

**DECISION
CONSENT/SEVERANCE**

Date of Decision:	June 13, 2025
Panel:	3 - Rural
File No:	D08-01-25/B-00104
Application:	Consent under section 53 of the <i>Planning Act</i>
Applicants:	J. Brook and J. Ethier
Property Address:	108 Inniskillin Drive
Ward:	5 - West Carleton-March
Legal Description:	Lot 16, Plan 4M-299, Geographic Township of West Carleton
Zoning:	V1M
Zoning By-law:	2008-250
Heard:	June 3, 2025, in person and by videoconference

APPLICANTS' PROPOSAL AND PURPOSE OF THE APPLICATION

- [1] The Applicants want to subdivide their property into two separate parcels of land for future development. The existing dwelling will remain.

CONSENT REQUIRED

- [2] The Applicants seek the Committee's consent to sever land.
- [3] The severed land is shown on the sketch plan filed with the application and will have a frontage of 20 metres, an irregular lot depth and a lot area of 890 square metres. This parcel will be known municipally as 101 Craig Lea Drive.
- [4] The retained land shown on said sketch will have a frontage of 49.8 metres, an irregular lot depth, and a lot area of 15,331 square metres. This parcel is known municipally as 108 Inniskillin Drive and contains an existing detached dwelling.
- [5] The property is not the subject of any other current application under the *Planning Act*.

PUBLIC HEARING

Oral Submissions Summary

- [6] J. Brook, Applicant, provided a brief overview of the application and confirmed agreement with the requested conditions of provisional consent.
- [7] City Planner Luke Teeft stated he had no concerns with the application.
- [8] The Committee also heard oral submissions from the following individual:
- K. McKenzie, resident, highlighted concerns regarding reduced lot sizes and confusion over the changing lot lines proposed by the application.
- [9] In response to Mr. McKenzie's concerns, Mr. Brook indicated that he would submit a survey by a qualified surveyor to confirm the lot measurements as a condition of provisional consent.
- [10] Following the public hearing, the Committee reserved its decision.

DECISION AND REASONS OF THE COMMITTEE: APPLICATION GRANTED

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).

Evidence

[12] 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:

- Application and supporting documents, including cover letter, plans, parcel register abstract, tree information, photo of the posted sign, and a sign posting declaration.

- City Planning Report received May 30, 2025, with no concerns; received May 29, 2025, with no concerns.
- Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority email dated May 27, 2025, with no objections.
- Hydro Ottawa email dated May 25, 2025, with no comments.

Effect of Submissions on Decision

- [13] The Committee considered all written and oral submissions relating to the application in making its decision and granted the application.
- [14] The Committee notes that the City's Planning Report raises "no concerns" regarding the application, subject to the requested conditions agreed to by the Applicants.
- [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 proposal 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] **THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT ORDERS** that the application is granted and the provisional consent is to be given, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A to this decision.

"Terence Otto"
TERENCE OTTO
VICE-CHAIR

"Gary Duncan"
GARY DUNCAN
MEMBER

Absent
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 **June 13, 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 July 3, 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. 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, 4th 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 APPLICANTS

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
cofa@ottawa.ca
613-580-2436



Comité de dérogation
Ville d'Ottawa
Ottawa.ca/Comitedederogation
cded@ottawa.ca
613-580-2436

APPENDIX A

1. 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.
2. That the Owner(s) provide evidence, to the satisfaction of the **Manager of the Development Review All Wards Branch, or their designate**, 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.
3. 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 the Development Review All Wards Branch, or their designate**.
4. That the Owner(s) enter into an Agreement with the City, at the expense of the Owner(s), which is to be registered on title to deal with the following covenant/notice that shall run with the land and bind future owners on subsequent transfers:
 "The property is located next to lands that have an existing source of environmental noise (Glenncastle Drive and Inniskillin Drive) and may therefore be subject to noise and other activities associated with these roadways."
 The Committee shall be provided a copy of the Agreement and written confirmation from **City Legal Services** that it has been registered on title.
5. Pursuant to clause 51 (25) (c) of the Planning Act and Schedule C16 of the City's Official Plan, the Owner conveys to the City, at no cost to the City, an unencumbered road widening across the complete Inniskillin Drive frontage of the lands, measuring 13 meters from the existing centerline of pavement/the abutting right-of-way. The exact widening must be determined by legal survey. The Owner shall provide a reference plan for registration, indicating the widening, to the **City Surveyor** for review and approval prior to its deposit in the Land Registry Office. Such reference plan must be tied to the Horizontal Control Network in accordance with the municipal requirements and guidelines for referencing legal surveys. The Owner(s) must provide to the **City Surveyor** a copy of the Committee of Adjustment Decision and a draft Reference Plan that sets out the required widening. The

Committee shall be provided written confirmation from **City Legal Services** that the transfer of the widening to the City has been registered. All costs shall be borne by the Owner.

6. The Owner conveys to the City, at no cost to the City, an unencumbered corner triangle, measuring 3m x 9m with the longer dimension along the collector road, at the intersection of Inniskillin Drive and Craig Lea Dr. The corner triangle must be determined by legal survey. The Owner shall provide a reference plan for registration, indicating the corner triangle, to the **City Surveyor** for review and approval prior to its deposit in the Land Registry Office. Such reference plan must be tied to the Horizontal Control Network in accordance with the municipal requirements and guidelines for referencing legal surveys. The Owner(s) must provide to the City Surveyor a copy of the Committee of Adjustment Decision and a draft Reference Plan that sets out the required corner sight triangle. The Committee shall be provided written confirmation from **City Legal Services** that the transfer of the corner sight triangle to the City has been registered. All costs shall be borne by the Owner.
7. That the Owner/Applicant(s) provide a tree planting plan, prepared to the satisfaction of the **Manager of the Development Review All-Wards Branch, or their designate(s)**, showing the location(s) and species or ultimate size of at least one new tree (50 mm caliper) on the new lot, in addition to any compensation trees required under the Tree Protection By-law.
8. That the Owner(s) satisfy the **Chief Building Official, or their designate**, by providing design drawings or other documentation prepared by a qualified designer, that as a result of the proposed severance the existing building on lot 108 shall comply with the Ontario Building Code, O. Reg. 332/12 as amended, in regards to the limiting distance along the newly created south rear property line. If necessary, a building permit shall be obtained from Building Code Services for any required alterations.
9. 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.
10. 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 a severance for which the Consent is required.