



As We Heard It Report – In-Person Open Houses

As part of the consultation on the final draft of the new Zoning By-law, two in-person information sessions were held on September 23 at the EY Centre and on September 29 at the Ottawa Event and Conference Centre. Around 150 residents were in attendance at these two sessions.

The sessions featured informative easels presenting information on the final draft and some of the changes introduced since Draft 2. Attendees were then encouraged to ask questions and share their thoughts with members of the New Zoning By-law team at roundtables on the following topics:

- Neighbourhood Zones
- Mixed-Use Zones
- Rural Zones
- Understanding Your Property – Zone Code Look Up

This As-We-Heard-It report provides an overview of the themes covered during the roundtable discussions and submitted through comment cards during the session.

There was some support for increasing building heights and density permissions in residential areas, in order to accommodate higher levels of development. Some attendees expressed concern with potential implications, such as parking and traffic impacts, due to increased density in neighbourhoods as a result of new zoning changes and the removal of minimum parking space rates.

Attendees generally supported introducing a greater mix of uses in many areas, including small commercial spaces in and around established neighbourhoods to increase walkability and convenience.

Many attendees were interested in the new zoning permissions for their properties and the development potential following approval of the new Zoning By-law.



Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for 15-minute neighbourhoods, including more mixed-use buildings in all areas. ▪ Support for increased density in Neighbourhood Zones. ▪ Support for additional increased height permissions citywide in both residential and mixed-use zones. ▪ Concern with increased density in existing low-density neighbourhoods.
Neighbourhood Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for further simplifying residential zones through the new Neighbourhood zone framework. ▪ Support for increasing the maximum building height in all N4 zones to 14.5 metres. ▪ Support for small commercial uses in residential areas.
Mixed-Use Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the use of the angular plane to regulate maximum building height. ▪ Support for increased commercial permissions in and around neighbourhoods.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern with the removal of minimum parking rates and the impacts on street parking. ▪ Support for removal of parking minimums citywide.



As We Heard It Report – Virtual Open Houses

As part of the consultation for the final draft of the new Zoning By-law two virtual open houses were held on September 17 and September 25, from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. The virtual sessions began with a presentation outlining the project to date, explaining the updated provisions in the final draft of the new Zoning By-law, and discussing the next steps for the project, including consideration by Joint Committee and Council in late 2025 and early 2026.

There was support for increasing housing opportunities and access to retail uses in neighbourhoods, including suburban communities. Some attendees shared concerns with the compatibility of new development in existing communities. Attendees were interested in confirming the height transition requirements for high-rise buildings and where these provisions apply. Several attendees were interested in learning about the post-approval process, such as the transition provisions between the current and new Zoning By-law and impacts on proposed developments.



Virtual Open House - September 17, 2025

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emphasizing the need for sufficient infrastructure to support planned growth and development.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for organic, gentle density over large scale, high-rise development. ▪ Support for increased density in suburban communities.
Neighbourhood Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarification on new permissions and maximum unit counts in specific N Zones. ▪ Seeking clarification on the meaning of grade and the measurement of maximum permitted heights. ▪ Clarifying the minimum level of density permitted citywide. ▪ Concern with the compatibility of new development in existing neighbourhoods.
15-Minute Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for introducing commercial uses into Neighbourhoods, including in suburban areas. ▪ Emphasizing the need to balance density and other priorities, such as trees.
Mixed-Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirming in which zones the angular plane is applied. ▪ Clarifying building requirements, such as permitted uses and glazing requirements, in Mainstreet Zones.
Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wondering how residents can best share their feedback.
Administrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirming the transition provisions for in-stream applications. ▪ Confirming the ability to maintain legal non-complying uses.



Questions and Comments

<p>Question:</p>	<p>The city faces a significant and growing infrastructure liability to maintain and replace existing services. How does the proposed zoning by-law improve the city's long-term fiscal health, particularly in our lowest-density suburbs where tax revenues fail to cover lifecycle infrastructure costs?</p> <p>If we approve this bylaw without enabling more productive land use in low density areas, what is the city's plan for addressing the inevitable and escalating infrastructure deficit in 20-30 years?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The growth, maintenance and operation of the City's infrastructure is governed by the Infrastructure Master Plan, which is intended to support the growth and density goals of the Official Plan. Development charges are fees on the construction of new developments to help pay for growth-related capital infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>While these processes are related to overall growth and development in the City, they are outside the scope of the new Zoning By-law. Ultimately, the plan for how these funds are allocated is decided through the annual budget process.</p>
<p>Question:</p>	<p>The Official Plan calls for intensification. How can we meet those targets without a city-wide plan to continually and organically densify over time, which will allow neighbourhoods to evolve organically rather than relying solely on disruptive, large-scale redevelopment?</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p>The new Zoning By-law will allow development permissions more broadly citywide which can allow corridors and neighbourhoods to grow organically. This is in-line with Provincial legislation and the Official Plan. Secondary plans provide further guidance on how growth develops in strategic areas such as around transit stations or along transit lines.</p>



Question:	<p>The city has official goals for creating walkable "15-minute neighbourhoods" and reducing citywide car dependency. How does the proposed by-law proactively enable this vision while continuing to prohibit low-impact commercial uses—like a corner store or a small café—in most of our least dense residential zones and historically residential areas?</p> <p>To reduce city-wide car dependency, residents need access to amenities without driving. Is there a reason not to allow small-scale, neighbourhood-serving commerce within our historically residential areas?</p>
Response:	<p>A new Minor Corridor zone has been developed, based on Official Plan policies, which will permit commercial uses near and through neighbourhoods. Additional commercial uses are permitted at-grade in N5 and N6 zones. The home-based business provisions have been expanded to increase permissions for small commercial uses in Neighbourhood zones.</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. 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 and can inform potential future studies.</p>

Question:	<p>What is the rationale for primarily relying on limited transit-oriented development in the east end when we could allow more broadly increased density everywhere by eliminating the most restrictive zones?</p>
Response:	<p>The location of higher density zones and the related distribution of new density permissions flow from the designations in the Official Plan, such as the location of Hub zones or the application of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay.</p> <p>Density has been increased citywide through the implementation of Official Plan policies and designations, including in all Neighbourhood zones (formerly Residential Zones) by permitting at least 4 units on all serviced residential lots in the urban area. Higher densities and heights through high-rise buildings in Hub and Mainstreet Zones play a different role than increased commercial permissions, densities and heights permitted in Minor Corridor Zones and the increased gentle residential density both in the interiors of Neighbourhoods and those areas subject to the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay.</p>



Question:	Can you elaborate more on the unit count per lot and per building in the N2 Zone. There was mention of 4 units per lot and 6 units per building. I read somewhere that as of right we would be allowed 4 units per lot. For example, if an N2 lot was divided into two lots with a semi-detached 3 storey home, could it include 6 or 8 units.
Response:	<p>The intent for the new Neighbourhood Zones is to permit at least 4 units on all serviced residential lots in the urban area. This direction is represented in the N1 Zone.</p> <p>In the N2 zone, the density permission is for 6 units per building. In the case of a N2-zone property developed in the form of a semi-detached dwelling, 3 units would be permitted on each half of the semi for a maximum of 6 units in the building.</p>

Question:	In the Kanata Town Centre Hub zone, there is no evidence of parks, parkettes, or setbacks wide enough to allow canopy trees. This is not appropriate for 15-minute neighbourhoods, for children and seniors. Will this be changed?
Response:	<p>Kanata Town Centre is subject to a secondary plan, which establishes the land uses for most of the lands in the Hub 2 Zone in this area, including locations where parks have been planned.</p> <p>The setbacks in this area are largely carried forward from the existing Mixed Use Centre zoning in this area. Through the Official Plan, Hubs are directed to be located around transit stations and to be the densest areas in the city with the greatest scale of development. The provisions in this zone are attempting to balance this direction with other priorities, such as trees and pedestrian experience.</p>



Question:	<p>Can you explain the timelines again as to when the new zoning by law will be in place? Will zones without appeals have the new by-law implemented immediately after Council vote? Or, implementation will be suspended for the entire city until the last appeal clears?</p>
Response:	<p>Following a Council vote on the approval of the new Zoning By-law on January 28, 2026, the By-law will be updated with the impacts of all amending motions and directions. This process should take approximately six weeks. The By-law will then be brought to Council for its third reading and enactment mid-March 2026. The appeal period will begin within ten days of the date of enactment, so it's estimated the appeal period will begin late in March and will be over by the end of April 2026.</p> <p>Following the appeal period, a pre-hearing with the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) will be scheduled and the City will ask the OLT to bring the unappealed sections of the new by-law into effect. It's estimated the earliest timing for a pre-hearing would be six weeks after the end of the appeal period, so the earliest date for the pre-hearing could be June 2026.</p> <p>The most restrictive provisions from the current Zoning By-law 2008-250 and the new Zoning By-law 2026-50 will apply for provisions that are appealed, and until the unappealed sections of the new by-law are declared to be in effect by the OLT.</p> <p>Updates on the status of the provisions in the new Zoning By-law will continue to be posted on the Engage Ottawa page, so interested stakeholders can find the most up to date information there.</p>

Question:	<p>When we speak about building heights, we need to understand where heights are measured from. In my opinion, building height should be measured from "existing average grade" or "established grade" as is the base for height measurement in Toronto. As you know, a measurement from "grade" can be manipulated so as to reduce the building height measurement - for example, installing raised walkways and ramps in the interior side yard. Can you please explain why staff are proposing measuring height from "grade" and why the definition of "Building Height" has changed in the final draft to read the vertical distance between grade instead of the Draft 2 "average grade"? Does this mean building height can be measured from any "grade" elevation at the perimeter of the building?</p>
Response:	<p>In the final draft, the intent is still to measure building height from average grade. The change to the building height definition is technical in nature; "grade" is a defined term and staff are introducing one consistent definition of grade.</p> <p>With respect to grade changes, applicants are still subject to submission and approval of grading and drainage plans.</p>



Question:	<p>What can I do to help the city enable my suburban community, that has limited density and almost no mixed-use buildings, to modernize? Where I live over 95% of the land is zoned N1 and won't really change quickly at all. What opportunities are there to continue to evolve beyond this bylaw?</p> <p>Has there been any considerations to how the zoning by-law can grow with the city over the next 15-20 years? As has been stated tonight, there's no way to tell what areas will attract the most development - is there a way for an area to go from N3 to N4 if demand calls for it?</p>
Response:	<p>Planning policy and regulations are not static documents and there is potential for changes to these policies, especially considering the changing provincial planning landscape.</p> <p>The City's Official Plan (OP) informs the Zoning By-law, so any changes to the Official Plan could lead to updates to zoning provisions. After an Official Plan update, a zoning by-law is reviewed to determine whether a comprehensive update is required.</p>

Question:	<p>How will the Zoning By-law handle properties where a specific use is no longer permitted but the use is existing?</p>
Response:	<p>In developing the new By-law, staff have generally tried to avoid rendering existing uses non-conforming by removing permissions for an existing use. Some exceptions to this include the removal of uses now prohibited by the new Official Plan, such as some automobile-oriented uses in certain designations.</p> <p>Section 103 sets out the provisions for legally non-conforming uses.</p>



Question:	Regarding transition provisions: can in progress applications, such as Site Plan Control or Zoning By-law Amendment applications, 'pick and choose' which by-law provisions to apply or are they restricted to the by-law which was originally applied under (the current Zoning By-law 2008-250 or the new ZBL)?
Response:	<p>Applications will be reviewed against the Zoning By-law in effect at the time of their submission. For applications deemed complete under Zoning By-law 2008-250, applicants have five years to develop under the permissions granted through subsequent approval. For applications that are approved under Zoning By-law 2008-250, applicants have three years to develop under the permissions granted through the approval.</p> <p>For applications that are made following enactment of the new Zoning By-law, the most restrictive provisions from the current Zoning By-law 2008-250 and the new Zoning By-law 2026-50 will apply for provisions that are appealed, and until the unappealed sections of the new by-law are declared to be in effect by the OLT.</p>

Question:	Why has the angular height requirement been removed from Minor Corridor Zones but remained for Mainstreet Zones?
Response:	The angular plane is still applicable to Minor Corridors, but only really impacts the CM1 – Minor Corridor 1 Zone in the Downtown transect. The four- and six-storey buildings in other transects would fit below the angular plane so it doesn't function as a limit.

Question:	Would a new zoning override any existing Restrictive covenants linked to specific properties? For instance, restricting the lot to be severed or what can be built in the new zone.
Response:	Restrictive covenants are agreements on title and these remain in effect. Zoning does not override or undo obligations that are registered on title.



Question:	The city of Toronto recently voted down the option of sixplexes on most suburban properties. Why is Ottawa not limiting them to certain areas as Toronto has?
Response:	Six-unit residential buildings are not proposed to be permitted as-of-right citywide. The number of units permitted in the N1 Zone, the lowest density Neighbourhood Zone, is four.

Question:	<p>I understand the need for increased density but am concerned that, both in the document and in the earlier slides, the building footprint & height envelope appears to allow for very limited side yard setbacks & the height creates massing that is not consistent with the neighborhood.</p> <p>Have you given any consideration to the effect on value of properties now that a sixplex could be built next to a single-detached home?</p>
Response:	<p>The Official Plan provides direction encouraging missing middle built forms, which includes generally low-rise multi-unit development with three-16 units in neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The minimum lot width and minimum setback requirements regulated by the N-Zone subzones, as presented in Table 801B, were created to ensure new development maintains consistent massing with adjacent buildings and responds to the existing conditions in a neighbourhood.</p> <p>While property values are not within the scope of the Zoning By-law, there is no evidence to suggest that zoning changes, development applications or new construction adversely impact property values.</p>
Question:	Is it factual that 16 units could be built on a severed 100' X 100' lot as of right in the N1 through N4 zones?
Response:	The N1, N2, and N3 Zones regulate the maximum density for a site through number of units per square metre of lot area and through number of units permitted per building. If a large lot in an N1, N2 or N3 Zone is severed, it becomes two lots and all provisions in Sections 801 and 802 regarding Neighbourhood Zones still apply to each lot, including the maximum density per lot area and per building.



Question:	Can a building in a Mainstreet Zone be 100% for residential?
Response:	Yes, completely residential buildings are permitted and there is no requirement for a mix of uses in new developments in the Mainstreet 1 or 2 Zones.

Question:	Is the glass requirement removed for a 100% residential building in a Mainstreet Zone? Is the height requirement maintained?
Response:	The glazing requirement for the ground floor facades of buildings in the Mainstreet 1 and 2 Zones still exists, including for residential use buildings. The total glazing requirement has been reduced, compared to similar provisions in the current Zoning By-law 2008-250. In residential buildings, these street-adjacent spaces are generally used for lobbies or amenity spaces.

Question:	Is there a way for residents to engage specifically with city staff working on zoning about their specific areas (especially as it relates to the -c suffix and its limited use)?
Response:	The best way to reach the project team is sending comments for our staff consideration to the project inbox at NewZoning@ottawa.ca . Hearing direct feedback, especially on local issues such as the distribution and use of the -c suffix to permit small commercial uses in Neighbourhoods, is useful in developing the By-law.

Question:	At this point in the engagement, what can communities comment on and change? Can you provide a little bit of context on the processes and how engagement from community is now weighed or used?
Response:	The 28-day circulation and comment period ran from September 28-October 3. During this period, staff reviewed all comments received and implemented changes to both zoning provisions and the Zoning Map based on stakeholder, resident and industry feedback.



Virtual Open House - September 25, 2025

Discussion Topics

Theme	As We Heard It
Neighbourhood Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity regarding development on non-complying lots. ▪ Clarifying the distribution of permitted heights and application of Official Plan policies. ▪ Seeking clarity on existing and new height permissions.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on the implications of the removal of the heritage overlay.
Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for additional density in suburban areas.
Parks and Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarifying how parks and recreation facilities are impacted by the new Zoning By-law. ▪ Support for ensuring sufficient soil requirements to plant new trees.
Mixed-Use Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarification on tower separation distances. ▪ Seeking clarity on the purpose of the height transition strategy and why it is necessary.
Affordable Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how affordability can be incorporated into the new Zoning By-law. ▪ Clarifying the relationship between the new Zoning By-law and inclusionary zoning.
Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarifying what type of feedback staff are considering at this point in the project. ▪ Concern with the definition of group homes and how this use presents in Neighbourhoods.



Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seeking clarity on how other housing initiatives impact the new Zoning By-law, such as the Housing Innovation Task Force report and Official Plan Amendment 46. ▪ Clarifying when applications can be submitted under the new Zoning By-law. ▪ Clarifying how the Zoning By-law operates in the context of other policies, such as secondary plans.
Stormwater Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarifying how these new provisions will be implemented and what strategies could be required.

Questions and Comments

Question:	Will the Housing Acceleration Plan lead to more changes to the new Zoning By-law?
Response:	Following Council's adoption Housing Innovation Task Force Report and Housing Acceleration Plan on October 8, staff are reviewing the final draft and assessing if additional changes may be required for Committee and Council consideration in January.

Question:	What happens if the Minister does not accept all changes in Official Plan (OP) Amendment 46 made for Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) consistency? Will the draft Zoning By-law be amended before January 2026?
Response:	Depending on the timing of the ministry's decision, staff will immediately review the details and present them as staff recommended changes for Council consideration in the December report. If the timing goes beyond the approval of the new Zoning By-law, staff will do a Zoning By-law amendment as quickly as possible to ensure the By-law is consistent with the OP and the PPS.



Question:	I own a 15m x 30m piece of land, which is zoned as N3E in the final draft zoning by-law. The by-law states that the minimum lot width (frontage) for this zone is 18 meters. What does this mean for my project? Do I need to apply to the Committee of Adjustment to rezone the property to N3D, which allows a reduced minimum frontage of 15 meters?
Response:	If the lot is existing and does not require a severance, there is still the ability to develop, but the smaller lot size will permit fewer units than a larger, zoning-compliant lot. For example, in the N3 zone 2.2 units per 100 square metres of lot area are permitted, up to a maximum of 10 units. With a smaller lot frontage, the full 10 units, as allowed in the main N3 zone, may not be permitted as the maximum unit count is restricted by the lot area.

Question:	How will the loss of the heritage overlay be mitigated for properties outside Heritage Conservation Districts and formerly on the Heritage Register, that will now lose protection?
Response:	Under the new Official Plan and the current legislation, the ability to regulate heritage consideration through zoning is restricted to Part 5 of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> . While staff have removed the heritage overlay, designated properties are still subject to the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> when changes to these sites is proposed.

Question:	Can a request for changes in definitions be made at this time?
Response:	Staff will consider comments on all aspects of the final draft during and after the 28-day circulation period.



Question:	How is the city reconciling the fact that turnover for homes is going to be fairly low, especially considering the minor increases to suburban heights, which doesn't really leave much room for the actual units we want in those areas? How are these car-dependent areas going to actually change when the footprints of the homes don't allow for intensification?
Response:	The turnover rate is the citywide rate of redevelopment and the citywide average is about 1%. Many factors go into decisions to redevelop a property. It's likely that turnover rates will be relatively low in the suburban transect but not due to height maximums. Neighbourhood zones need to be consistent with the Official Plan for low-rise built forms, which is generally up to 3 storeys within Neighbourhoods and 4 storeys in Evolving Neighbourhoods and where appropriate. The Zoning By-law is implementing the decisions made for built-form, including heights in the Official Plan.

Question:	Have the parking provisions in the by-law been changed to allow front-yard parking in City View where there is no garage so that rear yard parking will not be required? Back yard parking should not be allowed, due to the antiquated rural ditch system in the area.
Response:	The new Zoning By-law aims to be more flexible regarding front yard parking and provisions are provided in Section 604.

Question:	How are open space, recreation & parkland affected by the new Zoning By-law?
Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law has a suite of zones for open space, recreation and park areas in Part 11. Greenbelt and environment protection zones can be found in Part 14.</p> <p>Zoning does not establish the location of parks or open space, nor does it require the provision of parks with new development. Park locations are established in the City's Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan. When new parks are built by the city, we then apply appropriate zoning.</p>



Question:	How does staff plan to mandate trees and the room to grow in soft landscaping requirements?
Response:	Under the Planning Act, a zoning by-law cannot directly require trees. However, the new Zoning By-law has introduced provisions that ensure there is enough space for trees to grow and mature through soft landscaping requirements. Neighbourhood zones regulate soft landscaping in the front and rear yard. These provisions have been put in place to support Official Plan policies to increase the urban tree canopy.

Question:	Why was the minimum soil depth of 1-1.5 metres removed in the final draft and language was changed from “soil volume per cubic metres” to “surface area per square metres” for soft landscaping requirements above underground structures and in parking lots? There needs to be enough soil depth for optimal conditions for tree growth.
Response:	There are difficulties with regulating and enforcing a soil volume requirement through a zoning by-law, so the surface area requirement ensures that there is still a mandated landscaped area that promotes tree planting and growth. The final draft also reinstates the requirement for a below-grade setback from an underground portion of a building from a rear lot line. In conjunction, these requirements are intended to support sufficient soil volume for tree growth in lieu of a specific requirement for soil volume.

Question:	Regarding the height transitions for high-rise buildings, setbacks are described for distance from low-rise and mid-rise buildings. What are the setbacks for high-rise buildings up to 30 storeys?
Response:	Setbacks between high-rise buildings are described in the tower separation requirements in Section 207 of the new Zoning By-law, which are mostly carried over from the current Zoning By-law with some updates. These requirements vary by area of the city per Schedule A12 . Tower separations are generally meant to ensure around 20 metres between towers, with some distances as low as 15 metres or as high as 23 metres.



Question:	<p>Will the City revise zoning definitions to clearly separate group homes from detention/correctional facilities? In Beacon Hill, one facility operated by the Youth Services Bureau (YSB) is effectively running a correctional facility in a residential area, creating daily issues such as 9–12 staff cars overcrowding the street, frequent parking by-law infractions, and stress for neighbours — highlighting why this distinction is critical.</p>
Response:	<p>Staff are of the opinion the current definitions in the final draft of the new Zoning By-law align with the intent of legislation and policies for the settings in which youth custody facilities are contemplated.</p> <p>The Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) is a Canadian law that regulates the youth justice system. With respect to the questions of whether “open” and “secure” custody facilities ought to be treated the same, they are technical terms with different purposes in the youth criminal justice system.</p> <p>Under the YCJA, a “youth custody facility” is defined as a facility designated for the placement of young persons and, if so designated, includes a community residential centre, a child care institution and a group home.</p> <p>The current definition of group home is consistent with the federal and provincial approaches to youth custody and supervision to treat places of open custody separately from correctional facilities. A correctional facility is not a permitted use in any zone (a zoning by-law amendment would be required before this use can be established), while a group home is permitted in zones where a residential use is permitted and is subject to the provisions of the zone in which it is located. The permissions for group homes are intended to provide a wide variety of locations and choices for where these much-needed facilities can be located, including open custody facilities in a group home setting for children aged 12 to 17 years old in a neighbourhood setting.</p>

Question:	<p>How does affordability fit into the new Zoning By-law?</p>
Response:	<p>Under the Planning Act, zoning by-laws are only permitted to regulate permitted land uses, built form (setbacks, height, density), and parking and loading facilities. A zoning by-law can’t differentiate between housing tenure (such as ownership, rental, coop), price, or affordability. For example, the new Zoning By-law can permit a dwelling unit, but it cannot make that dwelling unit conditional on whether it is owned or rented, or a high-priced mansion or non-profit affordable dwelling. The City has an affordable housing service area that works with non-profit builders to construct dwellings that are oriented to the affordable market, but the new Zoning By-law itself does not regulate the market orientation of a dwelling.</p>



Question:	Will inclusive affordable housing in high-rises close to transit stations be developed?
Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law cannot mandate the provision or location of affordable housing. However, there are many different avenues by which affordable housing can be built, and some programs or mechanisms may have links between transit and affordable housing.</p> <p>Inclusionary zoning is a mechanism to mandate affordable housing units in developments near transit stations. This program is still being studied by the City and is out of scope of the new Zoning By-law.</p>

Question:	When can an application under the new Zoning By-law be submitted?
Response:	<p>City Council is expected to approve the By-law in January 2026, after which all motions will be applied and the final By-law will receive administrative approval in Q1 2026. It will take time for all provisions to be enacted and applied and for appeals to be resolved, so following Council approval there will be two Zoning By-laws in effect. If an application were to be submitted during this time, it would have to comply with both by-laws. Staff will provide resources to understand which by-laws apply and from which an application would require relief, if there is an application during this time.</p>



Question:	<p>Regarding the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, the OP cites – “Where no overlay is applied, the area shall continue to build out in its current context as set out in the corresponding transect area and designation policies, allowing for development to continue in the current form and function of the area.”</p> <p>Since the N1 & N2 zones are generally not located in the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, these “interior” areas are expected to evolve and intensify within their current form and function context – i.e. within the typical 8.5 m maximum building height limit. Why is this OP policy direction not being implemented and why has the maximum building height in Table 801A been changed from 8.5 m to 11 m in N1 and N2 zones?</p>
Response:	<p>A maximum building height of 8.5 metres was not universal in the current zoning by-law for R1 and R2 zones. Many existing zones already permit building heights of 11 metres or 3 storeys. The Official Plan also generally directs 3 storeys in the N zones. The application does vary based on other policy direction and secondary plans that direct lower heights.</p>

Question:	<p>If a secondary plan contradicts the new Zoning By-law, then does the Zoning By-law take precedent over and above a secondary plan?</p>
Response:	<p>The new Zoning By-law will implement secondary plan policies where possible, including prescribed heights and permitted uses. When the new Zoning By-law is passed, if the zoning of a property differs from the secondary plan (for example the plan allows greater heights, subject to a planning application) the property owner of the property would only be able to build to the approved zoning without submitting a development application.</p>

Question:	<p>What type of stormwater management strategies will be required on small infill developments (i.e. long semis with secondary dwellings)? Have the costs of these requirements been considered?</p>
Response:	<p>Staff are developing a toolkit featuring different on-site storage options depending on the specific context in order to assist builders with this new requirement. This work is being done in consultation with builders as the costs for these options have been raised by builders.</p>



Question:	Early in the presentation, Carol mentioned that a “gentle density” is being applied to low-rise residential areas, and that 4-storey limits are applied only if the existing zoning already had that provision. This doesn’t appear to be accurate. I live in an area with the revised N2C Zoning which allows up to 11 m (39’), or 4 storeys. The previous zoning allowed for just 3 storeys. Can this be corrected?
Response:	In terms of converting metres to storeys, 11 metres generally equates to 3 storeys and 14.5 generally equates to 4 storeys.

Question:	What is the rationale for the height transition strategy?
Response:	<p>The Official Plan provides direction to permit high-rise development on lots where it can be accommodated, subject to an appropriate transition. Specific direction on how this transition is to be regulated through the new Zoning By-law is not provided, so the height transition strategy as presented in the final draft was developed following several iterations.</p> <p>Mainstreet-zoned streets are linear and most likely abut a Neighbourhood Zone in the rear yard. The height transition diagrams reflect the transition that is required between a new high-rise building on a Mainstreet and existing low-rise neighbourhood.</p>



Joint Consultation with the Federation of Citizen’s Associations and the Greater Ottawa Home Builders Association - Final Draft

Since Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, the City has met regularly with representatives from the Federation of Citizens’ Associations (FCA) and the Greater Ottawa Home Builders Association (GOHBA) through a joint working group. The group met twice to discuss the Final Draft, once to discuss Neighbourhood Zones and once on Mixed-Use Zones, with additional time for broader discussion.

Topics discussed included:

- Livability considerations such as infrastructure, transportation options, landscaping, and tree planting;
- Zoning parameters for modular and prefabricated housing;
- Implementation details for transition provisions and secondary plan policies;
- Parking strategies, including communal and short-term bicycle parking; and
- Height and density considerations in Mainstreet and Neighbourhood zones.

Consultation with the Federation of Citizens’ Associations

The Zoning team attended the quarterly meeting of the Federation of Citizens’ Associations (FCA) Working Group with City’s Planning, Development and Building Services Department on September 15, 2025. The meeting provided an opportunity for members to discuss the Final Draft of the new Zoning By-law and raise questions related to implementation and next steps.

Discussion topics included:

- The process and timelines for providing feedback following the release of the Final Draft;
- Clarification of the approval process through Joint Committee and Council;
- Public awareness of proposed zoning changes and their relationship to the Official Plan;



- Communal parking provisions and their application within Neighbourhood Zones; and
- The transition of existing exceptions and schedules into the new By-law.



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 and inquiries received from September 8, 2025 to October 5, 2025. Approximately 190 detailed submissions were sent to the project inbox during that time period.

Index

	Topic	Page No.
1	Neighbourhood Zones	2
2	Mixed-Use Zones	6
3	Parking	7
4	Environmental Concerns	7
5	Rural Zones	8
6	Public Consultation	8



Overview of Topics

1) Neighbourhood Zones

Theme	As We Heard It
<p>Density and Intensification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request reconsideration of low-density zoning to allow higher-density residential or mixed-use development that aligns with infrastructure, transit access, and proximity to major institutions. ▪ Recommend that increased building heights (e.g., 4-storey on residential streets, 6-storey on commercial streets) include deeply affordable units to ensure developments support housing affordability goals and prevent displacement of smaller, more affordable homes. ▪ Request that properties be considered for upzoning to ensure consistency with surrounding areas, maintain fairness, and minimize potential negative impacts from nearby taller development. ▪ Concern that existing low-density zoning and aging infrastructure (narrow streets, minimal sidewalks, outdated stormwater and wastewater systems, limited transit, and scarce local amenities) cannot support higher-density residential or mixed-use development; requests that any intensification be aligned with infrastructure capacity, transit access, and proximity to major institutions to maintain livability. ▪ Concern that existing parkland and recreational facilities are insufficient for increased population; heavy weekend use of nearby parks and limited local amenities (e.g., outdoor rinks and pool, distant indoor facilities) could reduce livability if additional residents are added without expanding recreational capacity. ▪ Concern that limited and inconsistent transit service forces reliance on private vehicles for daily errands, commuting, and access to schools or retail, reducing overall mobility and livability. ▪ Concern that new development near high-speed arterial roads could create safety risks for vehicles, pedestrians, and transit users due to increased traffic and the lack of safe crossings in certain locations.



<p>Missing Middle Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports city-wide intensification and upzoning to make housing more affordable, enable “missing middle” development, and prevent resident exodus. ▪ Suggestion to reduce minimum lot width for vertically attached units to 5.2 m to support missing middle housing, improve affordability, and provide development flexibility while balancing resident preferences and intensification goals.
<p>Neighbourhood Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about preserving neighbourhood character, including the charm of treed streets and open sky views, in areas outside heritage conservation districts; residents are wary of tall or full-lot-width buildings that could alter this character.
<p>Neighbourhood Built Form Standards (Setbacks, Height, Design Standards, Yard Requirements)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requests that zoning designations and height permissions be aligned with surrounding context and approved secondary plans, including allowing increased heights where adjacent properties already permit taller buildings. ▪ Request for policy and technical justification for 20 m maximum building height, including Provincial Policy Statement, Official Plan, Secondary Plan, urban design guidelines, and technical studies (shadow, view, heritage, servicing, transportation, compatibility). ▪ Request to limit heights to 3 storeys (not 4) to maintain liveability, sunlight access, and scale. ▪ Concerns that the Draft 3 definitions of “grade” and “average grade” are ambiguous; recommends measuring building heights from the existing average grade prior to any site alterations, with clear rules for all roof types (flat, mansard, hip, gable, shed, gambrel) to ensure consistency with the intended context. ▪ Concerns that Draft 3’s 11 m height limit for low-rise N1/N2 neighbourhoods exceeds the typical 2½-storey context of their neighbourhood, and recommends reverting to 8.5 m to preserve neighbourhood character. ▪ Concern that current minimum front and exterior side yard setbacks are too small to support medium or large trees, safe pedestrian/cyclist movement, and environmental objectives; request for revisions to allow adequate setbacks (up to 6 m) and proper soft landscaping.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requests that zoning setbacks for small urban parks be reduced or adapted—allowing functional elements like play equipment, shade shelters, and picnic areas—so that standard large setbacks do not consume most of the park or conflict with neighborhood character. ▪ Clarification is needed for projections above building heights and into yards including rooftop amenities, solar canopies, trellises, water towers, sports equipment, and bridges with clear illustrations, tables, and minimum setbacks (e.g., 0.6 m) to ensure compliance and maintain livability.
<p>By-law Wording</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desire for clearer definitions and consistent terminology to ensure accessibility for residents
<p>15-Minute Neighbourhoods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for zoning changes that would enable 15-minute neighbourhoods with daily needs accessible within walking distance. ▪ Calls to allow 3-storey buildings across all Neighbourhood Zones to support gentle density and increase housing supply. ▪ Support for allowing mixed-use development in neighbourhood zones to create more walkable, complete communities. ▪ Request to permit essential services (such as pharmacies) within residential areas for convenience and to reduce car dependency. ▪ Belief that zoning reform enabling walkable neighbourhoods will help reduce urban sprawl and protect surrounding green spaces. ▪ Desire for neighbourhoods that are more affordable and livable while retaining the character of Ottawa’s communities.
<p>Accessibility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requests new residential zoning to promote accessibility for people with disabilities, emphasizing that including wheelchair-accessible homes from the start improves social inclusion, visitor access, and long-term cost-efficiency.



<p>Comments Concerning Specific Neighbourhoods</p>	<p>Woodpark Community, Woodroffe North, Wellington Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Density and Zoning Consistency: Residents oppose high-density designations (e.g., N4/N4B) on local residential streets such as Compton, Byron, and Flower Avenues. These designations are seen as inconsistent with existing N3B zoning and out of character with established low-rise neighbourhoods. Residents recommend applying N3B or similar moderate-density zoning to support gradual, context-sensitive intensification. ▪ Neighbourhood Character and Livability: Concerns that higher-density zoning would alter the character of quiet, family-oriented streets by introducing multi-unit buildings out of scale with existing single-family homes. Residents wish to preserve the cohesive, low-rise form and community-oriented character of the neighbourhood. ▪ Infrastructure Capacity and Safety: Concerns that existing infrastructure including narrow streets, limited parking, minimal sidewalks, and aging water and sewer systems cannot accommodate higher-density development. Increased traffic may exacerbate congestion and affect emergency access and pedestrian safety. Residents request clear infrastructure assessments and phased upgrades prior to approving further development. ▪ Traffic, Parking, and Accessibility: Streets such as Compton, Anthony, and Flower are already congested and lack adequate parking. Residents are concerned that developers determining parking minimums may prioritize units over accessibility, further straining limited space and street safety, especially near schools and parks. ▪ Complementary Development and Planning Alignment: Residents note that surrounding areas (e.g., Richmond Road, Cleary Avenue, Lincoln Fields) already accommodate higher densities. They urge that interior neighbourhood streets maintain their low-rise, residential character and that intensification align with the Lincoln Fields and New Orchard–Cleary Secondary Plans. ▪ Environmental and Community Considerations: Protection of greenspace, tree canopy, and parkland is a key priority. Residents emphasize the need for coordinated planning with the NCC to improve access to recreational areas, prevent flooding, and ensure sustainable design that supports livability and climate resilience.
---	---



2) Mixed-Use Zones

Theme	As We Heard It
<p>Comments about Specific Areas</p>	<p>Orleans – Innes Road, Chapel Hill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Building Heights: Residents oppose 18–30 storey buildings in suburban areas, preferring lower heights (4–9 storeys depending on proximity to transit) to maintain community character and compatibility with adjacent homes and retirement residences. ▪ Traffic and Transportation: High-rise developments would worsen existing congestion, increase cut-through traffic, and potentially impact emergency response times, requiring careful evaluation of transportation infrastructure. ▪ Community and Public Infrastructure: Current parks, schools, recreational facilities, childcare, and health services are insufficient to support increased density, raising concerns about livability and equitable contributions from developers. ▪ Environmental and Livability Concerns: Taller developments could increase noise, air pollution, overshadowing, and reduce privacy, sunlight, green space, and tree canopy, negatively affecting residents’ quality of life. ▪ Compatibility with Existing Residential Areas: High-rises are seen as incompatible with suburban, low-rise neighborhoods, lacking adequate transitions to surrounding homes and community-oriented scale. ▪ Zoning and Planning Process: Residents request adherence to zoning provisions, clear guidelines for landscaping, tree retention, building types, and ENO policies, emphasizing alignment with the Official Plan and avoiding developer-favored amendments. ▪ Group Homes vs. Institutional Facilities: Residents support small-scale group homes that provide care or supportive housing within neighbourhoods but are concerned that the Zoning By-law’s definitions could permit larger institutional, detention, or correctional facilities in residential areas. They request clearer distinctions between group homes and secure facilities, ensuring the latter are limited to appropriate institutional zones and not located on small residential streets or areas with limited access. ▪ General Sentiment: Orleans and Chapel Hill communities prioritize family-friendly, suburban character; residents fear excessive height and density will compromise safety, livability, and community cohesion.



3) Parking

Theme	As We Heard It
Parking Minimums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient on-site parking creates competition for on-street spaces, blocks driveways, and impacts daily mobility, including service and accessible vehicles. ▪ Recommend updating the by-law to accommodate long, cargo, and family tag-along bicycles.
Trailer Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requests that Section 612 be clarified to allow full use of double-wide driveways for RVs or trailers, even if part encroaches on the City Right-of-Way, provided pedestrian safety is maintained, with treatment consistent with standard vehicles. ▪ Seeks reasonable time allowances for loading, unloading, and seasonal maintenance without triggering by-law violations, emphasizing that RVs and trailers pose no additional safety risks compared to other large vehicles.

4) Environmental Concerns

Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that current minimum front and exterior side yard setbacks are too small to support medium or large trees, safe pedestrian/cyclist movement, and environmental objectives. ▪ Request to consider a minimum of one metre below-grade projection to protect tree root zones. Current provisions such as walkway widths and landscaping buffers may otherwise harm roots or encourage front yard parking. ▪ Concern that tree retention figures are not drawn to scale, making analysis difficult, and that maintaining large canopy trees in infill projects may be impractical under current provisions.
Environmental Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requests that the new by-law explicitly protect sensitive areas like Burnt Lands Provincial Park by including recognized nature reserves in the list of sensitive uses, particularly when adjacent to developments such as quarry expansions.



5) Rural Zones

<p>Mineral Aggregate separation distances</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requests that the Zoning By-law include reciprocal setbacks to protect existing homes, as well as new ones, from impacts of new quarry or mineral extraction developments.
--	--

6) Public Consultation

<p>Public Consultation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request clarification on whether an Official Plan Amendment is required or if a Zoning By-law Amendment alone is sufficient, including details on process, timelines, and contacts. ▪ Received a recommendation to streamline public consultations by addressing one topic per speaker and ensuring balanced participation so all residents can meaningfully contribute.
-----------------------------------	---