

This document is presented in the language it was provided.  
Ce document est présenté dans la langue dans laquelle il a été fourni.

May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Secretary Treasurer  
Committee of Adjustment  
City of Ottawa  
101 CentrepoinTE Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K2G 5K7

**Committee of Adjustment  
Received | Reçu le**  
**2025-05-13**  
City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa  
**Comité de dérogation**

**RE: Minor Variance Application for 2441 Cléroux**

Please find attached a Minor Variance application for 2441 Cléroux Crescent in the Blackburn Hamlet neighbourhood of the City of Ottawa (referred to in this letter as the "Subject Property").

I am writing on behalf of my clients, who own the Subject Property. My clients wish to demolish the existing single storey dwelling and build a 10-unit 12.5m tall building with 4 living levels, one being a shallow basement.

Figure 1: Proposed Development



The site is constrained by Hydro wires, therefore the building is setback much further from the street than the zoning requirement.

The proposed design includes a side driveway to rear yard parking with garbage stored inside the building. The large tree in the Subject Property's front yard will be retained and the cedar hedges surrounding the properties will be removed.

The Subject Property falls within the R4Z zoning with exception 1335. We are requesting variances to reduce the side yard setback and for the number of parking spaces and rear yard area used for parking.

## Side Yard Setback

The required 5m side yard setback in the exception zone is unusual and not appropriate for the proposed development.

Exception 1335 (outlined in blue in the figure below), which includes the 5m side yard setback requirement, was incorporated into the 2008 consolidated By-Law. This part of Cléroux Crescent is one of the oldest roads and parts of Blackburn Hamlet before it became developed. The lots are irregularly shaped and of varying sizes, several being on severe 45 degree angles to the road. The buildings on these lots are positioned at various angles and locations, some having no side yard setbacks at all.

Figure 2: Site Context



## Number of Parking Spaces

Zoning requires 1.2 tenant parking spaces per dwelling unit (in this case 12 spaces) and 0.2 parking spaces per dwelling unit for visitors (in this case 2 spaces), for a total of 14 parking spaces required for the Subject Property. We are proposing a 1:1 ratio of parking spaces per dwelling unit. We are requesting a variance to reduce the required number of tenant parking spaces to 8, instead of 12, for a total of 10 parking spaces provided. The site is in close walking proximity to Innes Road which is served by rapid bus transit (route 25) connecting Orleans and Blackburn Hamlet with the Blair LRT station. Additionally, route 24 nearby will connect with the future Montreal Road LRT station.

The proposed units are not large and are designed to attract a variety of rental tenants with different needs who may be on more moderate incomes, and likely not owning a car. Therefore, a 1:1 ratio of parking is appropriate.

## Rear Yard Area Used for Parking

The proposed rear yard area used for parking would exceed the maximum 70% permitted in the By-Law. We are requesting a variance to increase this to 78%. The building is over twice as far from the street as required due to hydro wires and clearances, providing much more landscaping in the front. The proposed rear yard is almost three times the minimum size required in the By-Law.

Within the minimum required rear yard area, only 61% is proposed for parking, comfortably meeting the By-Law intent.

## The Four Tests

Is this proposal...	Side Yard Setback	Parking Spaces	Rear Yard Area for Parking
minor in nature?	Yes. The proposed setbacks would go unnoticed as the setbacks in the surrounding context vary from lot to lot.	Yes. The Subject Property is close to transit and the target demographic are tenants with less car ownership. Most tenants would still own parking and there would be visitor parking.	Yes. 8% is a small reduction for this requirement. The front yard is more than twice as large (126% larger) than required and will be largely landscaped.

appropriate and desirable for this neighbourhood?	Yes. The setbacks of the surrounding context vary with a wide variety of lot shapes and building locations. The proposed setback matches the neighbour to the west.	Yes. The Subject Property is close to rapid transit and the proposal allows for a mix of tenants who own cars and those who don't.	Yes. A small shift of landscaping from the rear to the front to accommodate parking and overhead wires is appropriate and desirable for the neighbourhood.
in keeping with purpose and intent of zoning By-law?	Yes. A 1.5m setback meets By-Law intent to compliment existing setbacks and patterns to the west. A 3m eastern setback reflects the zoning intent for greater setbacks in an area of diverse lot and building form.	Yes. As in other sections of the By-Law, less parking is desirable wherever achievable (ex. R4U zones), as in this case with car-less households living near transit.	Yes. The zoning intent is to provide a balance of site needs including for landscaping, amenity, and parking.
in keeping with purpose and intent of Official Plan?	Yes. The Official Plan encourages intensification. The proposed design would allow for 10 units to replace 1.	Yes. The Official Plan encourages the use of public transit, active transportation, and a transition to a walking culture.	Yes. The Official Plan contemplates intensification together with landscaping, but without direction regarding front vs. rear landscaping.

If you require any further information, please email my file lead [jonathan@rjhill.ca](mailto:jonathan@rjhill.ca) or call me directly at **613-853-2822**.

Regards,



Rosaline J. Hill  
*BES, B.Arch., OAA,  
MRAIC, RPP, OPPI*