

**DECISION****CONSENT/SEVERANCE AND MINOR VARIANCE**

**Date of Decision:** May 16, 2025  
**Panel:** 3 - Rural  
**File Nos.:** D08-01-25/B-00032 & D08-01-25/B-00033  
D08-02-25/A-00047, D08-02-25/A-00048 &  
D08-02-25/A-00049  
**Applications:** Consent under section 53 of the *Planning Act*  
Minor Variances under section 45 of the *Planning Act*  
**Applicant:** Metric Homes (Ottawa) Inc.  
**Property Address:** 55 Henry Goulburn Way  
**Ward:** 6 - Stittsville  
**Legal Description:** Lot 44, Registered Plan 635  
**Zoning:** R1D  
**Zoning By-law:** 2008-250  
**Heard:** May 6, 2025, in person and by videoconference

**APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL AND PURPOSE OF THE APPLICATIONS**

- [1] The Applicant wants to subdivide their property into three separate parcels of land for future development, as shown on plans filed with the Committee. The existing dwelling will be demolished.

**CONSENT REQUIRED:**

- [2] The Applicant seeks the Committee of Adjustment's consent to sever land.
- [3] The property is shown as Parts 1 to 3 on a draft 4R-plan filed with the applications and the separate parcels will be as follows:

*Table 1 Proposed Parcels*

File No.	Frontage	Depth	Area	Part No.	Municipal Address
B-00032	15.24 metres	30.48 metres	464 sq. metres	1	55 Henry Goulburn Way

B-00033	15.24 metres	30.48 metres	464 sq. metres	2	57 Henry Goulburn Way
Retained	18.13 metres	30.48 metres	545 sq. metres	3	59 Henry Goulburn Way

- [4] Approval of these applications will have the effect of creating separate parcels of land that will not be in conformity with the requirements of the Zoning By-law and therefore, minor variance applications (File Nos. D08-02-25/A-00047 to D08-02-25/A-00049) have been filed and will be heard concurrently with these applications.

## REQUESTED VARIANCES

- [5] The Applicant seeks the Committee of Adjustment's authorization for minor variances from the Zoning By-law as follows:

### **A-00047: 55 Henry Goulburn Way, Part 1 on 4R-Plan, proposed detached dwelling:**

- a) To permit a reduced lot width of 15.24 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot width of 20 metres.
- b) To permit a reduced lot area of 464 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 600 square metres.
- c) To permit a reduced front yard setback of 5 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 6 metres.
- d) To permit a reduced rear yard setback of 6 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 9 metres.
- e) To permit an increased lot coverage of 54%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 40%.

### **A-00048: 57 Henry Goulburn Way, Part 2 on 4R-Plan, proposed detached dwelling:**

- f) To permit a reduced lot width of 15.24 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot width of 20 metres.
- g) To permit a reduced lot area of 464 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 600 square metres.
- h) To permit a reduced front yard setback of 5 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 6 metres.

- i) To permit a reduced rear yard setback of 6 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 9 metres.
- j) To permit an increased lot coverage of 54%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 40%.

**A-00049: 59 Henry Goulburn Way, Part 3 on 4R-Plan, proposed detached dwelling:**

- k) To permit a reduced lot width of 18.13 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot width of 20 metres.
- l) To permit a reduced lot area of 545 square metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot area of 600 square metres.
- m) To permit a reduced front yard setback of 5 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 6 metres.
- n) To permit a reduced rear yard setback of 6 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 9 metres.
- o) To permit an increased lot coverage of 50%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 40%.
- p) To permit reduced corner side yard setback of 3 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum corner side yard setback of 4.5 metres.

- [6] The property is not the subject of any other current application under the *Planning Act*.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- [7] On April 15, 2025, the hearing of the applications was adjourned to allow the Applicant time to address City staff's concerns and provide additional information regarding on the justification for the removal of several trees on site.

**Oral Submissions Summary**

- [8] Responding to the Panel's question, Connor Gallagher, agent for the Applicant, confirmed that he was in agreement with all the City's requested conditions of provisional consent.
- [9] City Planner Nivethini Jekku Einkaran was also present.

**Evidence**

- [10] Evidence considered by the Committee included all oral submissions made at the hearing, as highlighted above, and the following written submissions held on file

with the Secretary-Treasurer and available from the Committee Coordinator upon request:

- Applications and supporting documents, including cover letter, plans, tree information, parcel abstract, photo of the posted sign, and a sign posting declaration.
- City Planning Report received May 1, 2025, with no concerns; received April 10, 2025, requesting an adjournment.
- Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority email received April 14, 2025, with no objections.
- Hydro One email received April 27, 2025, with no comments.
- Hydro Ottawa email received April 4, 2025, with no comments.
- J. Fazzino, resident, email received April 23, 2025, with comments.
- R. J. White, resident, email received April 11, 2025, opposed; received May 1, 2025, with comments.
- D. Begin and B. Herres, residents, email received April 11, 2025, opposed.
- P. and C. Moore, residents, email received April 14, 2025, opposed.
- G. and F. Antonisse, residents, email received April 14, 2025, opposed.
- R. and C. Hedden, residents, email received April 14, 2025, opposed.

#### **DECISION AND REASONS OF THE COMMITTEE:**

- **CONSENT APPLICATIONS GRANTED**
- **MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATIONS GRANTED**

#### **Consent Application Must Satisfy Statutory Tests**

[11] Under the *Planning Act*, the Committee has the power to grant a consent if it is satisfied that a plan of subdivision of the land is not necessary for the proper and orderly development of the municipality. Also, the Committee must be satisfied that an application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and has regard for matters of provincial interest under section 2 of the Act, as well as the following criteria set out in subsection 51(24):

## Criteria

(24) In considering a draft plan of subdivision, regard shall be had, among other matters, to the health, safety, convenience, accessibility for persons with disabilities and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the municipality and to,

- a) the effect of development of the proposed subdivision on matters of provincial interest as referred to in section 2;
- b) whether the proposed subdivision is premature or in the public interest;
- c) whether the plan conforms to the official plan and adjacent plans of subdivision, if any;
- d) the suitability of the land for the purposes for which it is to be subdivided;
- d.1) if any affordable housing units are being proposed, the suitability of the proposed units for affordable housing;
- e) the number, width, location and proposed grades and elevations of highways, and the adequacy of them, and the highways linking the highways in the proposed subdivision with the established highway system in the vicinity and the adequacy of them;
- f) the dimensions and shapes of the proposed lots;
- g) the restrictions or proposed restrictions, if any, on the land proposed to be subdivided or the buildings and structures proposed to be erected on it and the restrictions, if any, on adjoining land;
- h) conservation of natural resources and flood control;
- i) the adequacy of utilities and municipal services;
- j) the adequacy of school sites;
- k) the area of land, if any, within the proposed subdivision that, exclusive of highways, is to be conveyed or dedicated for public purposes;
- l) the extent to which the plan's design optimizes the available supply, means of supplying, efficient use and conservation of energy; and
- m) the interrelationship between the design of the proposed plan of subdivision and site plan control matters relating to any development on the land, if the land is also located within a site plan control area designated under subsection 41 (2) of this Act or subsection 114 (2) of the City of Toronto Act,

2006. 1994, c. 23, s. 30; 2001, c. 32, s. 31 (2); 2006, c. 23, s. 22 (3, 4);  
2016, c. 25, Sched. 4, s. 8 (2).

### **Minor Variance Application Must Satisfy Statutory Four-Part Test**

- [12] The Committee has the power to authorize a minor variance from the provisions of the Zoning By-law if, in its opinion, the application meets all four requirements under subsection 45(1) of the *Planning Act*. It requires consideration of whether the variance is minor, is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure, and whether the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law are maintained.

### **Effect of Submissions on Decision**

- [13] The Committee of Adjustment considered all written and oral submissions relating to the applications in making its decision and granted the applications.
- [14] The Committee notes that the City's Planning Report raises "no concerns" regarding the consent applications, subject to the requested conditions agreed to by the Applicant's agent.
- [15] Based on the evidence, the Committee is satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement that promotes efficient land use and development as well as intensification and redevelopment within built-up areas, based on local conditions.
- [16] The Committee is also satisfied that the consent application has adequate regard to matters of provincial interest, including the orderly development of safe and healthy communities; the appropriate location of growth and development; and the protection of public health and safety.
- [17] Additionally, the Committee is satisfied that a plan of subdivision of the land is not necessary for the proper and orderly development of the municipality.
- [18] Moreover, the Committee is satisfied that the proposal has adequate regard for the criteria specified under subsection 51(24) of the *Planning Act* and is in the public interest.
- [19] Based on the evidence, the Committee is also satisfied that the requested variances meet all four requirements under subsection 45(1) of the *Planning Act*.
- [20] The Committee notes that the City's Planning Report raises "no concerns" regarding the minor variance applications, highlighting that "Staff do not have concerns with reduced lot width, lot area and front yard setback variances as there is sufficient space for tree planting".

- [21] The Committee also notes that no compelling was presented that the variances would result in any unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring properties.
- [22] Considering the circumstances, the Committee finds that, because the proposal fits well in the area, the requested variances are, from a planning and public interest point of view, desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure on the property, and relative to the neighbouring lands.
- [23] The Committee also finds that the requested variances maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan because the proposal respects the character of the neighbourhood.
- [24] In addition, the Committee finds that the requested variances maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law because the proposal represents orderly development that is compatible with the surrounding area.
- [25] Moreover, the Committee finds that the requested variances, both individually and cumulatively, are minor because they will not create any unacceptable adverse impact on abutting properties or the neighbourhood in general.
- [26] **THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT THEREFORE ORDERS** that the consent applications are granted and the provisional consent is to be given, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A to this decision.
- [27] **THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT ALSO ORDERS** that the requested minor variance applications are granted and the variances to the Zoning By-law are authorized, **subject to** the location and size of the proposed construction being in accordance with the site plan filed and Committee of Adjustment date stamped March 13, 2025, and the elevations drawings filed and Committee of Adjustment date-stamped March 5, 2025, as they relate to the requested variances.

*"Terence Otto"*  
TERENCE OTTO  
VICE-CHAIR

*"Gary Duncan"*  
GARY DUNCAN  
MEMBER

*"Beth Henderson"*  
BETH HENDERSON  
MEMBER

*"Martin Vervoort"*  
MARTIN VERVOORT  
MEMBER

*"Jocelyn Chandler"*  
JOCELYN CHANDLER  
MEMBER

I certify this is a true copy of the Decision of the Committee of Adjustment of the City of Ottawa, dated **May 16, 2025**

*“Michel Bellemare”*

MICHEL BELLEMARE  
SECRETARY-TREASURER

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

To appeal this decision to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), a completed appeal form and the filing fee must be submitted via one of the below options and must be received no later than **3:00 p.m. on June 5, 2025**.

- **OLT E-FILE SERVICE** – An appeal can be filed online through the [E-File Portal](#). First-time users will need to register for a My Ontario Account. Select [Ottawa (City): Committee of Adjustment] as the Approval Authority. To complete the appeal, fill in all the required fields and provide the filing fee by credit card.
- **BY EMAIL** - Appeal packages can be submitted by email to [cofa@ottawa.ca](mailto:cofa@ottawa.ca). The appeal form is available on the OLT website at [Forms | Ontario Land Tribunal](#). Please indicate on the appeal form that payment will be made by credit card.
- **IN PERSON** – Appeal packages can be delivered to the Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment, 101 CentrepoinTE Drive, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, Ottawa, Ontario, K2G 5K7. The appeal form is available on the OLT website at [Forms | Ontario Land Tribunal](#). In person payment can be made by certified cheque or money order made payable to the Ontario Minister of Finance, or by credit card. Please indicate on the appeal form if you wish to pay by credit card.

Please note only one of the above options needs to be completed. If your preferred method of appeal is not available at the time of filing, the appeal must be filed with one of the other two options.

The Ontario Land Tribunal has established a filing fee of \$400.00 per type of application with an additional filing fee of \$25.00 for each secondary application.

Only the applicant, the Minister or a specified person or public body that has an interest in the matter may appeal the decision to the Ontario Land Tribunal. A “specified person” does not include an individual or a community association.

There are no provisions for the Committee of Adjustment or the Ontario Land



Tribunal to extend the statutory deadline to file an appeal. If the deadline is not met, the OLT does not have the authority to hold a hearing to consider your appeal.

If you have any questions about the appeal process, please visit [File an Appeal | Ontario Land Tribunal](#)

## NOTICE TO APPLICANT(S)

Should a Development Agreement be required, such request should be initiated 30 working days prior to lapsing date of the consent and should include all required documentation including that related to transfers, easements, and postponements, and all approved technical studies. If you do not fulfill the conditions of provisional consent within the two-year period, the *Planning Act* provides that your application “shall be deemed to be refused”.

*Ce document est également offert en français.*

**Committee of Adjustment**  
City of Ottawa  
[Ottawa.ca/CommitteeofAdjustment](http://Ottawa.ca/CommitteeofAdjustment)  
[cofa@ottawa.ca](mailto:cofa@ottawa.ca)  
613-580-2436



**Comité de dérogation**  
Ville d'Ottawa  
[Ottawa.ca/Comitedederoation](http://Ottawa.ca/Comitedederoation)  
[cded@ottawa.ca](mailto:cded@ottawa.ca)  
613-580-2436

## APPENDIX A

1. The Owner(s) provide evidence that the accompanying minor variance applications (D08-02-25/A-00047, D08-02-25/A-00048 & D08-02-25/A-00049) have been approved, with all levels of appeal exhausted.
2. That the Owner(s) provide evidence that payment has been made to the City of Ottawa for cash-in-lieu of the conveyance of land for park or other public recreational purposes, plus applicable appraisal costs. The value of land otherwise required to be conveyed shall be determined by the City of Ottawa in accordance with the provisions of By-Law No. 2022-280, as amended. Information regarding the appraisal process can be obtained by contacting the Planner.
3. That the Owner(s) provide evidence to the satisfaction of the **Chief Building Official, or designate**, that the existing detached dwelling have been demolished or relocated under the authority of a building permit.
4. That the Owner/Applicant(s) provide a Grading and Servicing Plan/Site Plan with the proposed elements/structures (driveways, retaining walls, projections, etc.) designed and located based on the least impact to protected trees and tree cover, as well as a revised Tree Information Report reflecting these changes to the satisfaction of the **Manager of the relevant Branch within the Planning, Development and Building Services Department, or their designate(s)**.
5. That the Owner/Applicant(s) provide the **Manager of the relevant Branch within the Planning, Development and Building Services Department, or their designate(s)** a signed letter of permission from the owner(s) of identified adjacent or boundary tree(s), for the proposed removal or operations impacting the tree(s). A tree removal permit cannot be issued without the permission of all owners of a tree, and the development plan must be revised to allow for the retention and protection of the adjacent or boundary trees if this letter cannot be produced.
6. That the Owner/Applicant(s) provide a tree planting plan, prepared to the satisfaction of the **Manager of the relevant Branch within the Planning, Development and Building Services Department, or their designate(s)**, showing the location(s) and species or ultimate size of at least one new tree (50 mm caliper) per lot, in addition to any compensation trees required under the Tree Protection By-law.
7. That the Owner(s) provide evidence, to the satisfaction of the **Manager of Development Review All Wards, Planning, Development and Building Services Department**, that each existing parcel has its own independent storm, sanitary and water services connected to City infrastructure and that these services do not cross the proposed severance line. If they do cross or are not independent, the Owner(s) will be required, at their own cost, to relocate the existing services or construct new services from the City sewers/watermain. Notice shall be provided in writing to the Committee from the Department confirming this condition has been fulfilled.

8. The Owner(s) shall:

prepare a Noise Control Study, in compliance with the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Review All Wards Branch within Planning, Development and Building Services Department, or their designate. The Owner(s) shall enter into an agreement with the City, at the expense of the Owner(s), that requires the Owner(s) to implement any noise control attenuation measures recommended in the approved study. The Agreement shall also deal with any covenants/notices, recommended in the approved study, that shall run with the land and bind future owners on subsequent transfers, warning purchasers and/or tenants of expected noise levels due to the existing source of environmental noise (arterial, highway, airport, etc.). The Committee shall be provided a copy of the Agreement and written confirmation from **City Legal Services** that it has been registered on title.

**or**

Design the dwelling units with the provision for adding central air conditioning at the occupant's discretion and enter into an Agreement with the City, at the expense of the Owner, which is to be registered on title to deal with the covenants/ notices that shall run with the land and bind future owners on subsequent transfers, warning purchasers and/or tenants of expected noise levels due to the existing source of environmental noise. The Committee requires a copy of the Agreement and written confirmation from **City Legal Services** that it has been registered on title. The following two conditions will be included in the above-noted Agreement:

Notices-on-Title respecting noise:

- i "The Purchaser/Lessee for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns acknowledges being advised that this dwelling unit has been fitted with a forced air heating system and the ducting, etc. was sized to accommodate central air conditioning. Installation of central air conditioning by the Purchaser/Lessee will allow windows and exterior doors to remain closed, thereby ensuring that the indoor sound levels are within the City of Ottawa's and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's noise criteria;" and
  - ii "The Purchaser/Lessee for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns acknowledges being advised that noise levels due to increasing roadway traffic may be of concern, occasionally interfering with some activities of the dwelling occupants as the outdoor sound level exceeds the City of Ottawa's and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's noise criteria."
9. That the Owner(s) provide proof that a grading and drainage plan, prepared by a qualified Civil Engineer, licensed in the Province of Ontario, an Ontario Land Surveyor or a Certified Engineering Technologist, delineating the existing and proposed grades for both the severed and retained lands has been provided to the

satisfaction of the Manager of Development Review All Wards Branch within Planning, Development and Building Services Department, or their designate.

10. That the Owner(s) enter into a Resurfacing Agreement with the City, to the satisfaction of the **Program Manager, Right of Way Branch within the Planning, Development and Building Services Department, or their designate**, and provide financial security in accordance with the Road Activity By-law, as amended, to install an asphalt overlay over the roadway surface of Henry Goulburn Way, fronting the subject lands, to the limits shown on the approved Site Servicing Plan. Where the approved Site Servicing Plan demonstrates the resurfacing is not required, based on the City's Road Cut Resurfacing Policy, the Manager of Development Review All Wards Branch within Planning, Development and Building Services Department, or their designate, shall deem this condition satisfied.
11. That the Owner(s) file with the Committee a copy of the registered Reference Plan prepared by an Ontario Land Surveyor registered in the Province of Ontario, and signed by the Registrar, **confirming the frontage and area of the severed land. If the Registered Plan does not indicate the lot area, a letter from the Surveyor confirming the area is required.** The Registered Reference Plan must conform substantially to the Draft Reference Plan filed with the Application for Consent.
12. That upon completion of the above conditions, and **within the two-year period outlined above**, the Owner(s) file with the Committee, the "electronic registration in preparation documents" for the conveyance for which the Consent is required.