the Hub zone around Westboro station may be influenced by the Richmond Road/Westboro Secondary Plan, which affects permitted heights and could explain the limited number of properties designated as Hub zones. This will be reviewed further to provide a detailed explanation.</p> <p>Regarding Parkdale, the Minor Corridor designation is based on the Official Plan, which currently extends only to the 417 highway and does not go further south. The zoning must follow the Official Plan designations, which is why the Minor Corridor ends where it does.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Why is the minimum lot width for vertically divided portions of buildings increased in the new Zoning By-law. They argued that reducing the minimum lot width would allow developers to build row houses with three-bedroom units, which are in high demand, instead of being forced to build horizontally stacked units.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The intent of the new Zoning By-law is not to take away existing development rights. In zones where semi-detached and townhouse units are currently permitted, the minimum lot width should not be higher than what is allowed today. The goal is to provide flexibility for builders to decide the form of the building, whether it be semi-detached with additional dwelling units or a six-unit apartment building, as long as it meets the building form requirements such as setbacks and height. Staff will review and refine the by-law to ensure it aligns with these principles and addresses any discrepancies.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>I'm in the Civic Hospital area, where the zoning is changing from R1 to N3B. On 50 x 100 foot lots, this could mean up to 12 units per lot. How will this fit with the existing neighbourhood in terms of entries, exits, doors, and windows? Additionally, if developers amalgamate lots, this could result in 24 units where there was previously one, which seems beyond gentle intensification. Lastly, Carling Avenue is being used to justify this intensification, but without planned light rail or sufficient transit, how will this impact the community?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The density permissions are designed to scale with the lot size. For example, combining two lots could allow for 24 units, which could be configured as an apartment building or townhomes, provided they meet setback and height requirements. Bill 23 requires that additional dwelling units be permitted in single detached, semi-detached, and townhouse dwellings, influencing density considerations. The evolving overlay in the Official Plan applies within 150 meters of a designated Hub or Main Street, such as Carling Avenue. These factors guide the proposed zoning changes. The city acknowledges these concerns and will consider them in future drafts of the Zoning By-law.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Why is there no parking required for new developments in areas like Champlain Park, where properties could support up to 12 units? Many apartment dwellers still own cars, and this could lead to more cars parked on the street, especially during winter when plowing is necessary.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The proposed Zoning By-law adopts a choice-based approach to parking. While it does not require parking, developers are still allowed to provide it. The decision to include parking will likely depend on market demand, as developers will want to meet the needs of potential tenants. Additionally, providing parking must be balanced with other site uses, such as maintaining space for trees. Soft landscaping requirements ensure that there is permeable space to support tree planting and maintenance. Tree protection by-laws also regulate the retention of distinctive trees, particularly in infill developments. This approach aims to balance the need for parking with other urban planning goals, such as preserving green spaces.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Are the unit numbers provided for typical lots (e.g., 6 units on an N2 lot) minimums or maximums? What happens if a developer wants to build more units than specified? Additionally, what are the regulations regarding additional curb cuts, especially in areas with higher density zoning like N2?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The numbers provided for typical lots, such as 6 units on an N2 lot, represent the maximum units allowed. If a developer wants to build more units than specified, they would need to apply for a Zoning By-law Amendment.</p> <p>Regarding curb cuts, the proposed regulations generally carry forward the current by-law limits. No individual driveway is permitted on a lot less than 6 meters in width, and only a single-width driveway is allowed until the lot reaches 15 meters in width, at which point a double-width driveway is permitted. For federally owned streets, decisions on curb cuts rest with the federal authority, and further discussions with federal officials would be necessary to address specific cases.</p>



Question:	In our neighbourhood, the front yard setbacks have been reduced from 6 meters to 3 meters in the evolving overlay and to 4.5 meters in the N3C zone. This reduction impacts the ability to plant trees and maintain soft landscaping, especially since many properties have little to no city right of way. How can we work with the planning department to address these concerns and ensure that setbacks are adequate for tree planting and drainage?
Response:	The front yard setbacks proposed in the first draft of the new Zoning By-law are not final. Staff will review whether the proposed setbacks are adequately contextual, taking into account the specific needs of neighbourhoods like Champlain Park. The existing zoning exception that sets front yard setbacks at 6 meters will also be reviewed in the second draft. The planning department encourages written submissions detailing specific concerns, which will help guide discussions and refinements. There is ample time before the final Zoning By-law is approved, with the next draft expected in March of next year. This process will ensure that community feedback is considered and addressed.



As We Heard It Report – Wards 10, 16, 17 and 18

Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Wards 10, 16, 17 and 18 was held on Sept 4, 2024, from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a zoning by-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Hear-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 10 Gloucester-Southgate – Councillor Jessica Bradley	2
	Summary of Comments Received	2
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses.....	3
2	Ward 16 River – Councillor Riley Brockington	11
	Summary of Comments Received	11
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	13
3	Ward 17 Capital – Councillor Shawn Menard	26
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	27
3	Ward 18 Alta Vista – Councillor Cathy Carr	43
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	44



Ward 10 Gloucester-Southgate

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with increased density beyond the standard neighbourhood turnover rate. ▪ Seeking clarity on how the new Zoning By-law's policies will be reflected in Ottawa's neighbourhoods. ▪ Concerns about the risk of flooding, especially with increase density and new development proposed. ▪ Emphasizing the importance of providing sufficient space for trees through appropriate setbacks and soft landscaping requirements.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desire to see more commercial uses in Neighbourhoods and in closer proximity to existing residential areas. ▪ Support for increased residential density to support commercial uses in existing communities, including the -c suffix.
15-Minute Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments promoting the creation of 15-minute neighbourhoods. • Seeking clarity on the criteria for 15-minute neighbourhoods.
Simplifying Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion to simplify the zones by removing subzones and making permissions more uniform.



Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	I understand the average turnover rate in the city is 0.5% per year, but certain areas of the city are likely experiencing higher demand for the turnover of lots for new development. If a certain neighbourhood has more demand than expected, does the city start capping or preventing new infills? If the maximum for a neighbourhood is reached, does the city start restricting this kind of growth or is it fully permitted on every lot?
Response:	<p>It's true that turnover rates vary across neighbourhoods and range from 0.5%-1.5% annually. In areas with higher turnover rates, increasing the density of a neighbourhood is still a gradual process and the density of redevelopment varies.</p> <p>The Official Plan sets out minimum density targets for each transect to reach by 2046. The draft Zoning By-law aims to implement these policies by establishing density requirements, which includes density maximums per lot for Neighbourhood zones 1-3. The intent of introducing density minimums across transects is to control for the varied nature of turnover and intensification - some blocks might experience above average intensification while other blocks experience no turnover in 10 years and these are averaged out at the neighbourhood level.</p>



Question:	In practical terms, what changes in our neighbourhood could we expect as a result of the proposed by-law in the next 10 to 20 years?
Response:	<p>A main objective of the Official Plan is to increase housing opportunities as Ottawa's population is projected to increase by 400,000 by 2046. The draft Zoning By-law aims to support housing growth by enabling higher densities in neighbourhoods and allowing for more diverse dwelling types across the city.</p> <p>Aside from providing housing for new and existing residents, stimulating new residential development in neighbourhoods and along corridors that run through communities can boost local businesses and provide a wider range of local amenities to residents to meet their everyday needs. An increased population makes it more viable for businesses to establish and thrive which helps meet the Official Plan concept of creating 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p> <p>With population growth, transit needs will also rise, creating demand for more frequent and accessible service. A denser population closer to transit corridors could help increase ridership, addressing some of the current transit challenges by fostering a more robust and sustainable system.</p>



Question:

I just have a few different comments rather than a specific question. I'm from CAFES - Community Associations for Environmental Sustainability, an environmental network that's local to Ottawa. We've been looking into the zoning by-law to develop our position, which is very related to climate and trees. From a climate perspective, we really support a compact city that reduces sprawl, for climate and financial reasons, and we really support the 15-minute city. In terms of trees, we are really happy to see that there's a lot of effort being made to have the space for trees, like the 30 meter required soil volumes in the provisions for underground structures as well as the required soft landscaping in front and rear yards. And we are also happy to see the alternate setbacks for tree retention. That is really important.

In terms of setbacks, we're concerned with the provision that allows for the front yard setbacks to be reduced and average to existing lots when the existing lots are smaller than they're required will be less room for trees. Our overall position is to have no averaging because anything less than a three meter setback in front yards will not provide enough surface area for a tree to survive. We understand that the trend, when there is averaging, is that it can get less and less over time. It would be ideal even in existing areas where there's little to no setbacks, the new development should still have three to six meters.

We also noticed in several sections that the note section on the side explains the intent to make more space for trees, but it's not always as obvious in the actual provision. We do understand that zoning can't have provisions for tree planting directly. But the wording is really, really important and it needs to be careful to make sure that there aren't ways to skirt around these requirements to have the soft landscaping for trees.

CAFES put out a position paper in February on trees and zoning and we did quite a bit of research on the soil volumes that are needed for trees. We wanted to mention that 30 cubic meters that's mentioned a few times is definitely required for medium-sized trees. But if we want the really large canopy trees that we have in a lot of the older neighbourhoods today, they actually need even more space, closer to 50 cubic meters. Even small trees still require about 10 cubic meters. So we just want to bring that point up that it is really important to know which size of tree can fit in these different areas. Our overall concern is that over time, the big mature trees that we have will age out and with increasing density, all we'll be left with is small replacement trees that can't grow full height if their soil volume is just not big enough to allow them to grow to that size.



Response:

Thank you for these comments.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>It seems that the proposed zoning for this area is largely Neighbourhood, so a lot of residential without a lot of density or retail planned in our immediate area. We have poor transit in our area and it seems like we can't get better transit without higher density, so it's difficult for this area to become a 15-minute neighbourhood. For example, if you live east of Conroy, that's not remotely close to walk to South Keys which is a high density area with commercial uses.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>I'm glad to see we're getting more density in the area, although I'm disappointed in the limitedness of that density. I'd like to see smaller retail stores on smaller streets, because right now they must be part of a mini strip mall to be viable. Permitting a corner store or small neighbourhood restaurant would be great. At one point I was hoping that we'd have more access to actual corner stores, where someone takes a two or three story building and the ground floor is a store and then there's residential above it.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>There was a lot of talk about 15 minute neighbourhoods. The area around Blohm is severely lacking in amenities (it's just houses). How would the proposed changes facilitate the growth of shopping / service options there?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Through the policies in Draft 1, Neighbourhood zones allow a variety of density: N2 permits around six units per lot, N3 allows up to 12 units, and N4 can accommodate apartment buildings with approximately 20 units or more. This provides significant density, especially in comparison to what's currently allowed in R1, R2, or R3 zones.</p> <p>The intention is to achieve gentle density within neighbourhoods while directing mid-rise and high-rise buildings to busier, transit-adjacent streets. If Council approves the densities as currently proposed, neighbourhoods would indeed see a notable increase in the number of permitted units. With this increased density, the intention is to create conditions to support local business and provide better transit options.</p> <p>Staff are also exploring the use of the c- suffix, which can be added to a Neighborhood zone to signal it is appropriate for mixed-use development. This was done in a limited manner in Draft 1 where mostly existing cases were carried forward. Through Draft 2, Staff are working to establish a systematic method of expanding those permissions. Some of the potential considerations for applying the c- suffix are proximity to a park, school or other community feature that draws public interest, or if the site is at the corner of two collector roads. These higher-traffic locations in</p>



	<p>Neighbourhoods could potentially support a doctor's office or a coffee shop. Feedback on locations for these uses is always welcome.</p> <p>Staff have also looked at liberalizing home-based businesses in Neighbourhoods to move towards 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p>
--	---

Question:	How are locations being decided for the c- suffix to permit commercial uses in neighbourhoods? It would be a shame if the zoning were applied to an area and then nothing happens because the property owners aren't interested in pursuing that.
Response:	Ideally, property owners would indicate their own interest in having these new permissions. This avoids potential conflicts if neighbors propose a location that the property owner may not want or intend for commercial use. Staff will work with the Councillor to coordinate this process. If you're part of a community association, please reach out to share whether you support or oppose these permissions. If you're a property owner interested in these options, please reach out directly as well.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>It seems the big change we should expect from this plan is increased density. To meet the minimum density targets, is the city going to be doing anything to incentivize density in addition to just changing the zoning? Also, how are the minimum targets established? If it's a minimum target, what's the thought process for thinking an area would support that?</p> <p>With increased density, especially in areas that are prone to flooding, what's being done to prevent flooding from stormwater?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Regarding incentives, the Zoning By-law itself does not offer incentives for increased density; it simply establishes the permissions for development. Whether these density opportunities are utilized depends on market conditions and their feasibility.</p> <p>These targets are set in the Official Plan, and the new Zoning By-law is designed to allow for those targets to be met. By increasing permitted densities, the new Zoning By-law aims to support gradual redevelopment in neighbourhoods that aligns with the long-term goals of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Through Draft 1, if lands are in the floodplain, density permissions have not been increased in those areas. Draft 1 also introduced provisions in Section 201 requiring post-development runoff rates to be the same as pre-development levels. An increase in impermeable surfaces on the site post-development will require on-site stormwater management. This could include an underground cistern or rooftop storage, depending on the context of the site and existing conditions, such as an existing tree. These provisions aim to prevent additional runoff into the stormwater system, reducing the risk of neighbourhood flooding from redevelopment and, over time, potentially lessening overland flooding risks with improved infrastructure.</p> <p>Regarding incentives, the Zoning By-law itself does not offer incentives for increased density; it simply establishes the permissions for development. Whether these density opportunities are utilized depends on market conditions and their feasibility.</p> <p>These targets are set in the Official Plan, and the new Zoning By-law is designed to allow for those targets to be met. By increasing permitted densities, the new Zoning By-law aims to support gradual redevelopment in neighbourhoods that aligns with the long-term goals of the Official Plan.</p>



Question:	Is the designation of a 15 minute neighbourhood based on transit service during the week or weekends?
Response:	A 15-minute neighbourhood is one where accessing amenities is possible through the use of different modes of transportation from a vehicle, such as bicycling, taking the bus or walking.

Question:	Can you explain the zoning awarded to the NCC lands of Conroy Pit and MerBleu that are located in this Ward? What type environmental protection is awarded to these greenspaces.
Response:	Lands owned by the Federal Government, including those owned through the NCC, are not subject to the Zoning By-law. The City does work with the NCC to find appropriate zoning for federally owned lands.

Question:	I understand the removal of the minimum parking rates. Experience has shown that rooming houses or similar produce as many as 1 car per bedroom. What means is the City going to use to manage on street parking consistently?
Response:	The Zoning Team is reviewing the on-street parking permit program to evaluate its implementation and potential expansion. They are identifying priority areas with current or anticipated parking demand issues. Additionally, they are exploring ways to allow parking in areas where it is not currently permitted, such as utilizing underutilized surface parking spaces for other uses.



Ward 16 River

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizes disappointment and frustration over the decision not to implement 6-plex housing citywide, viewing it as a significant missed opportunity, especially during a housing and climate crisis. ▪ Emphasizes disappointment that the City is not adopting a minimum of three stories for buildings, considering it is the 21st century. ▪ Concern about the increase in light and noise pollution as a result of intensification which can have significant health consequences. ▪ Concern with significant density increases in areas subject to the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay. ▪ Seeking clarity on the relationship between intensification and tree preservation/planting.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the city is encouraging the use of public transit, the lack of established 15-minute neighbourhoods makes it premature to restrict private property parking. People will still need cars for daily activities. • Seeking clarification on the removal of parking minimums and concern about the impacts on street parking. • Concern with front yard parking and paving resulting from infill development.
Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion to include maps with street names as it is difficult to understand what the maps are showing. ▪ Suggestion to include a guide or instructions on how to use GeoOttawa. The extensive list of layers can be challenging to navigate, and it is difficult to find relevant information.



Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking clarity on new form-based zoning provisions. • Concern with inconsistent zoning within neighbourhoods. • Concern with the use of neighbourhood character to limit multi-residential development in neighbourhoods. • Seeking clarity on how the Carlington heritage study will impact development in the neighbourhood.
Hubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking clarity on the definition and function of Hubs.
Official Plan Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking clarity on the implementation of Secondary Plan policies in the new Zoning By-law and impacts on permitted heights. • Seeking clarity on the implementation of area-specific plans.
Parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wondering how the new Zoning By-law will impact the amount of parkland in neighbourhoods.



Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	When will the City deliver the new Zoning By-law? Will there still be applications for zoning amendments or minor variances and how will the Official Plan guide these processes?
Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law is expected to go to Council for approval at the end of 2025. The Official Plan provides extensive guidance on how to assess minor variances or zoning amendments in certain instances. There will still be applications for zoning amendments or minor variances, as permitted by the Planning Act of Ontario. In the By-law itself, Staff are establishing baseline standards for construction, which limits the opportunity to provide policy direction or metrics for assessing zoning amendments or community adjustment applications.</p> <p>However, the aim of the new Zoning By-law is to ensure that the By-law is smoother and simpler, making it easier for people to understand and avoiding complications that necessitate variances or zoning amendments. This will be supported by the higher-level policies and directions in the Official Plan.</p>

Question:	Can you provide an in-depth explanation of what a Hub is?
Response:	<p>As defined by the Official Plan approved in 2021, a Hub is a significant concentration of services, typically centered around planned or existing rapid transit stations and frequent street transit stops. These Hubs are intended to concentrate a diversity of functions, higher density development, mixed uses, and enhanced public transit connectivity compared to the surrounding areas. Often located along old train lines or in areas with an existing substantial concentration of services and businesses, Hubs provide opportunities for directed growth.</p> <p>Hubs are also intended to serve as major employment centers and are identified as Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSAs) under the Provincial Policy Statement. The Official Plan and the new Zoning By-law focus on accommodating the bulk of intensification and growth within these Hubs and along Mainstreets.</p>



Question:	Aside from the Experimental Farm in our ward, are there any Neighbourhood zones that downzone particular areas in the ward and if so, why are we allowing that? What about in secondary plan areas? What's the mechanism by which you're constrained to continue honouring those plans?
Response:	<p>There are no areas being down-zoned such that their potential would be reduced compared to today. Secondary plans that allow for down-zoning are still in effect. In some areas, secondary plans may establish lower heights than those contemplated in our recent Official Plan. Staff are mandated to honour these plans as they currently stand. For example, there will be areas within some secondary plans where the permitted heights along corridors may be lower than in other Main Street areas.</p> <p>Although some secondary plans were written before the current Official Plan, they have been reinstated as part of it. These secondary plans set specific ranges for intensities and heights, and they take precedence over the baseline Official Plan.</p>

Question:	Could you clarify whether the new zoning regulations will apply equally to the Carlingwood area, specifically where the veterans' homes are located, and which was subject to a heritage study? Additionally, how will the heritage study impact the application of the new zoning regulations in this neighbourhood?
Response:	<p>Carlington, rather than Carlingwood, was the subject of a <i>Cultural Heritage Character area study</i>. This study is enabled by the City's Official Plan (Section 4.5.13). A <i>Cultural Heritage Character Area</i> enables development of design guidelines that will assist in the conservation and understanding of these areas. These guidelines are not equivalent to an area-wide or property-specific designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. In these Cultural Heritage Character areas, design guidelines help private and public landowners conserve houses in the area. These guidelines do not override or otherwise change the zoning by-law requirements for the area. The outcome of the Cultural Heritage Character Area study was the <i>Veterans' Housing Character Area</i> report, here.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>How do we know if the area where we live is subject to a Secondary Plan?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>A map showing the areas covered by secondary plans can be found in Annex 6 – Urban Areas Subject to a Secondary Plan and Annex 7 – Rural Areas Subject to a Secondary Plan. More specific maps that include secondary plan designations and its respective policies can be found in Volume 2A and 2B of the Official Plan found here.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Are we dropping the parking requirements citywide?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>It is proposed that there will be no minimum parking space rates (with the exception of minimum loading space rates & visitor parking) within the new Zoning By-law. Removing minimum parking space rates does not mean that no parking will be provided as development occurs. Maximum parking space rates will still apply to properties within 600 metres of existing and funded rapid transit stations. This change also allows property owners, developers, and businesses to provide the amount of parking they deem necessary based on built environment constraints and transit availability.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>The Official Plan mentions area-specific policies, and I am curious whether these policies will be adopted in the same manner as a secondary plan. Will they be integrated similarly?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>An area-specific policy holds the same level of authority as the Official Plan. The Official Plan provides the foundational framework, while secondary plans typically cover specific neighbourhoods or areas, often around major transit Hubs. Below these are area-specific policies, which can be considered smaller versions of secondary plans. These policies usually arise from local developments that necessitate amendments to certain standards or details in the Official Plan. Although some area-specific policies may be decades old, they offer additional specificity.</p> <p>As part of our review process for the draft Zoning By-law, Staff must ensure that secondary plans are incorporated into the zoning. Additionally, Staff need to ensure that all area-specific policies are also reflected in the zoning maps.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Is Fisher Avenue considered a Minor Corridor? I believe it is planned for significant widening. The reason I ask is that Fisher Avenue seems to have been down-zoned through an area-specific policy. If there isn't a specific policy along Fisher Avenue, it suggests that better permits might be needed. It seems counterintuitive that a transit corridor like Fisher Avenue wouldn't have the same permissions as other sections.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Fisher Avenue is designated a Minor Corridor in the Official Plan (Schedule B3, Outer Urban Transect) from Baseline south to Meadowlands. Schedule C16 of the Official Plan is the Road Classification and Rights-of-Way Protection schedule, that designates the ultimate width identified for roads that are intended to be widened in the future. Fisher Avenue South of Baseline is not identified for further widening on Schedule C16. Fisher Avenue South of Baseline Road is also not subject to any area-specific policy as identified on Annex 5 of the Official Plan but is within the Carleton Heights Secondary Plan Boundary.</p> <p>A Secondary Plan is Official Plan-level policy, and overrides the designations found within the Official Plan. In the Carleton Heights Secondary Plan, Fisher South of Baseline to Meadowlands is designated mostly <i>Neighbourhood Mid-Rise</i> (up to 6 storeys), with <i>Neighbourhood Low-rise</i> (up to 4 storeys) on the east side of Fisher from Dynes to Lexington Park. These Secondary Plan designations direct residential-uses only, overriding the mixed-use land use of the Minor Corridor designation in the Official Plan. Staff will be reviewing the heights directed in the Secondary Plan against the current predominant N3 zoning (with a 3-storey height maximum) along this stretch of Fisher as we work towards a second draft of the Zoning By-law.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Could you please clarify the new conditions regarding on-site parking as per the recent Zoning By-law? The by-law appears quite prescriptive, making it challenging to provide parking on private property, especially in high-density areas. While the requirement for parking spaces has been relaxed, it is still important to manage the impact on neighbouring properties. Therefore, regulations ensure that if parking spaces are provided, they must be adequate.</p> <p>From my understanding of the new Zoning By-law, it appears that a 2-metre strip is required from the back of a property to the parking space. This requirement complicates the provision of on-site parking, especially when trying to maximize the number of units.</p> <p>Have you considered designing a six-plex with two or three proper parking spots to see if it is feasible under the new regulations?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The new Zoning By-law is still regulating on-site parking to ensure that if two parking spaces are provided, they can adequately accommodate two cars. The approach aims to balance regulation with market flexibility in providing on-site parking. While there are detailed requirements regarding parking, it remains an essential aspect of zoning management.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>The term “neighbourhood character” is often used to exclude multifamily housing and can serve as a pretext for non-planning-related discrimination. Why do we continue to use this term? What are the actual planning reasons behind it, and are any of them objective, or are they primarily subjective?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>In the new Zoning By-law, Staff have revised the neighbourhood zoning approach to focus on maximum units rather than the traditional method of categorizing residential zones by building types based on the number of units. This change provides greater flexibility for builders and the industry to meet their needs within the maximum unit limits.</p> <p>When referring to “neighbourhood character,” this is addressing the physical characteristics of the neighbourhood. The Neighbourhood zones include various subzones (A to F) that establish different standards, such as minimum lot width and setbacks. These standards aim to balance the provision of necessary amenities, like parking and trees, while maintaining the neighbourhood’s physical characteristics.</p> <p>Therefore, “neighbourhood character” pertains to the physical attributes of the area and its buildings, rather than the number of kitchens or self-contained units within a building.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Living in an R1GG zone in Cortland Park, which is proposed to be rezoned to N3D due to its proximity to Baseline, means that a neighbourhood currently consisting mostly of two-storey single-unit homes could transform into three-storey, 12-unit dwellings. This represents a significant change in neighbourhood character for existing homeowners. A more gradual intensification, such as two-storey, six-unit dwellings, would allow for a smoother transition. Is it possible to consider the extent of the zoning change, or the “delta,” while still adhering to the Official Plan?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Areas close to Hubs or Mainstreets are subject to a policy concept from the Official Plan called the “evolving overlay,” which applies to a 150-metre distance. In these areas, due to their proximity to services, a more rapid rate of change is expected. Consequently, Staff are implementing greater heights and higher unit densities. For example, an N3 zone is applied instead of an N2 zone, which might be used in the interior of the neighbourhood further from services. This approach aligns with the evolving overlay direction in the Official Plan.</p> <p>Staff are open to receiving feedback, especially regarding the evolving overlay and zone development. In the N3 zones closer to Mainstreets, the New Zoning By-law aims to regulate neighbourhood characteristics, such as setbacks, in a context-sensitive manner, even if they differ from the interior neighbourhood standards.</p>



Question:	<p>Regarding the new zoning map, I believe there is an opportunity to streamline the zoning process. In my neighbourhood of Arlington, and across the city, it appears that zoning changes have been made mathematically from R2 to N3 zones without considering the practical implications. For example, my street has a pocket of N3 zoning, surrounded by N4 zoning, which seems inconsistent. Similarly, further south, there are small pockets of N2 and N4 zoning that do not seem logical.</p> <p>What is the mechanism to address these inconsistencies with your mapping team? I do not have the time to write an email for every discrepancy.</p>
Response:	<p>The first draft of the new Zoning By-law has been released, which involved a significant amount of transposing existing codes. Currently, Staff are diligently working on a comprehensive redrafting process, which will intensify after October. Staff are systematically reviewing the entire city, divided into 500 grid squares, and manually examining each neighbourhood and street to identify and address small zoning inconsistencies, particularly those affecting 4-5 lot islands.</p> <p>We welcome comments from anyone who notices they are in a small zoning island and has the time to provide feedback. However, please know that Staff are actively addressing these issues in a detailed and meticulous manner.</p>



Question:	There are two key directions outlined in the initial presentation: increasing tree coverage and enhancing density. At first glance, these objectives may appear to be mutually exclusive. What is the strategy for advancing both of these goals simultaneously?
Response:	<p>Trees are often perceived as obstacles to new construction. However, in recent years, the City has adopted a much stronger approach to preserving existing trees. For the first time, zoning regulations include minimum landscaping requirements specifically designed to accommodate the growth of mature trees. While zoning cannot mandate the planting or maintenance of trees, it can ensure that adequate space is allocated for them within the overall zoning performance standards to be retained and to grow.</p> <p>The shift away from minimum parking requirements also creates opportunities for increased tree cover on intensifying lots. This approach aims to balance the need for building entryways and rear yard spaces with the preservation of tree cover. By establishing minimum landscaped areas for trees, the goal is to integrate green spaces into urban development effectively.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Regarding parking, in many neighbourhoods, residents are widening their driveways, adding curb cuts, and paving over their front lawns. For example, on the 900 block of Woodroffe Avenue near D. Roy Kennedy, the transition to three- and four-storey zoning has resulted in numerous duplexes, multiplexes, and mini condos. This has led to a lack of parking on Woodroffe, causing residents to park on nearby streets like Georgina Drive, creating a constant string of parked cars.</p> <p>If I were to convert my house into a three- or four-unit dwelling and needed three or four parking spots, how would that be managed? Am I allowed to create a wider curb cut, or must I resort to backyard parking, potentially removing trees? Is front yard parking permitted? These considerations are crucial, especially since many residents will still require parking due to limited transit options, as Councillor Brockington is likely aware. The transit service is infrequent, and it is a 20 to 30-minute walk to the nearest station.</p> <p>Is the 900 block of Woodroffe an example of the higher density envisioned for mainstreets? This area, along with parts of Baseline near the Experimental Farm, has seen significant changes, with front yards being paved over, resulting in an unattractive streetscape dominated by concrete, cars, garbage cans, and stairs, with little to no greenery. If this is the direction we are heading, I would prefer to see high-rise apartment buildings rather than the current developments.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Even under the current zoning rules, paving a front yard that does not lead to a parking space or garage is prohibited. This issue largely falls on the city's responsibility for by-law enforcement. While this is a widespread problem, with Baseline Road being a notable example, similar issues can be observed on Scott Street and other mainstreets across the city.</p> <p>Maintaining restrictions around parking, even when not required, is crucial as in many areas where transit service is limited, parking will still be necessary for residents who need or prefer to drive. Therefore, it is essential to regulate the location and extent of parking, ensuring it does not cover excessive property area, and to enforce by-laws effectively.</p>



Question:	<p>How will the new zoning changes affect the amount of parkland that will be allotted in neighbourhoods?</p>
Response:	<p>With intensification and population growth in certain areas, the importance of parks has indeed increased. Regarding parklands and public parks, development applications often include provisions for funding to support the creation and enhancement of parks. This is one mechanism through which we finance and support parks, adding more programming and amenities. While zoning does not specifically regulate the provision of parks, other development processes address this need.</p>

Question:	<p>Residing in an N2E zone, the new zoning regulations permit the construction of three units. Does this imply that one can build a triplex (a single building with three separate units) or three attached individual units?</p>
Response:	<p>There are standards for the vertical attachment of units, such as townhouses. These standards depend on the specific lot width. However, the overall approach with the draft Zoning By-law is to move away from strictly regulating the number of units in a given area. Instead, the focus is on ensuring that the overall building form is context sensitive. This means that, as long as the design is appropriate for the area, you can build two or three units in various configurations.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>I am trying to understand the changes to the green space around McCarthy Woods, the hydro cut, and the stormwater management ponds along the Airport Parkway. On the older maps, these areas are a mix of green space, recreational, and industrial zones. However, in the new plan, they appear to be designated entirely as industrial. It is difficult to envision the city repurposing the stormwater management ponds for industrial use.</p> <p>Does this new industrial designation imply that the industrial code now encompasses a broader range of activities than traditionally associated with industry? Additionally, are there any anticipated changes to the land use of this green space, including NCC-owned lands that have been designated as surplus?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>In the existing Zoning By-law (By-law 2008-250), an area along the hydro/railway corridor west of the Airport Parkway, and another area immediately east of Riverside over the greenspace/railway corridor is zoned IL (Light Industrial). The stormwater ponds immediately east of the Airport Parkway and west of the LRT tracks was zoned O1 (Open Space).</p> <p>In Draft 1, these industrial areas have been proposed to be rezoned to GRN (Greenspace) and REC1 (Recreation). The area currently zoned O1 (Open Space) is proposed to be zoned as GRN (Greenspace). The removal of the industrial zones was to recognize the low likelihood of industrial uses along what is a naturalized area bounding the railway corridor. There was no expansion of industrially-zoned lands with the current draft Zoning By-law proposed.</p>



Question:	<p>With intensification, there is naturally an increase in light and noise pollution. What measures is the City taking to mitigate these effects? For instance, regarding lighting, are there efforts to prevent light overflow and to use yellow lights instead of white lights?</p>
Response:	<p>Regulating lights or bulbs is not within the scope of zoning regulations. However, for larger development applications that include a site plan control application, the city can provide direction on aspects such as downcast lighting. This is part of the broader development process but is not covered by the draft Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Similarly, zoning does not regulate noise from neighbouring buildings, such as air conditioners. While zoning can influence the placement of such equipment, it does not address noise control directly. Construction-related noise also falls outside the purview of zoning regulations.</p> <p>Responsibility for these issues lies with other mechanisms, such as the Noise Control By-law and by-law enforcement. These tools can address potential nuisances that zoning does not cover.</p>

Question:	<p>What actions can we, as individual residents, take to ensure that this process does not experience further delays? We are already looking at an 18-month timeline for implementation. How can we maintain momentum and prevent any slowdowns? To clarify, this is not a criticism of the current timeline; I simply wish to avoid any additional delays.</p>
Response:	<p>Staff are required to complete a new Zoning By-law within three years of the approval of an Official Plan as required by the Planning Act. Staff are diligently working on revising Zoning By-law as quickly as possible, following the direction of the new Official Plan that was approved in 2022.</p> <p>Providing comments and sharing your on-the-ground insights are invaluable. This feedback helps refine the Zoning By-law, making it more effective and facilitating a smoother approval process. Your contributions are crucial in helping create and deliver a Zoning By-law that aligns with the Official Plan to receive Council approval at the end of 2025.</p>



Ward 17 Capital

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that there is a lack of parking resulting in an increase of on-street parking and more traffic. These 16-bedroom properties are primarily designed for students, and while we do not have an issue with that, there is a lack of parking. During winter, parking on both sides of the street obstructs school buses, plows, and emergency vehicles. ▪ It would be beneficial if transportation officials could introduce one-sided parking from the outset to support this greater densification.
Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that there is little to no greenscape or landscaping between these structures, typically only a chain-link fence, as a result of minor variances to increase building envelope. ▪ Concern that the front and rear extensions have resulted in the loss of numerous trees and greenery due to the intensification and built forms, which conflicts with the objective of enhancing the tree canopy.
Neighbourhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding the number of individuals residing in units. While enforcement may not be feasible, it is crucial to consider the impact. Sixteen adults living in four units, compared to four individuals in a single unit, significantly affects the community. This disparity influences site function and infrastructure, particularly water consumption. This consideration is vital for planning purposes and is a frequent concern with new infill developments.



Questions and Staff Responses

Question:

Looking further ahead, what does zoning entail for existing greenfield areas within the urban boundary? Are we planning to develop these outer parts of the city? Additionally, what protections are in place within the Official Plan to prevent urban sprawl beyond the urban boundary, which could cause financial hardship for city residents?

We appreciate the attention given to creating spaces for trees and hope that increasing density will not eliminate all trees. Our tree stock is aging, and we need new spaces for tree growth. If these spaces are too small, we will only have small trees, which will not provide the necessary canopy for the city's livability. While we understand that zoning cannot mandate tree planting, we are curious about any exceptions and would appreciate tips on how to protect and maintain tall trees.

Regarding stormwater management, I have attended previous presentations and understand that a new stormwater by-law is forthcoming. Given the increased rainfall due to climate change, I am interested in a briefing on this matter, especially since Capital Ward is one of the areas affected by basement flooding.



Response:

The Official Plan employs a transect model that includes downtown, inner/outer urban, suburban, and rural areas. These transects largely correspond to different types of development. As inner and outer urban areas evolve, they become denser, a trend observed over the past few decades. The transect concept allows for this evolution, meaning that parts of the outer urban areas could eventually adopt the zoning and policies currently seen in the inner urban areas. Consequently, older suburban areas today may develop characteristics of the outer urban transect over time. The Official Plan thus facilitates this evolutionary process as areas densify and intensify.

In terms of the urban expansion zone, this is governed by the Official Plan and not the Zoning By-law. It is influenced by the provincial planning statement and the requirement for a 15-year land supply, which supports market-driven housing. Therefore, the Zoning By-law cannot guarantee urban expansion.

Regarding trees, zoning cannot directly mandate tree planting. However, it can require that adequate space is set aside for trees in front or rear yards, or for the retention of existing mature trees. This is why soft landscaping requirements are emphasized in both front and rear yards within Neighbourhood zones, ensuring space for tree growth.

For stormwater management, the principle is that pre-stormwater flows must equal post-stormwater flows. Redevelopment that increases impermeable surfaces must include on-site retention or storage, such as rooftop or underground storage, to release water gradually. This ensures that the overall impact on the city's stormwater system remains consistent with current levels.



Question:

I am pleased to hear that secondary plans will take precedence where they exist and can override the Official Plan. However, I am having difficulty reconciling this with the designation of Old Ottawa East Main Street as a “mainstreet” with a small “m” and its implications. How does this align with the assertion that secondary plans take precedence, particularly in the context of the Lees Hub?

Regarding the importance of trees, while you mentioned that zoning cannot mandate tree planting, it can require the necessary space for trees. I hope there are also provisions to protect existing trees and that these protections are enforced. The policy is only meaningful if it is effectively policed and enforced, as we have seen numerous instances where new homes are built without proper tree protection, leading to the slow demise of the trees rather than their immediate removal. The tree policy must be enforceable to be effective.

Concerning the removal of minimum parking space requirements, I am curious about the provisions being made to address the impact on neighbourhoods. In Old Ottawa East, for example, there are low-rise and mid-rise apartment buildings with no parking spaces for residents. While encouraging cycling and walking is commendable, the reality is that some residents will still own cars. How do you anticipate managing parking to avoid complications and burdens for existing residents?



Response:

Generally, the designations in the secondary plan are more specific. For example, north of Clegg Street, Main Street is designated as a Mainstreet, while south of it, it is designated as a neighbourhood (more Neighbourhood than Mainstreet zones). The designations and policies for areas within the secondary plan area will prevail and will override Official Plan policies.

To reconcile this, the Mainstreet zone in the by-law is supplemented by various mechanisms to implement the policies in the secondary plan. These mechanisms include exceptions, indicated by a zone code in square brackets, which specify more detailed policies. If the secondary plan prescribes specific height designations beyond what is generally stated for mainstreets, we can use height suffixes, indicated by an “H” followed by a number in brackets, to denote the maximum building height in metres.

Regarding the protection of existing trees, in addition to zoning regulations, we also enforce tree protection by-laws, particularly in infill scenarios. These by-laws provide additional restrictions for distinctive trees (those with a diameter of 30 cm or greater). The process requires obtaining a permit and demonstrating that the tree is in poor condition. There is also a requirement for replacement trees and an enforcement mechanism.

In terms of how zoning can support tree preservation, this primarily involves soft landscaping requirements. While we cannot mandate tree planting, we can ensure that adequate space is allocated for trees to be planted. However, depending on how parking is provided, especially if it involves surface parking, this can impact the ability to properly protect trees on a site. Managing the interplay between parking and tree protection is one of the challenges we face. If there is a demand for on-site parking, it can be provided, but it must be balanced with tree preservation efforts.

Regarding the proposal to eliminate minimum parking rates, this approach is designed to offer flexibility. Property owners are still permitted to provide parking if they choose. The only limitations on the amount of parking are in areas close to certain Hubs or transit stations, such as rapid transit stations like Lees in the north end. Generally, outside a 400-metre radius of these areas, there are no restrictions preventing the provision of one parking space per unit.



Question:	Is it permissible to have underground parking beneath an apartment building, provided it does not extend beyond the building's footprint?
Response:	Yes, it is certainly permissible. There are no regulations preventing this; however, it is not a mandatory requirement.

Question:	I am concerned that the city is leaving the decision to developers without considering the impact on neighbourhoods. For example, in Old Ottawa East, developers have chosen not to provide parking for residents in some apartment buildings. If the city allows developers to make this choice, which I do not agree with, what are the provisions for on-street parking to accommodate residents. These provisions should aim to minimize the impact on existing residents in the neighbourhood.
Response:	<p>The choice-based approach to parking is already in place, and we are adapting to it. In recent years, we have seen developments in several neighbourhoods where some buildings provide no on-site parking, while others do. This approach must make sense for the market, particularly in areas with commercial parking lots, car-sharing options, local transit, and biking facilities (a combination of those things makes sense for those types of projects). However, challenges arise in areas lacking these attributes.</p> <p>Staff are in discussions with our parking department to address on-street parking provisions. If there is an increase in developments that are built without on-site parking, staff are looking at provisions to adequately provide parking for residents who need them.</p>

Question:	Regarding the zoning along Bronson on the east side south of the canal, will those be zoned as recreation, park or other, specifically the land around Brewer pool?
Response:	The intention for that area is to designate it as a recreation zone. In short, it will be zoned as park facilities, effectively carrying over the existing zoning, which serves the same purpose.



Question:	The space between Bronson and Canal Woods Terrace has been reclassified from a mainstreet to a development zone, indicated in purple. However, the surrounding streets, Canal Woods and Fulton, remain designated as N4. Could you please clarify what the DR zone entails, and whether there are plans to downgrade the surrounding streets?
Response:	<p>The Development Reserve (DR) zone appears to be a continuation of the DR zone from the current Zoning By-law. Typically, the DR designation applies to areas reserved for potential future development, often located on the edges of the urban boundary. The intention is that any development on these lands would require an amendment to the new Zoning By-law. Therefore, the current DR designation is likely a carryover from the existing by-law.</p> <p>Regarding the N4 designation to the east, this is something that can be reviewed. The N4 zoning in this location is likely influenced by Bronson's designation as a Mainstreet in the Official Plan. The overlay specifies higher density zoning within a certain distance from a Mainstreet, which may explain the N4 designation. Staff will take this feedback into consideration for future drafts.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>How will the city control the extent of density within a particular block or specific zoning area? While increasing density may occur gradually, is there any mechanism to prevent the construction of more than three large buildings with multiple units on three lots? Specifically, will dwelling unit targets be maximized, and will the city ensure that these maximums are not exceeded?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>While the first draft refers to density in terms of units per hectare, it is intended to address the number of units on a per-lot basis. For example, an N2 zone would generally allow around 60 units, depending on the lot size, with the units per hectare scaling to the lot size. The zoning aims to control density on a per-lot basis, rather than prescribing a fixed number of buildings per block.</p> <p>We acknowledge that there is some unpredictability in development patterns. The zoning provisions are designed to control both the density and the form of development, ensuring compatibility with the surrounding area. This includes regulations on setbacks, building height, and other performance standards. While staff cannot predict the exact nature or number of developments the form can be regulated to ensure it fits within the neighbourhood context.</p> <p>Height is likely to be the primary limiting factor for density on a site. The Zoning By-law sets height regulations, but there is always the possibility for applications to amend the Zoning By-law. The Planning and Housing Committee frequently reviews such applications, and we strive to align these with the Official Plan's context. Although Staff cannot entirely prevent deviations, there is a mechanism in place to manage requests for changes.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>How would you zone for making space for car share?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The draft Zoning By-law includes provisions that permit car sharing in certain zones, offering greater flexibility in areas where parking is provided. While we cannot mandate car sharing, we can facilitate its inclusion in situations where parking is available. These provisions are outlined in Part 3 of the first draft of the by-law.</p>



Question:	Regarding height transitions, there is a 7.5-metre setback from the rear. However, the depth for additional transitions in the rear was not specified. Do we have the specific depths for these additional transitions?
Response:	<p>The height transitions are specified within the applicable zones. There is a maximum height that is determined by the distance from the abutting Neighbourhood zones. Initially, there is a 7.5-metre setback, followed by a height allowance of up to six stories at a distance of 15-20 metres from the residential zone. Beyond a certain distance, high-rise heights are permitted.</p> <p>It is important to note that while Mainstreet zones generally contemplate high-rise buildings, they may not permit high-rise construction if the height is restricted by the depth of the lot. In some of the existing 15-minute communities within the urban transect, the existing lot sizes will likely control future development more than the allowable building heights.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Regarding the Official Plan (OP) for the Rideau Canal Special District, while it technically applies to the canal, it also provides direction for the first row of properties facing the canal. According to Subsection 6.6.2.2 of the OP, in addition to any policies from the secondary planning study, the development standards in the Zoning By-law must be considered. Policy 4) is not reflected on the zoning map as it limits the height in accordance with the existing heritage which will be removed in the new Zoning By-law.</p> <p>One of the OP policies directs that the Zoning By-law should reflect the existing patterns of building height, setback, and landscape character. This must be achieved in addition to and separate from any secondary planning study. How will the Zoning By-law accomplish this without secondary overlays? Will we be attempting to do to incorporate some of the stipulations of the heritage overlay without actually designating a heritage overlay?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Special District zone does indeed cover the first row of properties, including those facing Colonel By Drive and on the opposite side. To clarify, when discussing the canal zoning, it is intended to apply primarily to parkland. However, the special district policies still apply to that first row of properties.</p> <p>Some of the measures we are considering include height restrictions and existing exceptions along Colonel By Drive. There are also limitations on the Queen Elizabeth Drive side that prescribe certain limits on the permitted building footprint. For example, some exceptions on Colonel By Drive impose restrictions on the rear yard.</p> <p>Staff are committed to carrying forward existing provisions, not only height limits but also the specific provisions in the exceptions. Staff are open to refining these as needed to ensure compliance with the special district policies. The same approach applies to the secondary plans for these special district policies.</p>



Question:	Regarding secondary plans, if four units are going to be allowed, what happens to dwelling units where there is a secondary plan, and it is currently zoned R1? Would the R1 designation override anything in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) or the Official Plan (OP)?
Response:	<p>Council approved the consideration of allowing four units on serviced residential lots as part of the Zoning By-law. However, there are several factors to consider regarding the allowance of four units. As part of the City's application to the Housing Affordability Fund, staff committed to consulting on implementing four units per lot as a minimum starting point in the city.</p> <p>Secondary plans may discuss respecting the character of the neighbourhood, and we can regulate the form to align with current zoning in a certain way. However, it is important to note that, under Bill 23 of the Planning Act, the province requires at least three units to be permitted by law, regardless of the outcome of our consultation on four units.</p>

Question:	Where a secondary plan does not meet the current density calculations or targets, what was the methodology used to establish these targets? When determining these targets and developing the data on turnover, was the data specific to each transect, or was it based on city-wide redevelopment rates or those within the greenbelt? I suspect that the rate of change in areas such as Old Ottawa South or the Glebe is significantly higher than in other parts of the city. 19. If that data included areas out in Kanata, then the rate of change (like Old Ottawa south or the Glebe) would come out a lot lower than it actually is.
Response:	The targets were established using a combination of geographic data and zoning information at the time. Several elements were considered, including geographic location, the underlying zoning, and aspects of the 15-minute neighbourhood mapping (the amount and type of services available, and pedestrian usage). In essence, areas closer to amenities exhibited higher demand for turnover rates, resulting in a noticeable increase. Consequently, urban areas, particularly those with higher pedestrian use, scored better than suburban areas. Therefore, the turnover rates were determined by a composite of these factors.



Question:

How do we measure housing units, and do we account for population per unit? What constitutes a housing unit? In Heron Park, for example, we have observed the replacement of three-bedroom bungalows with semi-detached houses that include secondary units and a significant increase in bedroom counts. This change has resulted in a population increase from 3 to 16 people per property. Are we capturing this population growth accurately? Are semi-detached houses with secondary units counted as two or four units? Is there any consideration of the number of bedrooms?



Response:

In terms of population projections, net growth is estimated by age group. Staff uses data from Statistics Canada to identify the percentage of individuals in each age group who are heads of households, referred to as household maintainers. This information, derived from the census, allows the number of household maintainers to be projected, which in turn drives the number of dwellings required.

Staff then consider the number of dwellings, referred to as households, and analyze the age distribution of household maintainers. Staff examine their propensity to live in different dwelling types, using over 30 years of census data. This analysis not only considers past trends but also anticipates changes in housing choices as younger age groups mature. This process helps us determine the number of dwelling types needed, including single-detached, semi-detached, row housing, and various types of apartments (rental, condominiums, high-rise, low-rise, units above storefronts, and basement suites).

Staff assesses land supply, noting that there is a significant amount of vacant designated land in suburban areas yet to be developed. Staff evaluate how much of this growth can be accommodated through intensification, which traditionally involves apartments and condominiums in built-up areas. These areas are where the market demand for intensification is highest, as opposed to new subdivisions.

The Council has recently adopted a new initiative known as the Balanced Growth Scenario. This approach focuses on accommodating growth through ground-oriented housing, such as new single-family homes, semi-detached houses, and row houses. Due to the limited availability of vacant sites within the built-up area, it has traditionally been challenging to meet the demand for such housing through urban intensification. Consequently, this type of development has often been directed towards suburban areas, contributing to urban sprawl.

Under the Councillor's scenario, however, a portion of this ground-oriented development—specifically, households with three bedrooms and approximately 1,500 square feet—will be integrated into the urban area. The objective is to distribute this development throughout the entire urban area, rather than concentrating it in a single location.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Despite our relatively small neighbourhood, I can easily count ten of these infill developments, with more anticipated. Many small-bedroom homes are being replaced by semi-detached houses with secondary dwelling units, leading to a significant influx of residents.</p> <p>I believe students, due to their mobility, are a challenging demographic to accurately capture in a census. While we can identify four units, how can the city effectively plan for amenities given this sudden demographic shift, particularly with the reduction in senior residents and an increase to approximately 30% student population? This is an important consideration for the planning process. Although we cannot prevent this change, nor do we necessarily wish to, it does have implications for waste management and infrastructure.</p> <p>With the introduction of a three-item garbage limit in September, how will these homes, each housing up to eight individuals, manage within these constraints?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The new Zoning By-law is one aspect of the growth, and it will not fully capture all elements. Staff are addressing these issues through other initiatives, such as the parks plan, which the Council recently adopted as part of the infrastructure master plan. This plan outlines how we will service these needs. The Official Plan (OP) is the initial step, and the service areas connected to this growth have their own plans and services, which take time to implement. Earlier tonight, we discussed modifying on-street parking provisions to better align with this growth. The Zoning By-law focuses on the form and land use, addressing many aspects of this growth. These efforts will progress simultaneously over the next two years, and staff are actively working on them, each with different focal points. For any plans involving amenities, such as the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan and the Transportation Master Plan, staff will continue to provide feedback and explore solutions.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>There is currently no site plan review for some of the buildings being constructed in our community. We have observed that the minimum space between buildings is insufficient for storing garbage at the rear of the property, and there is inadequate space to move garbage to the front. Consequently, residents are defaulting to storing their garbage on their front steps and in their front yards. This issue is exacerbated by the presence of multiple waste containers, including four green bins, four blue boxes, four black boxes, and garbage containers, some of which are not properly enclosed. This example illustrates the domino effect that zoning decisions can have on the community, impacting not only density but also parking, maintenance, and site functionality. The lack of parking, garages, and designated garbage storage areas leads residents to place their waste on their front steps as a matter of convenience.</p> <p>Furthermore, you mentioned that other areas, such as forestry and by-law services, are involved in enforcing the current system. However, this system is not functioning effectively, as there is no enforcement, resulting in trees being cut down, improper garbage storage, and cars being parked on front yards. By-law services lack the personnel and mechanisms to regulate and enforce existing rules. This serves as a cautionary note, as we often hear that these issues are by-law matters rather than zoning issues. However, zoning directly affects and influences our community, necessitating frequent calls to by-law services. It is crucial that you communicate with other departments involved in creating the Zoning By-law to ensure a coordinated approach.</p> <p>My question is, regarding the zoning provisions, built form, and site function in your primary and sub zones, does site function take into consideration the concerns I have raised, such as providing adequate space for garbage storage or mandating the inclusion of a shed for this purpose? Is this aspect included in the site function?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Staff intend for site functions to include regulations around waste management, applicable to any residential building regardless of the number of units. The required space for waste management is designed to scale upwards with the number of units. For example, once a building reaches six units, the waste management guidelines mandate container collection rather than placing bags on the street. Additionally, storage sheds are required and provisions for a functional path of travel. This ensures there is adequate space for residents to move waste from the backyard to the street, particularly in cases where container pick-up is necessary and minor clearance is required.</p>



Question:

Is there a definition of a lot? It appears that the preferred development will be side-by-side long semi-detached houses. These developments will permit 16 units on a lot, but the required lot size is unclear. It seems that these lots do not need to be severed to be considered a lot. Therefore, what constitutes a lot? Must these lots be divided into four to accommodate 16 units?

To accommodate trees, space must be allocated within the Zoning By-law. By eliminating front-yard averaging, the front yard setback must match the average of the adjacent lots. This removal assumes that all underlying zoning for front yard setbacks is accurate, which is not the case. In Old Ottawa East, we have a 3-metre front yard setback, although the actual setbacks are often 4.2 or 4.5 metres, and rarely 3 metres. Therefore, the opportunity to use front yard setback averaging is crucial and should be reinstated in the regulations.

There is a mention of front-yard averaging, but it only stipulates that the setback need not exceed 1.5 metres. However, 1.5 metres is insufficient for planting a tree unless the right of way is very wide. Will front yard averaging be included in Draft 2 to allow for tree planting? I suggest the wording should be “the average of the adjacent properties up to a maximum of 6 metres”.

There will be no opportunity for front yard trees unless the setback is 4.5 metres. Consequently, trees would need to be planted in backyards or on corner lots, which presents another issue due to courtyard regulations on corner lots that do not leave room for trees. For example, the corner of Chestnut and Lees has a small courtyard used for paid parking, which lacks trees. Similarly, the lot at 7 Chestnut has no trees.

It is essential to allocate space for trees within the Zoning By-law, and in my opinion, front-yard averaging is the most effective way to achieve this.



Response:

While it is uncertain whether this will be included in Draft 2, the point is acknowledged that front yard averaging is a crucial aspect of the Zoning By-law. Although it is premature to commit to this now, it can be confirmed that Draft 1 includes an averaging provision in Section 802. The 1.5-metre requirement mentioned stipulates that, regardless of the average, a neighbourhood with an existing setback of 1 metre must have a minimum setback of 1.5 metres.

The primary difference between the position presented and what is outlined in Draft 1 seems to be the maximum allowable setback. The argument is for a maximum setback not to exceed 6 metres under any circumstance, whereas the by-law proposes that the maximum should not exceed the underlying zone's requirement, which could be 3, 5, or other measurements.

Staff is open to considering adjustments where the proposed 3-metre minimum is not significantly different from the actual front yard setbacks. For instance, if the pattern on the street shows setbacks around 4.2 metres, the zoning might be adjusted so that the minimum setback would be 4.5 metres or the average.



Ward 18 Alta Vista

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wondering if the densities in Draft 1 will be reviewed ahead of Draft 2. ▪ Seeking clarity on the density targets for Alta Vista, specifically in Guildwood Estates, including how the targets were developed. ▪ Seeking clarity on densities permitted in N3 subzones. ▪ Concern that the permitted densities are too high, especially on large lots in established neighbourhoods. ▪ Concern that the density targets are excessive as they're equivalent with cities like London and New York City. ▪ Support for increasing density and concern that the city is creating barriers to constructing new housing.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wondering how form-based zoning will be enabled in the new by-law. ▪ Seeking clarity on the conversion of Residential zones to Neighbourhood zones.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the loss of greenspace and tree canopy.
Secondary Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how the new by-law will impact existing Secondary Plans.



Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	How does the density formula make sense for Alta Vista and specifically Guildwood Estates?
Response:	<p>The maximum densities proposed for the N1 through N3 zones are higher than the density targets set out in the Official Plan by transect. The density maximums in zoning are intended to be on a per-lot basis, which is necessary in zoning so that, in aggregate, neighbourhood and transect-level densities can meet the minimum targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan by 2046.</p> <p>On average only a small number of properties in a given neighbourhood are redeveloped each year. Further, when that redevelopment occurs, the density of that development will vary depending on decisions made by the property owner. One single detached dwelling could be replaced by another single detached dwelling, which would represent no increase in the density of that lot, or it could be replaced by various multi-unit forms which would represent a varying increase in density.</p> <p>In summary, the densities permitted in the N1-N3 zones are to account for the fact that the average area-wide increases to density will be lower than the maximum permitted. As such, it is necessary to permit densities that are higher on a per-lot basis than the transect-wide targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan.</p>

Question:	How can a 12-16 dwelling building(s) in N3 (150-250 density) fit on a 50ft x 100ft max? Certainly, it would require mid-rises and higher when these are located specifically behind a Minor Corridor which should take precedence over the Walkley Hub and Heron BRT both of which are not about to be financially committed or funded? How is this not contrary to OP neighborhood characteristics and does it meet the OP intent for compatible/context fit within the neighborhood especially that this ward/neighborhood is of the maturity referred to in the OP?
Response:	The N3 zone sets out a height limit of 11 metres (or roughly three storeys in height). It is not intended to permit mid-rise (five to nine storey) buildings.



Question:	The great majority of the city is currently zoned R1 and there is supposed to be a transposition of the new codes to the new N codes except that R1 now corresponds to N2. The official plan refers to 40-60 dwellings per hectares (with an “exceed “caveat or rather loophole actually).
Response:	To meet the density targets of the new Official Plan will typically require greater density than permitted in the N1 zone. N1 zones are typically found in areas where secondary plans set practical limits or where infrastructure does not support greater density, such as with housing connected to septic systems.

Question:	How is the new Zoning By-law interpreting/applying the addition to stated densities “may exceed”?
Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law for the City of Ottawa must implement densities that meet or exceed the minimum targets set out in the Official Plan.</p> <p>The maximum permitted densities in the N1 through N3 zones are defined by units per hectare (UPH). These maximum densities exceed the minimum requirements of the Official Plan to account for the fact that, on average, area-wide increases in density will be lower than the maximum permitted. For example, while some lots may be redeveloped with six-unit buildings, it is more common to see detached dwellings replaced by two, three, or four-unit buildings. In the N4 and above zones, density is primarily limited by property setbacks and other performance standards. However, city staff are currently examining whether additional requirements are necessary to manage density effectively in these zones.</p>



Question:

Is the city and Council really willing to listen and change the proposed new Zoning By-law? If so then could the following be entertained:

- 1) Slow down intensification and its timing at least in Ward 18 where the population projection increase from 2026 to 2034 is the lowest in the city below 4 %. Too much, too fast for a low-needs ward particularly when one of the OP objectives is to be a model of livability neighborhood and when needs can be reassessed at the 5year OP reviews mark.
- 2) Could, for the most part of Ward 18, or at least of Guildwood Estate be zoned N2 rather than N3 with a lower density and ensure that streets in their entirety are zoned the same (example: Amberdale, Wyndale, Briar Hill, Lorraine, Florida...) at the lower density particularly where BRT and Hubs are not expected to be funded for quite some time, if at all maybe, given the city's financial difficulties and Transit problems?
- 3) From outer to inner urban: is the new ZB seeking to unnecessarily change all the neighborhood configuration, character and community spirit? If so how does the City justify this and the perceived and unwanted probability of fostering mid and high-rise apartment type of dwellings particularly when the market shows needs/wants are for missing middle: mid-rise heights, ground level, individual dwellings (row housing, semi or innovative types)?
- 4) Could (or why not?) the changes be limited to just increasing simplification, clarity and facilitation increased density in the ward by limiting them to separate or distinct or shared units in existing houses and carriage and tiny home dwellings? This could enable housing for, amongst others, seniors, students and young people to live independently, affordably, better and longer in their communities in a preventive approach to homeless and affordability situations in 15 minutes neighborhoods. This would not prevent meeting other types of housing needs.



	<p>5) How is the equity value in the OP upheld when actual residents in established neighborhoods perceive that they are bearing the brunt inequitably of these changes seemingly made in favor investors and developers. The affordable and homeless housing needs are not being met currently with additional vacant dwellings (example the apartments on Heron RD) nor are we assured that the new ZB as presented will solve the problems. Can the ZB not address this situation or via policy so that there is more sharing on the part of developers and investors in meeting the social needs even though their profit margin may be reduced some? Even though they are part of the solution in partnership, the City exists firstly for its resident citizens not for largely profit makers.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Neighbourhoods designation is a low-rise designation (four storeys or fewer in height) in the Official Plan. The N1-N4 zones are all low-rise zones by definition, with each of these zones being more specific with respect to maximum building heights – for example, the N2 zone permits a two-storey height and the N3 zone permits a maximum three-storey height. For reference, “mid-rise” refers to buildings between five and nine storeys in height, and “high-rise” refers to buildings that are ten storeys in height or greater.</p> <p>Generally, the higher density Neighbourhood zones such as the N3 zones in Alta Vista are in areas near Hubs, Mainstreets, and rapid transit stations as designated in the OP; these higher density zones correspond to areas within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay as directed in Section 5.6 of the OP. These policies are intended to provide for more flexible zoning permissions that “may differ from the existing characteristics of the area to which the overlay applies” as per Section 5.6.1.</p> <p>The Zoning By-law cannot directly prohibit someone from demolishing a building and replacing it with a new building; even in the R1 zones in the current Zoning By-law a property owner could demolish their house and replace it with a larger house. The Zoning By-law can regulate new development in a way that addresses existing neighbourhood context; to that end, many of the standards proposed to apply in the new By-law (e.g. minimum yard setbacks, lot widths) are generally proposed to be similar to existing standards – the size of building that can be built on a lot would be comparable to the size of building that would be permitted in the current By-law, the primary difference being that there may be more flexibility with respect to the number of units that can be permitted within that building envelope.</p>



	<p>This is in accordance with OP policy to provide greater flexibility with respect to housing options, which sets out that the Zoning By-law should primarily regulate “the density, built form, height, massing and design of residential development, rather than regulating through restrictions on building typology” (Policy 4.2.1(1) of the Official Plan).</p> <p>The question also cites the options of dwelling units in existing homes as well as in separate buildings on the same lot (e.g. “coach houses”, as they are defined in the Zoning By-law). The option of providing a coach house or “tiny home” as an additional unit on the same lot as an existing house is an option that is already allowed in the present By-law (Section 133), and this is proposed to continue to be an option in the new Zoning By-law.</p>
--	--

Question:	<p>Given that there was a defective algorithm in the zoning map for N5 lots, is it possible that the maximum densities for N1 to N3 were also calculated using a defective algorithm? Will you revise the maximum densities to take into account all corrections made to the zoning codes after May 31st, 2024?</p>
Response:	<p>City staff are currently reviewing the zoning map errors and expect to find and correct any discrepancies. So far, two revisions of the map have been made, and you can find the change log here. Further changes will be made in drafts 2 and 3.</p> <p>Regarding your concern about the N5 lots, the error was not due to a defective algorithm for density calculation but rather a mapping error. As for the maximum densities for N1 to N3 zones, these were not affected by the same issue.</p>



Question:	To what extent will form based zoning be enabled through the new zoning bylaw? And what opportunities might we have to give input on how this should be implemented in specific neighborhoods on a case-by-case basis?
Response:	<p>The intent of the new Zoning By-law is to switch to form-based zoning as opposed to typology-based, as is the norm in the current by-law. This approach has been taken to reflect that the impact of new development on its neighbours has more to do with the bulk of a building and site function characteristics, such as landscaping and parking, than the typology.</p> <p>This switch to form-based zoning is particularly evident in the new Neighbourhood zones where work has been done to simplify these zones by reducing the amount of subzones and removing the distinction between similar housing typologies which can introduce competing performance standards.</p> <p>Any feedback on this topic can be shared with the Zoning Team at newzoning@ottawa.ca.</p>

Question:	<p>My question is about the benchmarking of the proposed densities, because the numbers are really hard to imagine. When you look to the proposed densities of London, England or Brooklyn or New York City, it seems like we're overreaching Brooklyn and we're overreaching London and these places actually still have the ability to have single family zoning. I know we've gone beyond that, but they can manage single family zoning, they can manage duplexes, they can manage triplexes, and we look like we're starting at a minimum of eight units per lot. So I'm just, I don't know if you've had the opportunity to do that benchmarking, but I think that's a really important piece of the exercise. So I'm hoping that you'll be able to get to that before you get to the second draft.</p>
Response:	Thank you for these comments. Staff continue to review the permitted densities in Neighbourhood zones.



Question:	A major concern is the loss of green space, including lawns, gardens and tree canopies. This loss will result in tons of greenhouse gases not being cleared by existing mature trees. With the densities suggested, it's hard to imagine room for any trees.
Response:	Zoning cannot directly mandate tree planting. However, it can require that adequate space is set aside for trees in front or rear yards, or for the retention of existing mature trees. This is why soft landscaping requirements are emphasized in both front and rear yards within Neighbourhood zones, ensuring space for tree growth.

Question:	The housing crisis is making it difficult for young people to find housing, causing people to move out to places like Carleton Place and Arnprior. The draft by-law includes rules about the angular plane and neighbourhood character, which seem like barriers to development. Why has the city been so restrictive in blocking new housing and why aren't we considering doing more?
Response:	<p>The Official Plan does provide guidance to maintain the character of neighbourhoods, especially in the interiors of neighbourhoods. In this sense, character refers to the general size of the building on a lot, but not the density or the number of units inside a building. Through the new Neighbourhood zones, permitted densities are being increased while maintaining the general building size permitted in the current zoning. In the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay near Hubs and Corridors, even higher densities are permitted in larger buildings in order to support transit and create 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Staff are still exploring appropriate height transition strategies and policies between higher buildings and adjacent Neighbourhoods.</p>



Question:	With the new zoning bylaw and the new zoning parameters that have been put out there, what impact will that have on secondary plans that are currently in place?
Response:	Across the city, there are discrepancies between secondary plan policies, which give direction for specific areas in the city, and the current zoning for those areas. The intention of the Zoning By-law review for these areas is to bring these policies and the zoning into conformity and remove the guesswork in those areas. This should bring more certainty for the future development in these areas and help implement the secondary plan vision that may not have had the accompanying zoning to make a reality.



As We Heard It Report – Wards 1, 5, 19, 20 and 21

Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Wards 1, 5, 19, 20, and 21 was held on September 5, 2024, from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. It is noted that only that areas in the Rural Transect for Wards 1 and 19 were covered in this session. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a zoning by-law
- An overview of the Rural zones and related provisions
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 1 Orléans East-Cumberland (rural) – Councillor Matthew Luloff	2
	Ward 19 Orléans South-Navan (rural) – Councillor Catherine Kitts	2
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses.....	3
2	Ward 5 West Carleton-March – Councillor Clarke Kelly	4
	Summary of Comments Received	4
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	5
3	Ward 20 Osgoode – Councillor George Darouze	16
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	17
3	Ward 21 Rideau-Jock – Councillor David Brown	20
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	21



Ward 1 Orléans East-Cumberland (Rural) & Ward 19 Orléans South-Navan (Rural)

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Questioning the prospect of increased density in rural villages and the impact on their unique nature.
Rural Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Seeking clarity on changes rural residents can expect through the implementation of the new Zoning By-law.



Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	Given that both Ward 1 and Ward 19 have villages that are relatively close to the urban boundary, Navan and Cumberland Village, what are the chances that in the future amenities like City water and sewer make their way out there given that it's remaining part of the rural transect and not being changed or moved into the urban boundary? Will we see an influx of dense housing in the rural villages in the east end?
Response:	<p>Rural villages were not identified in Schedule C17 - Urban Expansion Areas of the Official Plan, and the new zoning By-law reflects this designation. Adding lands to the urban boundary is beyond the scope of the zoning By-law.</p> <p>It is more difficult to develop multi-unit residential buildings in areas that are unserved by City water and wastewater infrastructure, so it's rare to see this type of development in these areas. Additionally, the lot sizes required by Conservation Authorities for development on a lot with septic have increased over time, adding to difficulties with denser development. Even in serviced villages, the height and density permissions are no changing drastically from what is currently permitted.</p>

Question:	Given that there are not a ton of changes for the rural area, especially the ones we're contemplating, what would you want rural residents to take away from the new Zoning By-law?
Response:	<p>Generally, the same level and type of development are anticipated in the rural areas through the implementation of the new Zoning By-law.</p> <p>In the rural sections of the by-law, Draft 2 will include some organizational or administrative changes to make the by-law easier to read, including making a more clear distinction between serviced and unserved areas, and merging On-Farm Diversified and Agriculture-Related Uses policies into a single section.</p>



Ward 5 West Carleton-March

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Rural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion to consider the size of the lot when determining the maximum number of units permitted on a lot, especially in rural areas.
On-Farm Diversification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion to make the on-farm diversification program be made less restrictive and expanding the program, allowing people to remain on their farms or use their rural properties for other purposes. Since 2021, only one application - a vinyard - has been successful. This suggests that the program is extraordinarily restrictive, preventing multiple residents from utilizing the program.
Home-Based Businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion to include more commercial activities on residential lots outside of the house for home-based businesses. ▪ Concern that the requirement for home-based businesses to operate within the dwelling is impractical.
Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns that green energy initiatives are being encouraged in rural Ottawa due to the available space and lower population density. This approach seems to disproportionately target rural areas rather than the entire city.
Renewable Generation Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion to permit the location of renewable energy facilities in hydro-corridors, including solar panels.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>Concerning Environmental Protection (EP) zone. In May, the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) conducted a review of the floodplain extending to the Carp River. I am submitting this request in collaboration with my regional board member. Many members of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA) expressed significant concern that the new floodplain boundary mapping proposed by the MVCA would result in the loss of control over hundreds of acres of their land. These lands have been farmed by local agricultural groups for approximately 150 years. We believe that the increased water flow in the river is due to development in Kanata, particularly the large retaining ponds that release water.</p> <p>I agree that the wetlands are important, but we are specifically discussing the floodplain boundaries proposed by the MVCA. This project has not been halted. Additionally, the MVCA was not part of the South Nation Conservation group, which raises further questions.</p> <p>In summary, does the EP zoning align with the new map produced by the MVCA, or does it remain unchanged?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Referring to the wetlands mapping undertaken by the conservation authorities in Eastern Ontario, specifically the Mississippi, Rideau, and South Nation Conservation Authorities, the provincial government has currently paused these projects, which aimed to map non-provincially significant wetlands and incorporate permit requirements as mandated by the conservation authorities. Consequently, this project is on hold, and the new Zoning By-law does not specifically reflect any such mapping. For several years, the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority has regulated unevaluated wetlands, applying the same standards or tests as those for provincially significant wetlands.</p> <p>Typically, when new floodplain mapping is established by a conservation authority, the City's Zoning By-law and floodplain overlay are updated accordingly. Therefore, once the mapping is approved by the province, the City will implement it through an overlay in the Zoning By-law. You will need to consult with the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) to understand the process and steps required to transition from their current position to the final implementation as part of the new zoning regulations.</p>



Question:	Is the update to the City’s Environmental Protection (EP) zoning automatic when there is a change in floodplain mapping by a conservation authority or due to a provincial policy statement? Do we update the zoning to reflect those changes, or does the City have some discretion in deciding whether to implement the updates?
Response:	Staff are obligated, under various provincial legislation, to update our Official Plan and Zoning By-law to reflect the updated floodplain mapping. However, this update does not create an Environmental Protection (EP) zone – it establishes an overlay on the underlying zone. In the case of agricultural lands, agricultural uses are still permitted. The primary issue arises when seeking permissions from the conservation authority for activities such as constructing a new building or shed, digging a farm pond, or making other significant alterations. In areas with a floodplain overlay, such permissions are required from the conservation authority and are likely to be denied, depending on the specific circumstances.

Question:	<p>The affordable housing crisis facing our city is not solely an urban issue. It also affects rural residents as well and disproportionately impacts seniors and young people in the workforce. It is essential to find ways to improve rural housing availability and affordability, particularly for our youth. Ensuring that our rural seniors can continue to live in the communities where they have spent their entire lives, while being supported by their families, is widely recognized as beneficial for their mental, emotional, and financial well-being.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning By-law focus exclusively on increasing housing availability in urban areas, primarily around public transit. I would like to understand whether there are any proposed changes to support rural housing availability and affordability on rural-zoned properties that are not serviced by municipal water and sewage systems. For instance, could there be allowances for slightly higher density beyond the current limit of three dwelling units, while recognizing that additional restrictions may be necessary to address environmental concerns and setbacks?</p>
Question:	Could these technical constraints be addressed by incorporating specific provisions in the Zoning By-law? For instance, to support multiple septic systems, I have a 65-acre property in West Carleton with ample space to accommodate two coach houses for my in-laws and my parents.



Response:

Recent changes to the Provincial Policy Statement, another provincial planning statement that guides our Official Plan and Zoning By-law, are already considering increasing the number of permitted units in some rural areas. Currently, two units are permitted, with discussions about allowing a third.

This consideration must be balanced against lot sizes, septic system requirements, and the preservation of agricultural land. Staff are working with a standard of 20 hectares as set in our new Official Plan for the basic fabric of lots.

While staff are attentive to these needs, housing requirements must be balanced against technical constraints, other priorities, and the stipulations of our Official Plan.

Regarding the creation of lots, the Official Plan establishes a base unit of 0.8 hectares and limits the number of severances allowed. For multiple units on a single parcel, there are constraints on what zoning and building permits can achieve. There is a significant gap between what our Official Plan and Zoning By-law can permit and the provisions for private servicing, compared to what the province and building code allow.

This gap means there is no oversight to ensure that more than the two units currently permitted do not compromise drinking water safety or contaminate neighbouring ponds and watercourses due to overloaded septic systems. Consequently, the Zoning By-law is not an ideal tool for implementing such restrictions.



Question:	Is there an omnibus list of zoning changes for Ward Five, specifically a list of areas that require changes as a batch?
Response:	<p>Currently, there is no specific list of properties undergoing changes in a particular manner. However, if you are curious about a specific area, we can certainly look it up. Due to the comprehensive restructuring of the bylaw, generating a complete list is challenging.</p> <p>The City frequently undertakes significant zoning amendments, often through omnibus packages, to address issues or minor inconsistencies in the bylaw. However, given the widespread application of the new Zoning By-law, it can be quite complex to compile such a list.</p>

Question:	Could you please elaborate on the impact of Ontario Regulation 41/24, Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act of Ontario, on the City's Zoning By-law changes?
Response:	Updated flood plain mapping received from the Conservations Authorities has been included in the Draft 1 Interactive Map available on the New Zoning By-law Engage Ottawa webpage. The map includes the current boundaries of the flood plain overlay under Zoning By-law 2008-250 and the proposed updates to the flood plain overlay from the Conservation Authorities so that the boundaries of the two Overlays can be compared.



Question:

As a resident of Ward 5, I am very satisfied with my living situation. My first question is whether the size of a lot can be considered when determining the maximum number of dwellings permitted on it. My property is 120 acres with a pond. If only one house is allowed, I would have my children and numerous priorities left unaddressed in my backyard. Therefore, I suggest that the size of the lot be considered.

Regarding septic systems, if the lot size is considered, I am confident that technicians could conduct a study and provide a report indicating how many individual dwellings the property could support.

My second question concerns the permitted uses for rural residential zoning (RR2), which applies to my property. Currently, it is designated for residential use, limiting my options to building a house and residing there. However, given the substantial size of my property and the presence of a pond, which I have allowed West Carleton High School to use for student activities, and its proximity to the Bill Mason Outdoor Education Centre, I hope the new Zoning By-law will offer more flexibility for rural lots like mine.

I have consulted with the City about the possibility of setting up a few campsites for summer school activities and was informed that this would require a major zoning change, which can be both costly and time-consuming. Additionally, I was informed that to proceed with a home-based business, the business must operate within the dwelling. This differs from my vision of outdoor education activities and summer camps for students.



Response:

When it comes to rural lots and the creation or severance of new lots, our primary concern is ensuring the safety of drinking water and balancing the costs of rural development with potential impacts. Our Official Plan directs us to encourage growth in villages and serviced areas to mitigate these impacts.

For large rural lots, typically, permission is granted for two severances, as informed by our Official Plan and provincial directives. A lot is approximately 120 acres is interesting as it might fall within the rural residential zone; generally rural residential zones are designated for smaller estate lot subdivisions. The RR2 zoning does come with certain restrictions. In areas where the principal use is agriculture, on-farm diversified uses are permitted, but these are tied to agricultural functions.

For other uses, such as establishing a campground, a zoning amendment process is required to ensure proper servicing and minimal impact on neighbours and natural areas. While we consider such applications, we must balance them against safe servicing and environmental protection. The Zoning By-law has limitations on the extent of permissions we can grant.

Regarding home-based businesses, the provisions generally allow for such businesses within dwelling units across the city. The current home-based business rules are restrictive concerning outdoor activities, and this is an area we can certainly review. Expanding these possibilities to include more commercial activities on residential lots could be considered.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>The Official Plan anticipates a population growth of 400,000 people. What is the plan for accommodating this growth in West Carleton?</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>I have noticed that the Carp Road Corridor is not included in the list for a secondary plan. This is concerning because the community design plan offers no protection. The planning department acknowledged that a rezoning application for a concrete plant violated the community design plan, as the corridor lacks the protection of a secondary plan.</p> <p>Why is there no secondary plan for the Carp Road Corridor? This area is significant, encompassing approximately 700 acres designated for industrial and commercial development, making it the largest acreage in the entire region.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The growth management strategy, as outlined in the Official Plan, includes the allocation of 13,000 units to rural areas. This is part of the broader strategy to manage growth, with a total of 130,000 units designated for rural regions. The Official Plan serves as the primary document, with secondary plans, such as those for Carp Village, providing additional guidance.</p> <p>Regarding the Carp Road Corridor, some sections are governed by area-specific policies, which function similarly to secondary plans but are focused on smaller areas. These policies carry the same weight as the Official Plan. In contrast, Community Design Plans (CDPs) are guideline documents that inform planners but do not have the same legislative authority as area-specific policies or secondary plans.</p> <p>Area-specific policies are not reflected in the Planning Act of Ontario and are often more of a design exercise. If it becomes a priority for planning policy staff to develop a secondary plan for a particular area, council can direct staff to undertake this work.</p> <p>The Carp Road Corridor is a significant industrial and logistics area in the new Official Plan, protected for employment purposes. However, the CDP for this area does not have the same authority as a secondary plan.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>As a rural resident, I find it quite concerning to read the Official Plan and discover that green energy initiatives are being encouraged in rural Ottawa due to the available space and lower population density. This approach seems to disproportionately target rural areas rather than the entire city, which is troubling and should be a cause for concern among more rural residents.</p> <p>My question pertains to how we can implement these green initiatives in an environmentally friendly manner. Specifically, I believe it is crucial not only to protect wildlife, such as Blanding's turtles, and natural features like rivers and streams, but also to safeguard the well-being of residents. To achieve this, I urge the City to reconsider the current setbacks, which are based on provincial standards. We have the opportunity to establish more stringent setbacks that better protect our communities.</p> <p>The recent announcement prohibiting solar farms on farmland is a positive step forward. However, in rural Carleton, we remain concerned about the potential influx of wind turbines, which seems illogical. I hope the City will take these considerations into account and strive for a balanced approach that protects both the environment and the people living in rural areas.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Currently, our approach to renewable energy treats many installations as utility installations, with some being broadly permitted. A new report is expected to be presented to the council this fall, specifically addressing battery energy storage. Although this topic differs from energy generation, the report aims to supplement and solidify our current approach by introducing new regulations.</p> <p>This report will provide an excellent opportunity to establish standards for these activities, which the Official Plan appears to direct towards rural areas.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>The presentation referenced significant changes to the zoning in the Carp Road Corridor. Earlier in the consultation process, it was mentioned that there might be consultations specific to the new industrial and logistics zoning. Is this still planned for the future?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Four new subzones (RC6 – Rural Commercial subzone 6 to RC9 – Rural Commercial subzone 9) implement the Area-Specific Policies for the Carp Corridor in the Official Plan and the Carp Road Corridor Community Design Plan. Commercial uses currently permitted in the Carp Road Corridor have been retained and several new uses have been added.</p> <p>The current RG4 – Rural General Industrial subzone 4 and RG5 – Rural General Industrial subzone 5 that apply in the Carp Road Corridor have been proposed to be replaced with new RIL – Rural Industrial and Logistics subzones in the new Zoning By-law to reflect the Rural Industrial and Logistics designation that applies to the Carp Corridor in the Official Plan.</p> <p>Currently, if you look at the map along the corridor, you may notice an error with the zoning codes. The map shows rural industrial and logistics zones throughout the corridor, whereas there should be a mix of general industrial and heavy industrial zones in certain areas. Staff are working on updating this information to provide an accurate snapshot. If you see numerous industrial logistics zones along the corridor on our online zoning map, please note that this is subject to change in the near future as we correct these errors.</p> <p>The Carp Road Corridor is a key area, and the proposed provisions are subject to change. Public consultation will continue until the By-law's approval in late 2025 so there are ample opportunities to comment on the new Zoning By-law through future public consultation opportunities, directly on the Engage Page or to our project inbox (newzoning@ottawa.ca).</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>In Ward Five, how many building development projects are currently in the pre-consultation phase of the planning process and could potentially be affected by the proposed draft Zoning By-law changes?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Given the lengthy process involved in drafting zoning regulations and the time required for development, we are incorporating grandfathering clauses to ensure that current rules continue to apply, preventing any abrupt changes that could disrupt ongoing projects.</p> <p>The exact number of projects in the pre-consultation phase is currently unknown. However, staff are reviewing these projects to ensure compliance with the Official Plan. Since the Zoning By-law is designed to reflect the Official Plan, it is anticipated that there will be no significant obstacles for applications already in progress or mid-process. Ideally, these applications will be completed before the new Zoning By-law is implemented.</p> <p>To date, no issues have been identified that would raise concerns about the impact of the new Zoning By-law on current applications. While it cannot be definitively stated that this is evident for all applications, each case will be evaluated individually. For applications that are mid-process, a review will be conducted as the new Zoning By-law is prepared for implementation.</p> <p>Section 109 of the new Zoning By-law provides a transition for applications for building permits or applications under the <i>Planning Act</i>, such as minor variances and zoning amendments, that have been deemed complete. This provision should allow, in some cases, for approval to be considered under the older rules, ensuring that applicants are not caught off guard.</p>



Question:	Is there any interest in expanding the types of uses permitted for on-farm diversified activities? It could be argued that a wedding venue might also serve as an agri-tourism function. However, I do not believe agri-tourism is currently recognized as an acceptable on-farm diversified use. Could we explore the possibility of expanding these permitted uses?
Response:	This is certainly an issue that can be examined further. Currently, the provisions in the draft bylaw are essentially a continuation of existing regulations with some readability improvements. Similar questions and comments were noted in the record of the recent rural summit, indicating that this is a recurring concern. Therefore, it is something that can definitely be reviewed and considered more closely.

Question:	<p>I have two questions. First, regarding the report on battery energy storage systems that was mentioned, is there a way to be added to a notification list for when this report is released or presented? I assume it will be presented to ARAC. How can we receive advance notice of this report?</p> <p>Second, this first draft of the Zoning By-law mentions battery energy storage systems, but I did not see any references to solar panels or wind turbines. With the upcoming release of ISO's LD2, which I understand will include opportunities for businesses to bid on projects involving solar panels and wind turbines, is there a timeline available for the development of the Zoning By-law related to these renewable energy sources?</p>
Response:	<p>Regarding renewable energy, it should be clarified that the upcoming report is primarily focused on battery energy storage systems. There has been discussion about potential updates at a later date to align with provincial changes, but the situation is still evolving. Unfortunately, a definitive answer cannot be provided at this time.</p> <p>To stay informed about this report, which is tentatively scheduled for the fall, it will be included on the agendas for both ARAC and the Planning Committee. It is also advisable to reach out to Councillor Kelly, who will be circulated on this matter and is well-informed. Additionally, signing up for email updates on the City's website will provide notifications about committee agendas and keep individuals updated on this topic. Interested parties can also sign up to provide comments when these reports are made public.</p>



Ward 20 Osgoode

Theme	As We Heard It
Severances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the requirements for severing properties zoned Agricultural and confirming that no changes are proposed.
Industrial Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on any potential expansion of industrial uses into residential areas.
Mineral Aggregate Overlay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the function and location of the Mineral Aggregate Overlay.



Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	Regarding the aggregate zone, which you have mentioned on several occasions, I am curious to know whether it will facilitate the establishment of an aggregate company in that area. Additionally, does it alter the ease or difficulty of setting up a new aggregate company?
Question:	My understanding is that there are no changes happening in the facility or the area between 9th Line and north of Victoria. Could you confirm this?
Response:	<p>By comparing the old and new mappings, Staff can confirm that there are no changes happening in the facility or the area between 9th Line and north of Victoria. Referring to the interactive zoning map, the stripes shown on the Draft 1 zoning map serve the same function as the gray coloring in the old Zoning By-law 200-250 map. The RU zone remains underneath but is overridden by the stripes, similar to the previous gray mapping. Additionally, there is a 150 to 200-metre buffer around the edge, which is written into the by-laws but was not previously shown on the maps.</p> <p>For a more detailed explanation of the implications, follow-up via email is recommended.</p>

Question:	Is it currently not possible to sever a lot on a AG2 property or is the only way to do so by changing our property to RU and/or wait for the next OP.
Response:	<p>A significant threshold exists for approving severances in this region. The utility of agricultural land largely depends on maintaining large parcels for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>For specific inquiries about subdividing or rezoning land, it would be best to consult a development information officer or the development review team, as they are responsible for providing guidance on permissible changes to your land. The primary role involves overseeing systemic changes, and substantial alterations to the current operations of AG2 are not expected.</p>



Question:	There is a policy in the Official Plan that outlines the conditions required for severing rural properties. To my knowledge, only one lot may be created under these conditions. I do not believe there will be any changes to this policy, correct?
Response:	For agricultural and farmlands, a farm consolidation would be required. Subsequently, the second dwelling, often referred to as surplus, would be addressed. This process is essentially a byproduct of the initial farm consolidation.

Comment:	One of the recurring questions we have received, which is addressed in the presentation, concerns whether the review of the Zoning By-law will result in different zoning for their properties. It is important for people to understand that this is not the case. The current zoning of their properties will generally be maintained. When people hear about a new Zoning By-law, they often worry about potential changes to their property. We want to reassure everyone that there will not be any major changes to existing property zoning.
Response:	Staff can confirm that there will not be any major changes to existing properties in the rural areas. There is a possibility that in the second draft, there may be a shift or merging of a few subzones as part of an administrative cleanup. However, this will only be done after ensuring that the zones will continue to function as intended. It is primarily an administrative adjustment rather than a substantive change.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>I was wondering if there will be any changes regarding the placement of infrastructure such as hydro substations, battery storage facilities, and similar installations.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Do you know if there are going to be expansions for industrial into more of the rural residential area?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Regarding utilities such as Hydro, these are not controlled by the Zoning By-law. If Hydro requires additional substations, they will install them regardless of any updates to the Zoning By-law. Generally, if additional lines or upgrades are needed to service new developments, they will be implemented independently of the by-law.</p> <p>There will be reports presented to the Agricultural Fairs Committee on regulations for battery energy storage and renewable energy systems. These reports will coincide with the provincial calls for additional megawatt projects. This is a two-step process: proponents must obtain municipal resolutions for these projects, and we will also update the Zoning By-law and the Official Plan to regulate these facilities.</p> <p>Stay tuned for these updates, as they will be forthcoming this fall. Much of the zoning is determined by the Official Plan, and while there is a substantial supply of rural industrial land, there are no current plans for expansion. However, landowners can always apply to change the zoning if they see a business opportunity. Each application will be reviewed on its own merits. At present, there are no known additional rural industrial expansions beyond what is shown on the zoning maps.</p>



Ward 21 Rideau-Jock

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need to protect the heritage and character of rural villages. ▪ Seeking clarity on the type of residential developments permitted in the Village Mixed-use zone.
Agricultural Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirming the continued protection of agricultural land through the new Zoning By-law. ▪ Seeking clarity on the process for obtaining a Rural Exception, especially for agricultural lands.
Transportation and Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how the master plans regulating growth and transportation interact with each other. ▪ Wondering if traffic management is taken into account for zoning designations.




Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>I own a vacant parcel of land in Ward 21, near Exit 49, where I am planning to undertake a construction project. According to the current zoning plans, this area is zoned as 3. I understand there have been discussions regarding potential zoning changes at Exit 49, which may include hosting a large-scale operation. If such changes are implemented, they could significantly impact the surrounding development, economic attractiveness, and industrial operations.</p> <p>I am particularly interested in how these potential changes have been considered in your current planning. My specific focus is on Exit 49, particularly the 416 – North Gower exit, where a warehouse application was approved a few years ago. Additionally, I own a property in an AG3 zone along Steven’s Creek, on the east side of the highway. I am inquiring whether this area could be considered for residential zoning.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>At the time the application for that development was submitted, a public consultation process would have been conducted to consider its impacts. This development will generate traffic through that exit; however, your property is on the opposite side of the highway, approximately one kilometre away, which hopefully minimizes any impact on you.</p> <p>The Official Plan (OP) has designated agricultural zones as the most fertile lands, reserving them for agricultural use. As previously mentioned, provincial policy mandates municipalities to identify and preserve these fertile lands for agricultural purposes to ensure continued food production. These policies are strongly upheld in the provincial policy statement, and the OP must conform to them. Consequently, the OP imposes strict limitations on permissible activities within AG zones. The restrictions are intentional, reflecting the high fertility of these lands and their intended reservation for agricultural uses.</p>



Question:	Are there any significant changes we should be aware of?
Response:	<p>Staff will conduct periodic reviews to carry forward the provisions that are currently in effect in rural areas. The village plans remain unchanged, and the existing zones in Zoning By-law 2008-250 will be incorporated into the new Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Most of the changes in the rural areas are for administrative and organizational purposes for provisions to be clearer and more concise. Some codes, such as those for greenspace, may be updated to replace an open space zone to align with the designations in the Official Plan (OP). Staff have created new names that correspond with the designations in the OP, ensuring that the existing zoning provisions are accurately reflected.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Could you please clarify the situation regarding the village designation by the Royal Bank? There are three properties zoned VM9 located to below the V1P zones where the smaller bungalows are being replaced with new small apartments. They initially rezoned the area but had to rezone again due to an oversight that included commercial zoning. Will this area now remain mixed-use? Additionally, I noticed that three houses in that area have been sold. Is there a possibility of another apartment being constructed there? If a building in the VM9 zone were to be demolished, could a smaller apartment building be constructed in its place? I'm concerned about the traffic in this case and was wondering if the remaining land can be zoned as strictly residential.</p>  <p>The map displays several zoning areas. A light blue area at the top is labeled 'V1P'. Below it, a larger orange area is also labeled 'V1P'. In the center, a red area is labeled 'VM9[937r]'. To the right of this, another red area is labeled 'VM9'. A blue area is visible on the far right side of the map.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>V1 is a Village Residential First Density zone, typically not permitting commercial use.</p> <p>These properties are designated at Village Core on Schedule A in the Manotick Secondary Plan and are part of the Main Street Character Area on Schedule B of the Secondary Plan. The Village Mixed-Use Zoning reflects this designation. The Main Street Character Area generally does not permit residential-only uses, but there is an Area-specific policy in the Manotick Secondary Plan that allows residential-only uses and front yard parking at 5497, 5495 and 5491 Manotick Main Street.</p>



Question:	I have a property on Second Line Road, and I am on AG lands. There is an exception there for commercial use – can you explain how the exception process works particularly for AG lands?
Response:	<p>The Official Plan (OP) establishes policies and criteria for activities in AG areas. Exceptions are permitted under certain circumstances through a Zoning By-law amendment. To obtain an exception, you must apply for this amendment, which will be evaluated based on the OP’s criteria. If the amendment is supported, it will be recommended for approval and presented to the Council, followed by a public consultation process. In the Agricultural Resource Area designation in the OP, any new use should be related to agriculture and must meet specific criteria.</p> <p>For further details, you may contact a development information officer (dioinquiry@ottawa.ca) or send your inquiries to the general inbox (newzoning@ottawa.ca).</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Can you explain how the NZBL took into account transportation, traffic, and parking? How do the master plans speak to each other?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The new Zoning By-law serves to implement the designations and policies outlined in the Official Plan (OP), functioning as an essential tool for this purpose. Regarding parking, although the new Zoning By-law does not apply to roads, zoning regulations can influence the number of parking spaces available for developments. These provisions can be found in Part 6 of the new Zoning By-law. Supporting documents, such as the Transportation Master Plan, assess transportation demand across the city and establish priorities and plans to meet the transportation needs associated with growth. The Transportation Master Plan is currently being updated in response to the OP, incorporating growth projections and commuting patterns. As the population and number of dwellings increase, the plan anticipates transportation demand and identifies necessary road upgrades. An origin-destination survey is conducted to understand movement patterns within the city, informing the Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>Parking has emerged as a significant issue in villages, where limited transportation options compel residents to rely on personal vehicles. Recent subdivisions have highlighted problematic areas in accommodating the number of cars in villages. Discussions with the Development Review team have identified various factors contributing to parking challenges in new village developments, some of which are addressed by the new Zoning By-law. Issues include the required number of parking spaces, lot width, garage setbacks from the street, and garage size, which can be managed through zoning. Other complicating factors include subdivision design, right-of-way configurations, mixed-use areas (on-street parking for visitors), and lot compactness.</p> <p>Efforts are underway to address these zoning provision issues, with ongoing consultations with Development Review colleagues to tackle the challenges faced during subdivision approvals. These challenges are sometimes subject to appeals or Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) decisions. The upcoming report in March will provide an opportunity to highlight these challenges, encompassing both zoning and other related issues. Compact development areas with limited transportation options necessitate reliance on personal vehicles, further complicating the situation.</p>



Question:	How is the character and heritage of our village going to be preserved?
Response:	<p>If a village contains designated heritage resources, these are independent from the Zoning By-law. There is extensive design control for these protected heritage resources, and any proposed changes must undergo a heritage permitting process. Minor changes can be delegated to staff, but significant alterations to heritage buildings require Council approval.</p> <p>These protections remain in effect, maintaining the status quo without any changes for villages. The Ontario Heritage Act now offers stronger protection for designated resources than in the past, providing detailed design review and control.</p> <p>While the Zoning By-law can reinforce setbacks for the zone, any deviations would necessitate a Zoning By-law amendment. Heritage staff and Development Review staff collaborate on approvals for proposed changes to heritage resources.</p>

Question:	Could you please confirm that prime agricultural land will be protected, and that this protection will remain unchanged under the new Zoning By-law?
Response:	<p>The protections for agricultural land will remain unchanged, as it is required to implement the directives outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan. As specified in Section 9.1 of the Official Plan, these protections ensure that prime agricultural land is preserved for its intended use, preventing any unauthorized development or changes that could compromise its agricultural value. This commitment to safeguarding agricultural land is crucial for maintaining the integrity and sustainability of our rural areas.</p>



Question:	Does zoning redesignation take into account traffic flow?
Response:	<p>The Official Plan (OP) establishes policy directions that the Zoning By-law must implement. While zoning itself does not directly address traffic implications, it enforces these policy directions. The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) addresses the traffic implications of growth and development, ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is in place to accommodate anticipated city growth.</p> <p>This illustrates the interconnected roles of the OP, TMP, and the new Zoning By-law. In the context of a development application, a development review planner would consider traffic implications if a property's zoning were to change and introduce a new use. However, for the new Zoning By-law, zoning in villages remains unchanged as the secondary plans have not been altered.</p>



As We Heard It Report – Wards 3 and 24

Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Wards 3 and 24 was held on September 10, 2024, from 6:30 to 8:00 PM. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a zoning by-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 3 Barrhaven West – Councillor David Hill	2
	Summary of Comments Received	2
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses.....	2
2	Ward 24 Barrhaven East – Councillor Wilson Lo	5
	Summary of Comments Received	5
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	5



Ward 3 Barrhaven West

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with loss of residential on-site parking due to the removal of parking minimums and increased demand for street parking.
Minor Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification on the criteria for assigning Minor Corridors, specifically in suburban contexts.
Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification on the New Zoning By-law consultation plan and upcoming reporting mechanisms.

Questions and Staff Responses

Question:	<p>I understand that we need density and new homes are being developed in Barrhaven for this reason. However, many of these new developments only have space for one vehicle to park and this doesn't make sense because a lot of these homes have parents, teenagers, and in some cases, there's even a third generation living in those homes. The reality is there are 2-3 cars in some of these homes, yet the driveway is only made for one car. It's not only the issue of trying to drive through there, but in the winter time, snow plows can't get through safely. What are fire engines going to do? What's an ambulance going to do? I don't understand how you can continue to go ahead and plan for only one vehicle per home.</p>
------------------	--



Response:	<p>The Zoning By-law provides permissions and opportunities for development. Additionally, recent provincial legislation through Bill 23 now permits three units as-of-right on any residential lots serviced by municipal water and sanitary services. However, it does not guarantee a landowner will develop a property in this specific way.</p> <p>Regarding new development across the city, builders are doing their own internal calculations and deciding how much land on a site should be used for housing and how much should be dedicated to parking. The new Zoning By-law does not require only one vehicle parking space per home. The amount of parking on a site is largely based on the physical conditions on the property and the builder's market analysis.</p>
------------------	---

Question:	<p>I am wondering what criteria were used to designate Greenbank as a Minor Corridor and why some other streets such as Strandherd and Woodroffe weren't included on that?</p>
Response:	<p>Minor Corridors were assigned and defined through the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law will work to implement this designation to assist with the creation or evolution of 15-minute neighbourhoods. These designations may have been based on the concentration of existing commercial uses on a street or as an aspirational land use on streets that could support that in the future. These decisions were made based on various considerations including the transit level of service and existing lot fabric.</p> <p>One of the criteria for creating a well-functioning Minor Corridor is having lots fronting on the designated street with the front lot line of the property touching the right of way. Especially in the Suburban Transect, this can be difficult due to the pattern of suburban development for the past several decades. Many subdivisions have houses backing onto an arterial road, which is potentially a Minor Corridor candidate, but the orientation of the adjacent lots is not compatible with this designation.</p>



Question:	<p>The September New Zoning By-law Status Update IPD includes a request by developers for staff to investigate increasing maximum building heights in N1 and N2 neighbourhood zones from the current 8.5 meters, being two stories, set out in the current draft by-law being discussed to 11 meters, AKA three stories. Why is this before PHC already and why has it never been mentioned in these draft by-law discussions which are underway? Is there a separate stream of discussions going on with other groups like developers outside of these public consultations?</p>
Response:	<p>The purpose of the Information Previously Distributed (IPD) listed on the September 11 PHC agenda is to identify feedback and themes from the summer 2024 public consultation sessions and provide this information to Council for their awareness ahead of the release of Draft 2 in March 2025. The IPD includes potential options being considered on several topics that have come up through the consultation process. No decisions on these options have been made at this point.</p> <p>In addition to the virtual workshops occurring throughout the summer, staff are consulting with various stakeholders. Staff regularly hold joint meetings with the Federation of Citizen’s Associations (FCA) and the Greater Ottawa Home Building Association (GOHBA) so representatives from both these organizations are aware of feedback on key issues.</p>



Ward 24 Barrhaven East

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Public Realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the importance of streetscape planning and the impact of road design on livability.
Tree Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern for the impact of infill and setback distances on trees, especially unintended consequences for trees on neighbouring properties.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for increasing density around Hubs. ▪ Support for adjusting the height transition strategy or removing the angular plane to permit the construction of more housing.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the removal of parking minimums and the impacts on street parking.
Unserviced Lots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the growth and density permissions for unserviced lots on well and septic tank service.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>I'm curious as to how parking would be factored in if you were allowed a 6 unit building to be built as infill on a 450 square meter lot, which is typical on our street. I'm wondering how those 6 units would find parking space. Would that be included in that lot, or would they be expected to park on the street?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The parking permissions which are proposed in the draft Zoning By-law, including the removal of parking minimums, can only apply to the subject lot as zoning doesn't apply to the right-of-way. However, removing minimum parking space rates does not mean that no parking will be provided as development occurs.</p> <p>It is proposed to replace minimum parking ratios with a choice-based approach that gives property owners and developers the flexibility to provide the amount of parking they require, aligning parking supply and demand. Removing minimum parking ratios does not mean new developments built in Ottawa will not have on-site parking, nor does it mean that the number of parking spaces provided will necessarily be lower in the short-term. Shifting away from minimum parking ratios towards a choice-based approach will assist with the creation and enhancement of more-transit supportive, walkable neighbourhoods in the city in the long-term.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>The Barrhaven Hub seems a lot bigger than many of the Hubs in densely populated areas that already have LRT access. I don't understand why we're not putting more density near existing transit stations? In particular, there were two that really stuck out to me. #1 is Carleton University which has 30,000 students attending. Across the road, less than a 2 minute walk from transit, it's zoned N3 for three stories. Why do we continue to make it illegal for students to live in this neighborhood? Why do we continue to make it illegal to build in this neighborhood? The other one that I really noticed, was Tunney's Pasture that's slated to become a transit hub, and there will be some development going there. But again across the road it's zoned to N3 or N4 for only three or four storey building.</p>
-------------------------	--



Response:	<p>A secondary plan is a comprehensive planning document aimed at managing growth and development in a specific area, which supersedes the Official Plan. Many of the areas around transit stations are subject to a secondary plan, including Tunney’s Pasture mentioned above. Some of these plans are slightly dated, even pre-amalgamation, and there’s a gap between their objectives and Official Plan policies which direct the new Zoning By-law. This can lead to those inconsistencies in heights around Hubs. Staff have noticed these discrepancies and are undertaking policy reviews to identify these areas.</p>
------------------	---

Question:	<p>Why does the city continue to insist on angular planes as a height transition measure to regulate the way things look and the character in neighbourhoods? Past a 3-storey podium, you can’t see the rest of the building anyway. This is a dated planning concept that’s restrictive to development and we need to focus on building as much housing as possible to address the housing crisis.</p>
Response:	<p>The Official Plan does provide guidance to maintain the character of neighbourhoods, especially in the interiors of neighbourhoods. In this sense, character refers to the general size of the building on a lot, but not the density or the number of units inside a building. Through the new Neighbourhood zones, permitted densities are being increased while maintaining the general building size permitted in the current zoning. In the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay near Hubs and Corridors, even higher densities are permitted in larger buildings in order to support transit and create 15-minute neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Staff are still exploring appropriate height transition strategies and policies between higher buildings and adjacent Neighbourhoods.</p>



Question:	<p>And then I did have a question around the alternative setbacks. So I do appreciate this goal for preserving trees. We have some really nice mature trees as well that we would love to preserve for decades to come. But so say if one of my neighbors has a mature tree and he wants to protect it, but then his development or infill is awarded an alternative set back then, then gets really close to our fence, is there something about protecting neighbors' trees that are also mature such that you wouldn't perhaps allow a set back that would kill the neighbor streets? So that would kind of defeat the purpose of preserving trees.</p> <p>And I do say that because I have seen the downside of some infill projects where they end up hurting the root balls of trees on neighboring lots and then eventually the trees get sick and they die. And it just becomes an unintended consequence. So yes, I'm wondering if you could speak to that a little bit.</p>
Response:	<p>This is certainly not the intention of any setback provisions. Staff will speak with Forestry staff at the City to discuss this issue and address it in the new Zoning By-law.</p>

Question:	<p>Does streetscape planning fall under the new zoning by-law? Curb extensions not only improve pedestrian safety, but also provide space for street furniture, planting and expanding the tree canopy, which can enhance the urban environment. Why isn't this considered a higher priority in our suburban streetscape planning?</p>
Response:	<p>While the streetscape or the road profile does contribute to the livability of a neighbourhood, under the <i>Planning Act</i>, the Zoning By-law can't regulate what happens in the street.</p> <p>Street design largely occurs as part of the design of the broader community, including policies set out in applicable Secondary Plan documents and the standard street profiles at the City. As roads are rebuilt, improvements can be made, such as those described above.</p>



Question:	My question deals with how does this revised land use plan affect development and communities such as Heart's Desire which are on well and septic tank service?
Response:	The density permissions in unserved communities are not proposed to change as these lands are not the focus for intensification in the city. A new zone for unserved or partially serviced neighborhoods will be included in Draft 2 in which the intent is to carry forward the existing zoning without any changes.



As We Heard It Report – Wards 4, 6, 23

Virtual Information Session

As part of the consultation for Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, a ward-specific virtual information session for Wards 4, 6 and 23 was held on September 11, 2024, from 7:00 to 8:30 PM. This session presented an overview of key concepts relevant to each ward. It included:

- A project overview and public consultation for Draft 1
- Key directions from the City’s new Official Plan
- Planning primer – what is a zoning by-law
- An overview of the new Neighbourhood zones
- An overview of the new Mixed-Use zones
- Ward-specific presentation
- Ward-specific questions & answers session

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of comments shared by attendees during the ward-specific virtual information session. 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.

Index

	Title	Page
1	Ward 4 Kanata North – Councillor Cathy Curry	2
	Summary of Comments Received	2
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses.....	3
2	Ward 6 Stittsville – Councillor Glen Gower	11
	Summary of Comments Received	11
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	12
3	Ward 23 Kanata South – Councillor & Deputy Mayor Allan Hubley	18
	Summary of Questions and Staff Responses	19



Ward 4 Kanata North

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Parking and Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with removal of minimum parking requirements, especially in areas lacking alternative transportation modes. ▪ Suggestion to implement an online parking permit system to accommodate new residents without parking.
Active Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with lack of active transportation options, including cycling lanes and pedestrian pathways.
Retail Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with a prevalence of cannabis shops and lack of retail diversity in existing and future retail locations.
School Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with capacity in existing schools for children moving into future developments in the area.
Local Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the potential type and level of development that's likely to occur in area neighbourhoods.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the impacts of a potential future Heritage Conservation District on development in the area.
Parks and Recreation Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with lack of parks and community space with potential development and an increase of residents in the area.
Stormwater Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with stormwater management and provision for trees as future development occurs.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>One of the constraints that runs through the community is that in a good portion of Beaverbrook, the streets are only 6.5 metres wide. With as-of-right intensification, if you take down a single-family home that may have 1-5 people in it and put in something that would max out the lot size, you may end up with 2 or 3 times the number of people with nowhere to put additional cars and we are a very transit poor neighborhood. Particularly with removing parking minimums, it sounds like there is no transition plan to move from a car-centric neighborhood because we have no transit, and the plan for interior streets in Beaverbrook is very unclear at this point. The draft of the TMP we've seen is predominantly focused on March Road in terms of putting BRT. But that's a future deliverable that has still not been committed to. Neither is the connection from the Moodie station to that BRT. There's a mismatch in terms of potential intensification, which may add a lot more people, against what the actual transportation requirements are for the community.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>As-of-right permissions are an opportunity for development, but they do not guarantee that all the houses in an area will develop in that format. The 0-parking space requirement also does not mean that no parking spaces would be provided in new developments. If a developer sees an opportunity to develop a property with more units than what's there currently in a community that does not have a lot of options for alternative modes of transportation, they will likely include parking, which is still permitted. The Zoning By-law is not banning the ability to providing parking, it's just not requiring a minimum amount.</p> <p>A lot of the development with 0 parking spaces is anticipated to occur within the inner urban areas where there is greater access to a variety of different modes of transportation. But even in those areas, there is intensification with 0 parking spaces right next to intensification with parking spaces. In areas such as Beaverbrook that don't have a lot of transportation options, it is anticipated that builders, should they choose to develop in this area, probably will provide parking spaces.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>I live between Beaverbrook and Centrum on the north side of Campeau, near the golf course. I've made a point, since moving here, of walking and biking every chance I get. I have already talked to Councillor Curry about how ridiculous Campeau Drive is with the speed limit of 60 kilometers and the terrible bike lanes that sort of disappear and appear. On top of that, there's all this high density building that is going on the south side of Campeau and I don't see any parks. So you've got all these people being stuck here, you've got climate change, but there's not really any space for these people to go and have recreation. We want to make healthy communities where people can interact, but if you're not building a community like that, it's not going to happen. Campeau has the possibility of being part of a 15-minute community because we're near all kinds of retail, we've got the library, the senior centre, a sports area and so on. I know that this is a transportation issue, but I think that the zoning should include that as part of its overview. So I just want to make sure that that gets in that it's not just about how to cram as many people as you can into a hectare, but it's also once they move there, how are they going to live. How are they going to get around? How are they going to get out and get fresh air and exercise?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>These are important issues, but they can't be directly addressed through the new Zoning By-law. Generally, discussions regarding street design occur at the subdivision planning level and decisions for the location of new park space are handled by the City's Recreation, Cultural and Facility Services Department.</p> <p>One way the New Zoning By-law is promoting increased green space in our communities is by adding "park" as a permitted use in nearly every zone.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Almost every storefront we see that's vacant is quickly filled by a vape shop or pot shop. Are there any concerns that the stores in the 15-minute neighborhoods will not meet the objectives of providing food, restaurants and convenience shopping and what are you doing to ensure the intention of the 15-minute neighborhoods are kept?</p>



<p>Response:</p>	<p>Through zoning, it's not possible to regulate the type of retail or the products being sold in a retail establishment. Currently there is a scarcity of mixed-use or other commercial enabling zones, which can lead to a prevalence of certain types of retail, such as cannabis shops, as they have relatively low overhead costs compared to cafes, restaurants or grocery stores.</p> <p>By expanding the amount of land available for retail uses through the new Zoning By-law, the intention is to decrease the competition for existing retail locations and make it easier for restaurants or other uses to rent retail space across the city.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>In Kanata North there will be a substantial amount of building as brownfield developments and as you know, brownfield developments have no requirements for schooling, recreation, etcetera. In Kanata North and the research park area, it looks like we're going to have around 8000 units with no additional recreation, sports field, schools as part of the consideration. Literally thousands of kids with nothing to do and parents can't take them to recreation because of course, there's no parking. So I guess the first part of this is, when I expressed this before to the city planner, we were talking about the development on March and Terry Fox she said they don't talk to the school boards about future developments. When you have something of this incredible size, which is effectively a couple of high schools and several public schools worth of kids, what sort of discussions do you have with school boards to make sure that sufficient schools are being built and that we don't have gross overcrowding?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The implementation of any development that would occur within Kanata North, or the Economic District in particular, would most likely come through an application for development. When development applications are made to the City, those applications are also circulated to different agencies, including the school boards. School boards are also aware of the Official Plan and the vision for the Kanata North Economic District (KNED) to ensure they have an idea of future growth and development opportunities. The challenge for school boards in planning for new schools is that it's difficult to predict how many units will be built out or when that will occur.</p> <p>The KNED does envision a variety of uses beyond office and residential, and school boards are welcome to contribute to the diverse activities in this district.</p>



<p>Comment:</p>	<p>As we're going to be inundated with people without parking, this is a potential revenue gain for the city. You may consider having online parking permits that people can download and put in. For example, a friend of mine had a sidewalk put in front of his house and had friends visit, they parked outside for dinner. They got a ticket from by-law because it was more than three hours. So people are having that issue when they come for Ramadan or Diwali or Christmas, they have friends park on the street and someone calls by-law to get a ticket. You may want to consider especially with thousands of people without parking spots looking for somewhere to park on residential streets, that you may consider a parking permit regime where people can buy permits online from the city, stick it on their dashboard and hopefully not get ticketed from by-law.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>I appreciated what was discussed in the presentation, but it was far too technical for me to understand the various zoning. What can my neighbor across the street do? Can he rip his house down and put up a 5-storey building - what can he do?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Within Kanata North, an average residential zone would be N1 zone, likely N1D. Based on the proposed zoning and existing policies, a lot in this area would permit four units.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Where exactly will minor corridor CM4 be located?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Minor Corridor Subzone 4 (CM4) is located on Teron Road from the intersection of Campeau Drive and north to The Parkway. Proceeding north, the corner of Beaverbrook Road and Teron Road is also zoned CM4. There are also pockets of CM4 along Terry Fox Drive such as the northwest corner of Campeau Drive and Terry Fox Drive and the corner of Kanata Avenue and Terry Fox Drive.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>I had trouble figuring out where all these sections you had on the maps were. Could you put the streets names in of big ones, because they're not listed? They're just all these colors and looking on the screen, I find it very difficult to understand where everything was in the short time that you had them up. It would be much easier if you put things like March Road and Teron Road and Campeau Drive and Terry Fox on the map so that we could see exactly where we are.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>This feedback has been taken into account for the in-person engagement sessions in fall 2024.</p>

<p>Question:</p>	<p>My question is what you would see as the expected impact on an existing mature neighborhood with these proposals, including the as-of-right, where it seems like maybe things will be possible that haven't been possible in the past in a mature neighborhood as well as a greenfield project. I'm just curious what you might have mapped out or you have some scenarios that we could be aware of to make us understand what we could expect if we're in a mature neighborhood.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Incrementality is the main principle for growth anticipated in the interiors of neighbourhoods. Only so many lots are being bought and sold in any given year and, of those lots that are being bought and sold, an even smaller proportion of the buildings on them are being demolished and rebuilt. The turnover rate accounts for those lots upon which buildings are being torn down and rebuilt.</p> <p>In the average neighbourhood across the city, 10-12% of lots are anticipated to change use by 2046 over the life of the Official Plan. Kanata North would likely be on the lower end of the scale, and the turnover rate is potentially lower than 10%. The anticipated scale of redevelopment in interior neighbourhoods is largely fourplexes. Some variables leading to larger scale development could include an increased lot size or the ability of a developer to assemble adjacent lots.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>I have a specific question for Beaverbrook. We're up for a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) evaluation in January, so the heritage planners at the City who we haven't talked to for about 10 years, finally got that at the top of the list in terms of priorities. So they're going to be coming and looking at neighborhood character and as a heritage district designation as opposed to building designation, so that has a large impact in terms of preserving not only some of the homes that are representative, but also the general character of the district, which means in our case they're well set back from the road, that they're single family homes. We have actually a huge amount of mixed density, unusual as a suburb, we've done everything from 8-storey apartment buildings. But within the community itself, that's going to be a question as to how far zoning and the heritage designation, should we get one, is going to clash.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>To clarify, this review has not yet commenced and there are currently no heritage policies in place for the Beaverbrook area. Should the area be designated under Part V of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> in the future, a separate designation process will be undertaken which falls outside the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>An aspect of the new Zoning By-law that may address some of the concerns with compatibility is the updated subzones for residential areas. The subzone analysis that's been completed to date has determined the provisions for subzones A-F to be applied to Neighbourhood zones. The subzones are intended to be relatively descriptive of the existing lot sizes, patterns of setbacks, and building separation in a neighbourhood.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>In connection with the parks, right now in Kanata Lakes, all we have is a small schoolhouse with poor lighting outside and a very poorly paved parking area, and if you're planning to intensify that area, that is not going to be a suitable location for people to meet. We need a well-defined Community Center that can hold reasonable groups of people. And it's all about encouraging the community to interact.</p>



Response:	<p>The creation of new parks and recreational facilities is not within the purview of the new Zoning By-law. The Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan examines where and how many parks and facilities will be required to serve residents' needs to 2031.</p> <p>The Zoning team does connect with the Recreation, Cultural and Facility Services Department on these issues. The City as a whole is very interested in ensuring appropriate facilities are developed where they're needed with the resources available.</p>
------------------	--

Question:	<p>Often in suburban neighborhoods, people will pave over their front yards to get an extra parking spot and By-law will be called. By-law will tell the resident you need to fix that back and make it into what we call permeable material so that it can absorb stormwater. So when we see some of this new zoning and we see people would be allowed to put 3 units on their lot, potentially a coach house or some kind of small home or something like that, in addition either in their backyard or somewhere, it makes me wonder about the stormwater argument that is made by By-law, that, you know, even paving over your driveway would reduce the amount of absorbable materials and then more water would go into our stormwater systems that may not be able to handle that in a major rain event. What if people decide they want to add in a coach house and make 3 units on their lot, that means cutting down mature trees. And what about making sure that we are not preventing ourselves from getting to our tree canopy target as a city. Can we just have a comment on that?</p>
------------------	--



Response:	<p>While the new Zoning By-law will facilitate intensification in certain areas, requirements for soft landscaping to assist with stormwater management are being maintained and expanded.</p> <p>Section 201 in Draft 1 contains provisions requiring post-development runoff rates to be the same as pre-development levels. An increase in impermeable surfaces on the site post-development will require on-site stormwater management. This could include an underground cistern or rooftop storage, depending on the context of the site and existing conditions, such as an existing tree. Staff are working with the development industry to identify different ways of storing stormwater on site and options for varying locations.</p> <p>There will also be provisions to create the baseline conditions for tree planting by ensuring there's sufficient room for a tree to grow without impediment. In addition to the zoning provisions, the Tree Protection By-law continues to be enforced, where applicable.</p>
------------------	--

Question:	<p>One last comment on trees. Beaverbrook's trees were planted 65 years ago, they're all vulnerable to storms with are occurring at much higher intensity than when they matured. One of the things that came up with the development application on the attempt to redevelop the golf course was the feasibility of trees with the proposed setbacks and lot size. In many cases there was not enough setback space to put anything other than a hedge. So if we're looking at increasing canopy, it's difficult with the high densities being proposed and the required conditions for planting a tree on your property, especially in the backyard because they're often totally occupied by hard space. You know someone has a choice - I can put a tree or I can put something else. So certainly in terms of the canopy and density, there's a competition. And I think we need to find the right balance, otherwise we're going to end up with no trees, you've got no roots to absorb the water. I have a side yard, but I have green stuff that's sitting on the top. Most people call it a lawn, but I would call it a carpet because you get 3 inches and you hit the Canadian Shield. So yes, we have issues. Thank you.</p>
Response:	<p>Thank you for the comment.</p>



Ward 6 Stittsville

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with removal of parking minimums and the impacts on available street parking. ▪ Request to reconsider provisions in Section 612 regarding parking of recreational vehicles in residential driveways.
Housing Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern for providing sufficient housing for an aging population. ▪ Questioning how the new Zoning By-law is facilitating missing middle housing. ▪ Concern with decreased minimum lot widths in Stittsville and the ability to sever lots for redevelopment.
15-Minute Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the definition of 15-minute neighbourhoods and how they will be achieved. ▪ Questioning the location of 15-minute neighbourhoods within the city.
Height Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with achieving adequate height transitions and the removal of the 45 degree angular plane.
Greenbelt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioning the function of the Greenbelt and the ability to develop on these lands.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>With regards to the approval of 6310-6320 Hazeldean Road. My question is regarding the undeveloped property immediately to the west of that development. I was looking on the map trying to get some information, but it just seemed to be cut off the edge. So I have two questions about that property. It's currently zoned AM9 H(11), which means the 11 meter height. I did see several properties zoned MS2 H(11) along there. My first question is will the 11 meter height still be applied to that property in the future Zoning By-law?</p> <p>And the other condition currently on that property is the requirement for a 10-meter landscape buffer. Will that be grandfathered and applied to the new Zoning By-law as well?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Staff are working to carry forward existing height suffixes and exceptions into the new zone codes. The intent would be for that H(11) and the exception requiring the landscape buffer to be carried forward.</p> <p>Initially, the first version of the zoning map included widespread instances of exceptions and height suffixes not being carried forward. The zoning map was reissued a couple months later with corrections to work towards capturing all of those exceptions and height suffixes. Staff will check to ensure these provisions are carried forward.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>Please explain how aging populations can be factored into the projected number of housing units. For example, an older population will seek different housing versus a family.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>It can be difficult to address the number of units that are anticipated to be needed for a growing aging population. However, the policies in the Official Plan do address the issue by requiring us to provide a diversity of housing choices for residents.</p> <p>As people get older, they may choose to downsize into a condominium or into a rental accommodation with less maintenance, for instance. It is an aim of the new Zoning By-law to provide more opportunities for those types of units to be built, whether with the development of a 6-unit building in a neighbourhood zone, a mid-rise building that's in the five-seven storey range along a Minor Corridor, a mid-rise building on a Mainstreet Corridor that's nine storeys, or a high rise building that is defined as a building that's ten stories or higher. The new Zoning By-law does create for more opportunities for those various types of housing choices to be built. That would be focused on addressing the question about an aging population and the housing that they may need.</p> <p>There are also broad permissions for retirement homes and residential care facilities throughout the city. There are policies in the Housing section of the Official Plan that require broad permissions for the types of dwellings that people may need as they get older, including retirement homes and residential care facilities where there are medical staff available as people age and require that support.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>This is somewhat a question about 6310 Hazeldean and future development like it. Developers have mentioned 15-minute neighbourhoods and it sounds like they're just saying it. What's the checklist that the City is trying to use to determine if an area is a 15-minute neighbourhood or potentially can be a 15-minute neighbourhood? If anyone has actually been down in that area (around 6310 Hazeldean), it's pretty clear that it will never be that with the absence of transit, suitable grocery stores, medical, schools. I just wanted to know how the City is deciding it is a 15-minute neighbourhood to make things like 6310 Hazeldean a possibility.</p>



Response:	<p>A 15-minute neighbourhood should provide a mix of uses, including residential, commercial, institutional, and recreational, and it's supposed to give people convenient access to their day-to-day needs. All neighbourhoods in Ottawa are not currently 15-minute neighbourhoods. 15-minute neighbourhoods typically evolve over time as areas mature and redevelopment occurs, introducing a mix of uses.</p> <p>Through the Official Plan, Hazeldean Road has been designated a Mainstreet Corridor which is planned to combine higher density residential development, a mix of uses and a higher level of street transit service than abutting Neighbourhoods to encourage the evolution of an area towards a 15-minute neighbourhood.</p>
------------------	--

Question:	When calculating units per hectare, will those be rounded up or down? So for example 4.5, where would that go?
Response:	The provision set out that the calculation of the number is to be rounded to the nearest even number. In this specific example, the number would be round down to 4.

Question:	<p>I'm a current residential infill developer. Throughout Stittsville, a majority of Stittsville seems to be N1E zoning. Over the past 10 years of developing in Stittsville, we've established the average lot size is majority 100 foot wide lots, which is 30 metres. When subdivided, you end up with 15-metre lots. My understanding was that the new draft by-law was to kind of take what has been happening in the neighbourhoods and kind of bring everything to the point where we didn't need any minor variances to get what was expected to be in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>But it seems like now with the proposed 18 metre lot width, basically every lot in Stittsville would still need minor variances to be able to be severed into two and built upon. Is that the intent that we would still need minor variances?</p>
Response:	Thank you for this feedback. It will be considered in the development of Draft 2.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>In the OP and urban design guidelines, the 45° angular plane, shadow studies setbacks, step backs, massing, landscape buffers and other criteria are used to assess whether there is suitable transition or not. The new Zoning By-law is supposed to provide further clarity in line to the OP. Why is the angular plane no longer being used, and why are heights at distances prescribed without consideration of mass and shadows, buffering etcetera? It seems to be making it more ambiguous than clear. A very pro developer stance and not upholding the OP in any way.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Zoning By-law is able to regulate certain aspects related to height transition, such as the location of buildings, provisions for setbacks at prescribed heights, and requirements for minimum soft landscaping.</p> <p>On Corridors, where higher development is considered through the Official Plan, lot depth is a key determinant of a site’s ability to provide height transition to adjacent low-rise areas. Corridor lands that permit high-rise development will be subject to an on-site transition framework based on graduated rear- and interior-yard setbacks, such that feasible building heights increase on deeper lots as distance from abutting low-rise areas increases. Where a proposed development is able to meet required tower setbacks, it is anticipated that a maximum height of 25 storeys will accommodate a majority of “ordinary” high-rise building developments, such that zoning by-law amendments for height will be limited to proposals for exceptionally tall buildings.</p> <p>Staff are examining various methods for regulating height transition and will provide various options in the Draft 2 report, which is scheduled to be released in March 2025.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Most Stittsville subdivisions built in the past 25 years have smaller lots (50-60 feet), with homes closer together than in older neighborhoods with larger lots. Many properties have double-wide driveways, but Draft 1, Section 612, prohibits parking non-car vehicles (like utility trailers, boats, campers, or travel trailers) in driveways or front yards, requiring them to be parked in side or back yards. However, these areas are often inaccessible, and parking on soft landscaping would damage existing mature greenery. We need flexibility in allowing recreational vehicles in driveways when they don’t pose safety risks or obstruct sidewalks, especially in established neighborhoods where primary vehicle access is unaffected.</p>



Response:	Thank you for this feedback. It will be considered in the development of Draft 2.
Question:	Has the city designated the entire city into 15-minute neighbourhoods to be implemented recently or in the next several years?
Response:	<p>15-minute neighbourhoods are a concept featured in the Official Plan to assist with the creation of complete communities. The intent is to create neighbourhoods that have a mix of uses and make it easy for residents to look after their day-to-day needs with minimal travel time involved while also providing a variety of transportation options so people are not entirely dependent on the car if they don't want to be.</p> <p>The Official Plan nor the zoning By-law designate specific areas or neighbourhoods in Ottawa as 15-minute neighbourhoods. However, the Zoning By-law takes direction from the Official Plan to try to provide more locations across the city where a range of uses are permitted in proximity to where people live, specifically through the Minor Corridor designation.</p>
Question:	<p>There is a great big massive green space around the city in between Kanata and the rest of the city. If the city is still concerned, if you have this insurmountable growth problem, I haven't heard anybody talking about what you're going to do with all that big open space that you are traversing every day and there's nothing built on it. Starting at the bottom of the Kanata Hill running past Bayshore. So I haven't seen anybody addressing that. So I don't really believe that if you say you have alternatives, what are you doing to address NCC's stranglehold on that space? And second point related to that, do you have data from other large Canadian cities? If we're saying we're a large Canadian city that is dealing with its unprecedented growth, what about other cities? If they've got existing green spaces, how have they dealt with it? I haven't heard anybody speak to that.</p>



<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Greenbelt lands are owned by the federal government through the National Capital Commission. The lands are not subject to municipal by-laws and regulations.</p> <p>The NCC has developed a master planning document for the Greenbelt containing guidance on its future. While the City does not have a role in determining the development potential of the Greenbelt, staff have considered many options for accommodating expected growth both inside and outside the Greenbelt.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>Concerning the missing middle housing. Missing middle housing is incredibly important to this city and it seems like every application in Stittsville now is for high rise or for low rise, there is no middle. What are we doing to make sure missing middle housing actually happens? What is the Zoning By-law doing to make that attractive and possible? Or are we in a mode of high rise and low rise only? I've seen nothing in the Zoning By-law that actually promotes missing middle.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The Zoning By-law takes direction from the Official Plan and the Official Plan promotes missing middle housing, which is defined as 1-16 unit buildings with a maximum height of 5 storeys. The Zoning By-law includes broad permissions for that form of development. In Neighbourhood zones the maximum height is 4 storeys and the focus of these zones is to provide that form of housing in the range of 1-16 units.</p> <p>Missing middle housing could also be achieved as a result of the new permissions for Minor Corridors across the city, where buildings higher than 4 storeys are permitted.</p>



Ward 23 Kanata South

Comments Received

Theme	As We Heard It
Transit Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kanata South struggles with more cars than parking spots on properties because of transit is inadequate.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with sufficient infrastructure and parking capacity to support increased density. ▪ Seeking clarity on the relationship between intensification and tree preservation/planting.
Mixed-Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for mixed-use buildings both in Hubs and in areas around Hubs.



Questions and Staff Responses

<p>Question:</p>	<p>How does the city ensure the infrastructure needed? The sewers and the parking issues would really limit the density.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The new provisions require that any development, regardless of whether it is subject to site plan control, must provide on-site stormwater management if there is an increase in impermeable surfaces. This means that post-development peak runoff rates must be controlled to pre-development levels. These provisions apply to redevelopment and infill building permits that are exempt from the Site Plan Control process and involve a net increase in impervious area compared to pre-development conditions. Stormwater management objectives can be achieved through on-site attenuation, infiltration, or a combination of both techniques, depending on site-specific conditions.</p> <p>Regarding the adequacy of water and sewer services, increased permissions for density in the new Zoning By-law do not guarantee sufficient servicing capacity for every development proposal. The Infrastructure Master Plan identifies infrastructure improvement projects to increase backbone system capacity based on high-level intensification projections. However, it is not possible to predict if there is adequate servicing capacity in all locations due to the variability of development proposals.</p> <p>To address this, the Infrastructure Master Plan recommends an Infrastructure Capacity Management Program to evaluate local systems on a priority basis, focusing on areas with high intensification development pressures and where local system capacities are most limiting. This program will identify where local system capacity upgrades are needed to support intensification.</p> <p>Until these studies and upgrades are completed, some development projects may be delayed based on capacity assessments during the development approvals process. If insufficient capacity is available for a development project, the possible outcomes are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development will not be able to proceed. 2. The developer could fund local upgrades needed to accommodate the development. 3. The developer could wait until a local servicing study is completed and implemented, including a financial plan for any recommended upgrades.



<p>Question:</p>	<p>How will the city ensure that the density and the tree canopy work together. Tree roots are going to grow where they want to, and can affect the infrastructure.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>To support the urban forest tree canopy, the City of Ottawa is proposing expanded requirements for soft landscaping in its new Zoning By-law project. These provisions aim to ensure that as redevelopment occurs, space for trees and soft landscaping is preserved in front and rear yards. The new rules will allow flexibility in the siting of buildings to accommodate the retention of existing trees and will limit the extent to which underground structures, such as parking garages, can project to the lot line. This is to ensure there is enough soil volume for trees to grow to maturity. Specific setbacks for tree retention will be included, allowing for alternative building placements to protect existing trees. These measures are designed to create a harmonious balance between increased urban density and a thriving tree canopy, ensuring that both can coexist and contribute to a healthy, sustainable urban environment. For more detailed information, you can refer to Part 2 (Section 214 – Alternative Setbacks for Tree Retention and Section 217 – Provisions for Underground Structures) and Part 8 – Neighbourhood Zones and Provisions in the Discussion section of the report.</p>



<p>Question:</p>	<p>With the multiuse properties, what are the limitations of those? Why are there not more opportunities to add these to areas that could be seen as continuations of hub areas?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>Generally, properties can utilize the uses permitted in their respective zone. Zones with the highest intensity and breadth of uses are found along major transportation corridors and around transit hubs. As you move away from these areas towards zones with lower densities, the range of permitted uses typically decreases. This zoning approach is designed to concentrate higher-density, mixed-use developments in areas that are well-served by public transportation and infrastructure, thereby supporting efficient land use and reducing reliance on private vehicles.</p> <p>The limitations on multiuse properties in lower-density areas are primarily due to zoning rules that aim to preserve the character and scale of these neighborhoods. These rules often restrict the types of commercial and high-density residential uses that can be introduced, to maintain a balance between development and the existing community fabric. However, the City of Ottawa continues to explore opportunities to expand multiuse developments where feasible, particularly in areas that can serve as natural extensions of existing hubs, while ensuring that such expansions align with overall planning objectives and community needs.</p>



As We Heard It Report – In-Person Sessions

As part of the consultation on Draft 1 of the proposed new Zoning By-law, five in-person workshops were held throughout the fall of 2024 at locations throughout Ottawa:

- Ray Friel Recreation Complex on October 1
- John G. Mlacak Community Centre on October 8
- Fred Barrett Arena on October 15
- City Hall on October 22
- Confederation Education Centre on November 5

Over 200 residents were in attendance at these sessions. All five events were supported by Youth Ottawa, who provided a group of eager young leaders to assist with greeting residents and note taking during the event.

The sessions featured informative easels presenting information on Draft 1 and a brief introduction to the project. Attendees were then invited to ask questions and share their thoughts with members of the New Zoning By-law team at roundtables on the following topics:

- Growth Management
- Livable Communities
- Mix of Uses
- Other Topics

Dealing with growth management in neighbourhoods was a common theme at the workshops. These discussions ranged from parking issues and transportation needs, stormwater management strategies, and ensuring sufficient space is provided to retain existing trees and plant new ones as development occurs. Attendees were also concerned about permissions for taller buildings throughout the city, and how these will transition into the inner neighbourhoods. However, there was general interest for permitting a greater mix of uses in residential areas, including small commercial spaces in and around established neighbourhoods to increase walkability and convenience.

Several discussions focused on the implementation of the new Zoning By-law and how it may change the development process. Attendees were particularly interested in increasing predictability regarding development rights in their neighbourhoods and surrounding community.

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of the themes covered during the in-person roundtable discussions and some specific questions and comments raised by attendees.



Index

Session Location	Date	Page
Ray Friel Recreation Complex.....	October 1, 2024	3
John G. Mlacak Community Centre.....	October 8, 2024	8
Fred Barrett Arena.....	October 15, 2024	14
Ottawa City Hall.....	October 22, 2024	19
Confederation Education Centre.....	November 5, 2024	27



As We Heard It Report – Ray Friel Recreation Complex

Growth Management

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that the city is lacking sufficient infrastructure to support the increased density proposed by the Official Plan and the new Zoning By-law.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questions on why the maximum densities proposed for Neighbourhood zones presented in Draft 1 are higher than the Official Plan targets. ▪ Why N1-3 zones do not have a unit cap, such as 4 units. ▪ Concern with increasing N1 and N2 height permissions to 3 storeys in suburban areas. ▪ Seeking clarity on the purpose of the maximum densities proposed for N1-3 zones.
Traffic and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How increased density will impact traffic and congestion issues in Orléans. ▪ Sharing that St. Joseph Boulevard is currently dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists and emphasizing this needs to change with more residents moving into the area.
Transit and Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing that growth and density need to be tied to alternate transportation options, including public transit.
Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with shadowing impacts of taller buildings and how zoning can address this issue.



- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Seeking clarity on why Minor Corridors do not have density maximums. |
|--|--|



Livable Communities

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Building Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioning the function of requiring façade articulation for certain buildings. ▪ Questioning the fenestration requirements, considering the building code has window placement requirements.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with a potential lack of parking due to the removal of parking minimums and questioning whether parking permits will be introduced to deal with this issue.
Large Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that requirements for larger dwelling units in new developments make building more expensive.
Stormwater Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with stormwater management and seeking clarity on how developers will ensure post-development flow remains the same.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need to ensure sufficient space for trees, especially in urban areas with dense development



Mix of Uses

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Seeking clarity on the assignment of Corridor designations and how certain streets were chosen to be zoned this way.



Other Topics

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioning how Corridors without secondary plans can develop in an orderly way. ▪ Seeking clarity on the maximum permitted heights and where they apply. ▪ Seeking clarity on the use of the angular plane for height transition along Corridors.
Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how geographic information in the by-law will be presented. ▪ Questioning if the information in the by-law will be accompanied by diagrams or maps.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the reason densities are lower in Neighbourhoods in relation to other zones.
Predictability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioning if the intent of the new by-law is to reduce the number of zoning by-law amendments required to facilitate new development. ▪ Seeking clarity on the guiding policy for creating the new Zoning By-law and how that has been used to create Draft 1.



As We Heard It Report – John G. Mlacak Community Centre

Growth Management

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking clarity on the density permissions in Neighbourhood zones, including any maximum caps. • Inquiring if the density targets could be met by capping new development in Neighbourhoods at 2 storeys. • Support for 4 units as-of-right to permit gentle density and incentivize developers.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in the communal parking provisions to relieve parking pressures, especially with the introduction of 4 units per lot as-of-right. • Seeking clarification on any parking requirements for developing a lot with 4 units as-of-right. • Discussion on the trade-offs between useable space for housing, parking and landscaping.
Transit and Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasing density before alternate transit options are available causes problems.



Livable Communities

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that allowing 4 units on residential serviced lots across the city is not enough to meet intensification targets. ▪ Seeking clarification on the possible configuration of 4 units per lot and clarifying that 4 units does not mean 4 storeys. ▪ Concern that intensification will lead to overcrowding and density needs to be balanced with livability. ▪ Questioning if infrastructure requirements exist to match higher densities. ▪ Concern with minimizing heat island effect while intensifying neighbourhoods. ▪ Seeking clarity on the community benefits process and if developers provide money directly to the city. ▪ Confirming if urban expansions are being considered to facilitate new development.
Greenbelt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the preservation of the greenbelt and any potential future uses. ▪ Confirming that the greenbelt will not change in size or configuration.
Large Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking information on methods to incentivize developers to build more 3-bedroom units. ▪ Concern that many 3-bedroom units only have 1 bathroom which isn't very livable.



Theme	As We Heard It
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the permission of small stores or restaurants in residential areas. ▪ Concern that non-residential uses in neighbourhoods could lead to noise or other nuisances. ▪ Seeking insight on how long it might take for the suburbs to gain a larger mix of uses and become 15 minute neighbourhoods.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirming if there are different parking requirements for rural areas.
Process and Future Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the purpose of zoning and what will be changing as a result of the by-law review. ▪ Seeking clarity on how staff decided what the changes are and what this is based on. ▪ Seeking information on any mechanisms in place for the city to make future changes to the bylaw to fix unforeseen consequences.
Soft Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarification on the definition of soft landscaping and some examples of types. ▪ Concern that soft landscaping requirements might conflict with the provision of parking and ability to make a project profitable. ▪ Sharing that it is preferred to have more than less soft landscaping provided, in order to mitigate climate impacts such as flood and heat island effect.
Stormwater Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desire to see the creation of low impact development and sufficient permeable space on lots. ▪ Confirming if stormwater management requirements are applied equally or if they are more prevalent in certain zones.



Theme	As We Heard It
Transit and Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need for transit connections to and from higher density areas. ▪ Request to expand park and ride lots to better accommodate transit use in Kanata.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how much underground space trees need for their roots. ▪ Concern with how tree roots can affect foundations.
Waste Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that waste may not be properly separated in multi-residential buildings and seeking information on any related requirements.



Mix of Uses

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Height Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing that Minor Corridors and height transition are common topics among residents.
Home Based Businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns with home based businesses that are not appropriate for residential areas, such as animal care establishments and car detailing businesses.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interest in introducing non-residential uses into neighbourhoods.
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarification on the approval process of the NZBL, including any requirement for provincial approval.



Other Topics

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the measures being taken through the zoning by-law to ensure neighbourhoods remain livable as they intensify.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the differences between Neighbourhood zones and how these will be implemented.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the size of setbacks and the ability to accommodate trees.



As We Heard It Report – Fred Barrett Arena

Growth Management

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the maximum densities set in the south end of the city. ▪ Seeking clarity on any proposed density increases in suburban neighbourhoods. ▪ Sharing the perception that density seems focused in downtown areas and it's not evenly distributed across the city and certain neighbourhoods are permitted to remain unchanged.
Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how the ENO was mapped and how certain properties were determined to be included. ▪ Seeking clarity on the impact of the ENO and how much density will be added to zones when it's applied.



Livable Communities

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the application of density maximums in Neighbourhood zones. ▪ Discussion on how increased densities will actually look in residential areas. ▪ Seeking clarification on the differences between the density targets presented in the Official Plan and the density maximums presented in the new Zoning By-law. ▪ Sharing that people are confused about the push for increased zoning when they see developments being approved and not being built. ▪ Support for diverse housing options as increased density is permitted. ▪ Concern that people will seek further and more distant housing options to avoid increased density.
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing that community services and roads are already overloaded and concern that density will worsen these issues. ▪ Concern that zoning changes will overwhelm existing infrastructure. ▪ Emphasizing the importance of expanding infrastructure in line with growth and development.



Theme	As We Heard It
Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing how the municipal budget determines investments in infrastructure and services which make the city livable. ▪ An understanding that zoning will not bring social infrastructure but it can set the conditions for positive growth and change. ▪ Concern that more affordable options and denser housing is focused on but corridors with the highest rates of pollution. ▪ Support for walkable neighbourhoods.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing support for mixed use development and increased access to services. ▪ Concern that mixed use designations in some areas are occupied by embassies and not local services that could benefit the community. ▪ Sharing successful commercial uses in the Alta Vista area.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with increased street parking due to density and inability to safely use streets for walking or playing. ▪ Support for the removal of parking minimums as it could reduce the cost of housing.
Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for engaging youth in consultation and discussion on the new Zoning By-law.
Transit and Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with increased density in areas that are not well served by transit.
Trees and Greenspace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern for providing adequate space to plant trees and tree protection. ▪ Emphasizing the importance of green spaces, especially as density increases.



Mix of Uses

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarification on the origin of the ENO and how it's being applied. ▪ Seeking clarity on the impact of the ENO and how much additional density will be permitted where it is applied.
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that density is focused in certain areas and not equally distributed across the city. ▪ Understanding that development typically occurs incrementally in neighbourhoods as opposed to sudden transformations.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that insufficient room is being provided for trees.



Other Topics

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on proposed density permissions and how maximum density is applied per lot. ▪ Clarifying the effect of permitting 3 units as-of-right citywide.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on difference between residential Neighbourhood zones and Minor Corridors and the permissions for each. ▪ Concern with the implications of mixing residential and commercial or industrial uses, such as noise complaints.
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questions about how the implementation of the new Zoning By-law may impact other development processes, such as Site Plan Control and a Minor Variance through the Committee of Adjustment.



As We Heard It Report – City Hall

Growth Management

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with a reduction of heritage buildings and locations as a result of the removal of Heritage Overlay policies in the former Section 60. ▪ Questioning the reasoning for removing these policies and if heritage protections will be reduced as a result. ▪ Confirming if the existing protections under the Ontario Heritage Act are sufficient to protect heritage without zoning provisions. ▪ Suggesting exempting heritage buildings from new zoning provisions they might not meet, in order to retain them. ▪ Concern with attempts to modify heritage policies and the impacts on this older housing stock, which can provide affordable housing options.
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the impact of infrastructure capacity on new zoning provisions, including increased density. ▪ Concern with the coordination of all city master plans, including the Zoning By-law, in addressing infrastructure deficits.
Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussing the possibility of introducing a vacant commercial space tax to incentivize the revitalization of downtown commercial areas. ▪ Emphasizing that increased residential density needs to be paired with a mix of uses, including employment opportunities. ▪ Support for increasing flexibility on commercial uses in non-traditional areas.



Theme	As We Heard It
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with conflict between cycle lanes and on-street parking and how the new Zoning By-law may address this. ▪ Expressing support for the removal of parking minimum, especially as a means to increase soft landscaping.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need to protect trees in denser downtown areas.
Transit and Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the sequencing for creating communities well-served by transit and questioning if building transit infrastructure or residential development comes first. ▪ Concern that transit service can't keep up with current and planned density increases.
Stormwater Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the proposed stormwater management provisions for new development and potential management options.



Livable Communities

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Greenspace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need for more parks, especially as some urban areas are not meeting targets in the Greenspace Masterplan. ▪ Concern with the lack of enforcement of landscape plans and the resulting lack of trees and soft landscaping. ▪ Concern with worsening the heat island effect with increased density and hardscaping.
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with overdeveloping central neighbourhoods to the point they lose unique and livable characteristics, such as trees and natural features. ▪ Concern that desirable neighbourhoods develop more quickly and intensely than other areas, potentially leading to overdevelopment. ▪ Seeking clarity on how noticeable increased density will be in neighbourhoods. ▪ Seeking clarity on the application of the maximum density permissions in N1-N3 and how these translate to units in a building. ▪ Seeking clarity on the permitted locations for high-rise development.
Large Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that large units aren't being built when they're required and the impact on housing options for families.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sharing that locating schools, community centres, and stores in close proximity improves livability in a neighbourhoods, especially for children.



Theme	As We Heard It
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with spillover parking needs due to the removal of parking minimums. ▪ Concern with enforcement of potential parking violations due to the removal of parking minimums. ▪ Emphasizing the need to prioritize parking and greater density creates chaos with parking needs.
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how the by-law has changed and the policy guiding these changes. ▪ Seeking clarity on the future role of Minor Variances following the implementation of the new Zoning By-law.
Transit and Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need for reliable public transit to support increased density and ease parking pressures. ▪ Sharing that zoning changes can impact livability, but traffic and transportation options are also factors.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need to retain space for trees in new developments, especially in canopy deprived neighbourhoods. ▪ Concern with residential front yard setbacks decreasing and the ability to plant trees in front yards. ▪ Concern with losing space for trees in backyards due to decreased rear yard setbacks and larger buildings.



Mix of Uses

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Built Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with creating wind tunnels along Corridors with tall buildings and questioning how this can be avoided.
Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the conditions under which a 40 storey building would be allowed to be built.
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that developers have received approval from the city for new housing and they're not building, contributing to the housing shortage. ▪ Emphasizing the need for more residential development downtown. ▪ Encouraging the redevelopment of malls and locating housing on these sites. ▪ Discussing the possibility of providing incentives to build housing in large retail parking lots. ▪ Questioning how the new by-law protects or encourages missing middle housing in downtown neighbourhoods.



Theme	As We Heard It
Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with vacant commercial units in downtown areas. ▪ Emphasizing the need to strike a balance between increased density in downtown neighbourhoods and livability. ▪ Questioning if increased density requirements are compatible with creating a livable city, especially regarding sufficient capacity for tree planting. ▪ Concern that required commercial space is eating into downtown residential space in existing neighbourhoods. ▪ Support for locating larger, family-sized units downtown to take advantage of certain benefits, such as walkability or not needing a vehicle. ▪ Seeking information on the implementation of inclusionary zoning in the context of the new Zoning By-law.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussing the idea of compelling the construction of mixed use development across the city.



Other Topics

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on permitted heights near transit stations. ▪ Concern with lot width and the amount of density permitted on smaller lots. ▪ Seeking clarity on maximum densities and comparisons to Official Plan density targets. ▪ Seeking information on any changes to how the city addresses the provision of off-campus student housing. ▪ Concern that property tax increases as a result of adding units to a home could disincentivize gentle density. ▪ Concern with waste management as density increases. ▪ Sharing that many residents would rather see heritage buildings maintained and retained than demolished and redeveloped.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for greater permissions for the Neighbourhood Commercial Suffix. ▪ Support for permitting mixed use buildings in N4 zone.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with legalizing all front yard parking, considering this space could be used for trees.
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking information on the implementation timeline for the new Zoning By-law. ▪ Confirming if developers will be permitted to apply to amend the new Zoning By-law.
Secondary Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the implementation of secondary plan policies in the by-law.



Theme	As We Heard It
Stormwater Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Concern with increased stormwater runoff as a result of increased density.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Concern about tree protection with new development.



As We Heard It Report – Confederation Education Centre

Growth Management

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Built Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the new form based zoning system and the removal of definitions for different dwelling types.
Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the height permissions for Baseline Road, a Mainstreet Corridor, and interactions with abutting properties. ▪ Seeking clarity on the intention of Corridors as mixed use zones. ▪ Concern that long semi-detached dwellings won't be permitted on Corridors due to active entrance requirements.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on permissions for 3 or 4 residential units per lot. ▪ Confirming that it is not compulsory to provide 3 or 4 residential units per lot. ▪ Confirming the potential locations and requirements for a 40-storey building. ▪ Questioning why the area around South Keys, including the pedestrian bridge connecting to the LRT station, have not been more significantly upzoned. ▪ Concern with focusing and permitting density in existing neighbourhoods. ▪ Suggestion to encourage more density along Corridors with existing commercial and industrial uses before permitting density in established neighbourhoods.



Theme	As We Heard It
Height Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the transition strategy for high-rise development in N5 and N6 zones that abut N1-N4 zones. ▪ Seeking clarity on the use of an angular plane for height transition from a Corridor zone that abuts a Neighbourhood zone.
Hubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the location of Hubs in Nepean and the height permissions in these zones.
Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the potential locations for mixed use development and the zones that permit it. ▪ Sharing that other aspects are required to improve quality of life in residential areas, such as parks and stores.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the definition of midrise and what type of development might be permitted in new N zones. ▪ Seeking clarity on the zone conversion from Residential zones to Neighbourhood zones. ▪ Seeking clarity on the provisions for vertically attached units, mainly width requirements. ▪ Concern that the width requirements for vertically attached units limit the building potential in the Neighbourhood zones. ▪ Suggestion to create different exterior and interior widths for vertically attached units.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the removal of minimum parking requirements and how this will impact future development.
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the need for Site Plan Control following the implementation of the new Zoning By-law.



Livable Communities

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Seeking clarity on how many units are permitted in a mid-rise building.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Seeking clarity on any changes to setbacks to accommodate trees.



Mix of Uses

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion to increase density targets in existing low density areas.
Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that new zoning permissions will cause more displacement and increased housing costs. ▪ Concern with gentrification and pricing people out of neighbourhoods due to a loss of affordability. ▪ Concern that this area is introducing significant density already and other areas aren't intensifying at the same rate.
Secondary Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the use of secondary plans and how they relate to the new zoning.



Other Topics

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Built Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioning if zoning is focused on the typology of buildings and pushing certain types of buildings in certain areas.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on density permissions, including limits, in certain zones. ▪ Concern that limiting density will lead to further urban sprawl. ▪ Expressing a need for more housing in low density, car-oriented areas. ▪ Suggestion that density be focused in other areas that are not yet well established. ▪ Questioning why strip malls aren't the first areas to develop, instead of established neighbourhoods. ▪ Support for low-rise apartment buildings to increase density. ▪ Support for redeveloping malls with higher density development. ▪ Concern that permitting 4 units as-of-right won't introduce much more density as it's not likely many homeowners will develop that way.
Livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hoping that the new by-law provides options for affordable housing, as a benefit to the community.
Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with loss of character as density increases in Neighbourhoods. ▪ Concern that too much pressure is being put on neighbourhoods to increase density.
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the policy basis for the ideas being implemented through the new Zoning By-law.



Theme	As We Heard It
Transit and Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need for reliable transit to support additional density.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that setbacks aren't sufficient to plant trees. ▪ Concern with the inability of the new Zoning By-law to require trees and questioning how more trees can be encouraged. ▪ Concern with loss of trees for redevelopment and support for emphasizing tree preservation in redevelopment plans.



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. 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 August 1, 2024 to January 31, 2025. Approximately 400 detailed submissions were sent to the project inbox during that time period.

Index

	Topic	Page No.
1	Neighbourhood Zones	1
2	Mixed-Use Zones	4
3	Parking	5
4	Environmental Concerns	6
5	Rural Zones	7
6	Stormwater Management	7
7	Public Consultation	7

Overview of Topics

1) Neighbourhoods

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intensification might not leave enough greenspace in neighborhoods to regulate city temperature and help wellbeing. ▪ Concern about overbearing existing infrastructure. ▪ Concern that lot severances nearby will diminish property values. ▪ Concern around permitting development over 6 storeys in areas far from transit stations. ▪ In favour of increased density to alleviate the housing crisis and address the fiscal municipal issues posed by low density in suburban areas.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for the zoning changes as they will help our neighbourhoods be more sustainable and affordable for the next generation. Increased density will mean the neighbourhood can support local businesses and more frequent public transit with less car dependency. ▪ Concern that the pressure to convert green countryside to suburbia will only become greater if we don't allow urban densification. ▪ Suggestion to apply a more effective solution for ensuring gentle intensification. Where an area reaches the top of its zones' density, it can be automatically upzoned to the next level. ▪ Concern by the maximum densities for N1 to N3 in Table 801A which are different from the targets in Table 3b of the Official Plan. ▪ Suggestion that developers who sever properties and intensify be held responsible for installing heat pumps or geothermal units, electrical panels that can sustain electric vehicles and other equipment that can alleviate the demands on the grid. ▪ Concern that if 1 or 2 companies dominate a neighborhood, they would act as a monopoly and can set prices and maintenance levels with little pressure for competition. Request to consider ownership of land per neighborhood in zoning bylaws, with explicit prohibitions about individual non-government entities owning above a certain percentage of the real estate/ rental units. ▪ Request that density is proposed around the city equitably. ▪ Worry that the cost per new unit, even if smaller, may not be at a level that increases affordability. ▪ Concern that extreme intensification might lead to insufficient room for adequate garbage and recycling storage/management. ▪ Proposal to create ward-specific intensification targets including the number of housing units needed and the type of housing that reflects the profile of the newcomers expected for each decade until 2046. ▪ Concern that developers may request amendments to build higher than permitted and secure affordable housing grants for units that are not affordable.
<p>Missing Middle Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Doubling density may eliminate any family-sized accommodation anywhere in neighbourhoods as is the likely result in new developments. ▪ Recommendation that current residential zoning inside the greenbelt be zoned to N3 or higher.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposition to allowing triplexes and fourplexes in established communities. They can be allowed on major thoroughways such as Baseline Road or Woodroffe but not in single dwelling areas. ▪ Suggestion to set the maximum height for N1 and N2 zones to 11m in order to allow financially-viable 'missing middle' development. ▪ Observation that in Lowertown most new units are small and cater to small households with no children. Even three-bedroom units are too small to meet the needs of families with children. ▪ Concern that unless the zoning requires a certain number of larger size units within a new development then families will be forced to live outside the core. ▪ Suggestion to consider returning properties that were previously zoned residential to their previous residential status in an effort for additional affordable housing. ▪ Concern that the minimum large household (3+ bedroom) target could become a requirement. This could create delays for proposed developments, especially if they're subject to community consultations. ▪ Concern that developers will opt for building more units on a given lot; and therefore, they will build more bachelors, and one-bedrooms units, and less two or three bedrooms. ▪ Concern that coach house provisions make it challenging to find flexible and creative housing solutions, especially in urban areas. ▪ Request for clarification on how the draft zoning supports "missing middle" housing types.
<p>Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worry that the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) in some cases appears to extend too far into Neighbourhood Zones. ▪ Evolving overlay regulation should be described in the draft bylaw, as required by the Official Plan. The need for ENO policy direction to have clear translation to the level of zoning bylaw details. To make the overlay operations accountable. ▪ Request for more clarification regarding the overlay's equity in targeting specific areas.
<p>Neighbourhood Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To preserve neighborhood character, single-family post-war and post-modern Campeau and Minto homes from the 60s are suggested to remain. Additional units can be added within existing buildings or through new buildings on the same plot. The



	<p>rules should prioritize expanding larger buildings on the same lot instead of demolishing the charming single-family homes that define our neighborhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request to encourage the use of the abundant lands available to builders for intensification so as to not disrupt or dismantle the character of existing neighbourhoods. ▪ Suggestion to remove Subzones (A to F) to reduce complexity. ▪ Worry that the proposed increase of heights for student housing will create a student ghetto out of otherwise very pleasant family/student/senior hybrid areas. ▪ Concern that intensification might lead to changing community profiles which will impact quality of life, community services, safety, and the number of by-law violations. ▪ Support for building more low-rise apartment blocks as this would increase housing availability and increase the diversity of our neighbours.
<p>Limited Retail in Neighbourhoods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favour of proposals to permit limited retail and services in residential dominated zones that will hopefully facilitate the transformation of car-dependent suburbs into more liveable, walkable, family friendly spaces, and improve access to food and services even in urban and semi-urban areas. ▪ Request to limit any retail use spillover into existing greenspace, especially where these areas border the trails, which are a valuable resource for our community. ▪ In favor of allowing small commercial zoning in several areas of our neighborhood. I believe spaces along Hunt Club, Conroy, and Hawthorne are ideal for this kind of development, as well as many areas around Lorry Greenberg, including near the library and at intersections like Johnston and Pike. ▪ Concerns over the removal of restrictions on ground-floor retail and office uses along main streets.
<p>Neighbourhood Built Form Standards (Setbacks, Height, Design Standards, Yard Requirements)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request to restore the R1 11 m height allowed in the Existing Zoning By-law rather than the 8.5 m proposed ▪ Suggestion that if there is a height difference of more than 0.5 m, the setback should be increased. A suggested wording: "In situations where a property grade is more than 0.5 m higher than the abutting residential property, the minimum setback shall be increased by 0.1 m for each 0.5 height differential in the grade."



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worry that changing the placement and size of openings affects the functionality and feel of a space and could negatively impact the end-user. ▪ Suggestion to not regulate built-form standards through zoning, as these might create hurdles during the development process. ▪ Call for the reconsideration of setbacks, height transitions, and design standards to ensure compatibility with existing built form.
<p>Neighbourhood Site Functional Standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request to ensure adding permeable surfaces to encourage water and sewage drainage.
<p>Comments about Specific Neighbourhoods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N1 zoning mandates a minimum lot width of 18 meters. This presents a problem, as the majority of the lots in Stittsville are approximately 100 feet (just over 30 meters) wide. When subdivided, these lots yield a width of around 15 meters, meaning that any new lot creation would still require a Minor Variance to proceed. ▪ Suggestion to make adjustments to zoning designations in properties along North River Road and Donald Street to better reflect their character and needs. ▪ Call for adjustments to zoning designations for areas near Carling Avenue to preserve unique "Mainstreet" characteristics.
<p>Heritage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about the removal of the Heritage Overlay and its impact on architectural heritage. ▪ Request to require heritage permits for applications for alterations of any building or for the construction of a new infill building within a Heritage Conservation District. ▪ Suggestion to require that relevant heritage policies must continue to apply where a property is within a Heritage Conservation District ▪ Requests for tailored approaches to zoning near heritage districts and areas like the Rideau Canal. ▪ Recommendation to explicitly include Section 41.2 (2) of the Ontario Heritage Act in the new zoning by-law text.
<p>By-law Wording</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for the simplification of zoning regulations. ▪ Desire for clearer definitions and consistent terminology to ensure accessibility for residents



--	--

2) Mixed-Use Zones

Theme	As We Heard It
Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarification request regarding the Official Plan Hub designation extending north of Heron Rd. ▪ Worry that concentrating density on hubs & corridors will result in putting the poorest people along noisy polluted streets. ▪ Permission for non-residential uses in a residential zone might lead to daytime-only uses that leave the streets emptier in evenings, and/or nighttime uses that disturb residents of what is currently a very quiet residential neighbourhood. Both of these might take away from the family-friendly nature of neighbourhoods. ▪ Commercial spaces are already struggling on Mainstreets throughout downtown and the inner-city, as indicated by vacant storefronts. Expanding the amount of commercial space might dilute this further. ▪ Ottawa has a severe shortage of cafes on quiet streets, and the new zoning seems to restrict those uses onto busy roads. ▪ Preference that S.313 restricts production based on %ABV or explicitly outlawed distillation rather than restricting to specific product classes. Suggestion also that production from fruit and grain were not restricted. For example, wine making from grapes often uses the grape skins to impart tannins to the wine. ▪ Concern about blurred distinctions between restaurant, bar, and nightclub use definitions, potentially escalating social issues. Suggestion to maintain separate definitions for clarity. ▪ Request to maintain amenity space requirements and enforce communal spaces in multi-unit developments.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for density around transit hubs and more mixed-use zoning. ▪ Concern about infrastructure and transportation capacity not supporting proposed densities near transit hubs. ▪ Request that Hub zones be much larger around transit stations to help boost ridership and tax revenue. Proposal to expand this to a 3km radius, which is a typical 10-minute bike ride, with height maximums between 20-30 stories.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendation to zone all properties along Bank St. as MS(2) to allow growth along this existing Main Street (currently there are sections that are N5 or N3). ▪ Suggestion to zone properties that are adjacent to existing greenspace (FAC or GRN) as N4 or N5 to take advantage of the less existing neighbors and adjacent greenspace. This includes the Greenboro pathway and properties along Sable Ridge Dr near Conroy Pit.
<p>Missing Middle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changing the zoning to a Mainstreet zoning might lead to replacement of family-friendly housing with apartment dwellings likely to be composed primarily of one-bedroom housing which is not suitable for families. ▪ Calls for zoning provisions that encourage diverse housing types in mixed-use zones.
<p>Setbacks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarification needed on setbacks for detached garages and carports.
<p>Height</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns about height increases near minor corridors and heritage districts. ▪ 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. ▪ Request that larger scale buildings should be restricted to areas away from where they will cast shadows on parks. ▪ Recommendation to increase minimum height of 2 storeys along minor and major corridors (which was set by the Official Plan). ▪ Worry that imposing height transitions in certain cases might arbitrarily decrease the potential density/number of units a developer could place on certain lots or force them to build higher than they would have if the height transition weren't a factor. ▪ Suggestion to remove provisions allowing tall buildings close to the city limits. There are 4 notable spots in Kanata/Stittsville, and 3 in the Barrhaven area. ▪ Objections to nine-storey heights in heritage districts, suggesting four-storey limits. ▪ Support for transitions between high/mid-rise buildings and adjacent low-rise areas.



3) Parking

Theme	As We Heard It
Parking Minimums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced parking minimums can cause parking shortage and increased traffic congestion. ▪ 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. ▪ Bringing to attention the impracticality of walking and cycling for seniors as well as in areas without sidewalks. ▪ Low- and middle-income seniors and families need cars to access affordable stores, as corner stores can be expensive. ▪ Support for removal of parking minimums. ▪ Concern that street will be littered with parked vehicles that belong to people with limited driveways and garages, which will make streets become dangerous for kids and pedestrians. ▪ Worry that removal of parking minimums will lead to lack of sufficient parking spaces in new developments. This will lead to reduced comfort for walking in the streets due to traffic issues and on-street parking. ▪ Disagree with the widespread legalization of pre-2007 front-yard parking spaces
Parking Maximums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.
Trailer Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ concerns regarding Section 612 and table 612A in regards to parking a recreational camper (travel trailer) on a driveway
Driveways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most single family home neighbourhoods in Ottawa (those with 50'x100' lots) have many grandfathered double lane driveways, many of which have the car parked in front of the house building not in front of a garage. Could we let the rest of the plots also have double lane driveways?



4) Environmental Concerns

Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Zoning could be one of the more powerful tools we have to combat Climate Change. ▪ The need for provisions that help with the climate change emergency. Suggestion to require new flat roof buildings and/or commercial, industrial, institutional and office to be equipped with solar covering at least 80% of the surface. Request to add the provision to permit agrivoltaics in any agricultural zone.
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasis on requiring sufficient space for a mature canopy tree to flourish in the rear yard of every lot. ▪ Rear yard setbacks are proposed to be reduced from 30% to 25%. Projections into the rear yard are also permitted as well as accessory structures. Together this may result in insufficient space to support tree growth. ▪ Support for the protection of trees while maintaining maximum built volume through space swapping (alternative setbacks to support the retention of distinctive trees) ▪ Call to take measures to protect existing mature trees and parkland, and provide sufficient greenspace to enable recreation areas, clean air, refuge from heat zones, and absorption of run-off. ▪ Request for explicit tree protection measures, including front-yard setback averaging and buried hydro wires.

5) Rural Zones

Rural Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request for consideration of setting limits on the size of Utility installations in Rural Countryside Zones. ▪ Noting that the Official Plan has several policies for rural severance which are not reflected in the zoning by-law, which is causing some confusion from a practical perspective and seems to be missed in some circumstances. ▪ The size of a lot should be an important factor in zoning regulations. Call that zoning by-laws, such as those limiting the number of dwelling units or the number of animals permitted, should be adjusted based on property size.
-------------	--



- There is a pressing need to permit additional uses on large rural properties and to redefine "Home-based business" to allow for a broader range of activities, such as educational and recreational programs, small-scale retail, agricultural tourism, and more.
- Call for consideration of allowing subdivisions on large properties within already-established communities.
- Call for more effort to increase housing affordability and availability in rural areas. The focus is solely on increasing housing availability in urban areas and primarily around public transit.
- The proposed rural zoning By-law carries forward the provisions of the current By-law which limits a rural RU zoned property to one additional dwelling unit which can either be in the same building or as a separate coach house (but requires connection to either the principal dwelling well or septic system). We propose to increase this to allow up to 3 dwelling units on a single property (1 primary and 2 additional attached or detached) and removal of the requirement for a coach house to be connected to the well and septic system of the primary dwelling. Removing this restriction would allow further separation of the dwelling units allowing more privacy and less concentrated environmental impact.
- The "units per hectare" calculation from the proposed Neighbourhood zones could be adjusted for the rural zones and require a minimum of an additional 0.8 hectares of property for each additional dwelling unit, i.e to have 3 dwelling units on a single property the property would have to be a minimum of 2.4 hectares. This would in effect have the same environmental impact as three separate 0.8 hectare lots.
- Suggestion to put additional well and septic setback provisions to address detached dwellings having their own well and septic. This would ensure sufficient separation from the well and septic of the other dwelling unit(s).
- Provisions could be put in place limiting the size of any additional detached dwelling units to some percentage of the primary dwelling unit which would further limit the density impact.
- Increased rural housing density has minimal impact on already over-stretched city coffers. As the property owner is fronting the entire cost of housing expansion including water and septic systems, there is minimal cost increases to the city, and arguably increased tax revenue through higher property valuations.



6) Industrial Zones

<p>Industrial Zones</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Industrial zones are a huge potential for redevelopment and should be adjusted to allow the incorporation of low rental units, and emergency refuge needs to be folded into future industrial zones. Of course, some space will have to be reserved/allocated for personal use such as car parking, recreation and parkland. ▪ Suggestion that new build and replacement warehousing facilities should be mandated to have at least two high bay levels that would double future availabilities and thereby increase overall industrial capacity.
--------------------------------	--

7) Public Consultation

<p>Public Consultation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request for more accessible and transparent communication regarding zoning reforms. ▪ Lack of clarity about the definition of ‘dwelling unit’ use, and reduction in defined residential uses in neighbourhoods. ▪ Request for clarification on the turnover rate of 1% to understand its scope and meaning. ▪ Appreciation for the information session accessible presentations and knowledgeable staff who provided precise answers and specific references to documentation. ▪ Suggestion to include more visuals in public consultations presentations. For example, I find it hard to envision what a certain number of units on a certain sized lot would look like. ▪ Suggestion to go street by street in a presentation and explain how the new rules would impact each neighborhood. More localized discussions could be used effectively to better inform of the real impact of the changes.. ▪ Appreciation for ward-specific breakout rooms in public consultation sessions. ▪ Schematic building level/height categories are slightly difficult to differentiate when studying the map layout. It would help to add another distinguishing feature rather than purely colour shades. I would suggest insert symbols within the shaded areas, perhaps showing the number of stories.
-----------------------------------	---



- Reminder that while community associations are organized and vocal, others may not participate due to the demands of daily life, resulting in a range of perspectives being less represented.
- Request for more readily available information about the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, including detailed criteria for its application in the new by-law. It would also be helpful if this overlay could be made more accessible in the Draft 2 accompanying maps. The new draft and its overlays also deserve more visibility in GeoOttawa.
- Call to involve residents in testing zoning documents for clarity.
- Concern about extensive documentation being challenging for laypeople to navigate.
- Suggestion to include for the boundaries of the Heritage Conservation Districts in the new zoning and geoOttawa maps for educational purposes, clarity and planning process efficacy



Appendix VI

Advertising Outcomes

Print Advertising

- **Daily Newspapers:**
 - **Ottawa Citizen and Ottawa Sun:** 2 insertions with a readership of 173,000 and 73,000 per insertion, respectively.
- **Community Newspapers:**
 - **Barrhaven Independent:** 2 insertions with a readership of 17,625 per insertion.
 - **Centretown Buzz:** 2 insertions with a readership of 20,000 per insertion.
 - **Community Voice (Kanata North, Kanata South, Stittsville/Richmond):** 2 insertions with a combined readership of 63,000.
 - **Glebe Report:** 2 insertions with a readership of 7,500 per insertion.
 - **L'Orléanais:** 2 insertions with a readership of 44,000 per insertion.
 - **Kitchissippi Times:** 2 insertions with a readership of 18,000 per insertion.
 - **Lowertown Echo:** 2 insertions with a readership of 7,150 per insertion.
 - **Mainstreeter:** 2 insertions with a readership of 5,000 per insertion.
 - **Messenger:** 2 insertions with a readership of 10,000 per insertion.
 - **New Edinburgh News:** 2 insertions with a readership of 3,200 per insertion.
 - **Orleans Star:** 2 insertions with a readership of 44,000 per insertion.
 - **OSCAR:** 2 insertions with a readership of 4,300 per insertion.
 - **Riverview Park Review:** 2 insertions with a readership of 4,600 per insertion.
 - **VISTAS:** 2 insertions with a readership of 12,000 per insertion.
 - **Perspectives Vanier:** 2 insertions with a readership of 8,000 per insertion.

Two insertions were provided in each community newspaper for a total of 260,000 per round of insertions.

Online Advertising

- **LeDroit (online only):**
 - June session: 50,000 impressions, 500 clicks.
 - Additional session: 40,000 impressions, 500 clicks.
- **Google Display Ads:**
 - June session: 100,122 impressions, 189 clicks.



- Additional session: 176,080 impressions, 276 clicks.
- **Kijiji:**
 - No specific metrics provided.

Social Media Advertising

- **Facebook/Instagram (English/French 80/20):**
 - June session: 700,548 impressions, 813 clicks.
 - Geotargeted virtual open houses: 689,984 impressions and 1,737 clicks.
 - Additional session: 1,096,149 impressions, 2,131 clicks.
 - Multilingual session (Arabic, Chinese, Spanish): 310,973 impressions, 2,747 clicks.
- **LinkedIn:**
 - June session: 127,776 impressions, 100 clicks.
 - Geotargeted virtual open houses: 210 impressions, nine clicks.
 - Additional session: 216,835 impressions, 139 clicks.

City of Ottawa Advertising

- **Bus Exteriors:** 25 buses with an estimated reach of 18,096,000.
- **Bus Interiors:** 650 buses with an estimated reach of 39,845,000.
- **Digital Transit Shelters:** 27 locations with an estimated reach of 9,285,800.
- **Digital Screens (City Hall, Recreation Facilities, OPL):** These are in various locations, and no specific reach metrics are provided.
- **Digital Billboards:** 6 locations with an estimated reach of 501,900.
- **Posters (OPL locations):** 25 locations with no specific reach metrics provided.