

- c) To permit a reduced parking space length of 4.25 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum parking space length of 5.2 metres.
- d) To permit an increased driveway area of 58.9% of the front yard, whereas the By-law permits a maximum driveway area of 50% of the front yard.
- [4] The property is not the subject of any other current application under the *Planning Act*.
- [5] For the purposes of the transition and continuation provisions of Zoning By-law 2026-50, this application was deemed complete on March 17, 2026.

PUBLIC HEARING

Oral Submissions Summary

- [6] Tyler Yakichuk, agent for the Applicants, provided a slide presentation, a copy of which is on file with the Secretary-Treasurer and available from the Committee Coordinator upon request.
- [7] In response to the Panel's questions, Mr. Yakichuk confirmed that the building included a primary dwelling unit and a secondary dwelling unit, as well as three parking spaces.
- [8] City Planner Elizabeth King expressed concerns about the width of the driveway and the lack of space set aside for landscaping. She also clarified that parking was permitted in the driveway leading to the designated parking area, is but that vehicles must be parked behind the front wall of the dwelling; otherwise, it would be considered parking in the front yard.
- [9] The Committee also heard oral submissions from the following individuals:
- M. Giannakos, a local resident, expressed concerns about the impact of widening the driveway on green spaces, the increase in the number of parking spaces on a lot located near public transit, and the repair of the curb.
 - M. Giannakos, speaking on behalf of C. Gianakos, a local resident, raised further concerns regarding the widening of the driveway for parking and drainage issues.
 - G. Kontogiannis, a resident, presented a slideshow. She showed referred to photos highlighting concerns about increasing the number of parking spaces on the character of the neighbourhood, as well as the issue of on-street parking blocking her laneway. She also objected to increasing the number of parking spaces on a lot located near public transportation.
- [10] Mr. Yakichuk addressed the concerns raised by the residents, confirming that the Applicants would reinstate the curb to allow for on-street parking for the

community, and that the planters could be moved to prohibit an additional parking space.

[11] Following the public hearing, the Committee reserved its decision.

DECISION AND REASONS OF THE COMMITTEE: APPLICATION GRANTED IN PART

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 variances are minor, are 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.

Evidence

[13] 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 abstract, tree conservation report, photo of the posted sign, and a sign posting declaration.
- City Planning Report received April 2, 2026, with concerns; revised received January 9, 2026, with concerns; received January 8, 2026, with concerns.
- Rideau Valley Conservation Authority email received March 31, 2026, with no objections.
- Hydro Ottawa email received April 2, 2026, with comments; received January 8, 2026, with comments.
- C. and C Eady, residents, email received April 1, 2026, in support.
- N. Ramsay, resident, email received April 1, 2026, in support.
- V. Bouga, resident, email received April 2, 2026, in support.
- I. Bouga, resident, email received April 2, 2026, in support.
- C. Collett, resident, email received April 2, 2026, in support.

- G. Kontogiannis, resident, email received April 2, 2026, opposed; received January 12, 2026, opposed.
- H. Anl Akyldiz, resident, email received April 3, 2026, in support.
- A. Broznak, resident, email received April 4, 2026, in support.
- M. Yavuz, resident, email received April 5, 2026, in support.
- N. Antille and E. Grainger, residents, email received April 5, 2026, in support.
- C. Giannakos on behalf of E. Hallewick, resident, email received April 5, 2026, opposed; petition signed by 18 residents received January 12, 2026, opposed.
- D. Simmons, resident, email received January 9, 2026, in support.
- A. and M. Giannakos, resident, email received January 12, 2026, opposed.
- M. Mallish, resident, email received January 12, 2026, with comments.

Effect of Submissions on Decision

- [14] The Committee considered all written and oral submissions relating to the application in making its decision and granted the application, in part.
- [15] Based on the evidence, the majority of the Committee (Members J. Wright and H. MacLean dissenting on variance (a); Members H. MacLean and G. Barrett dissenting on variance (c)) are satisfied that the requested variances (a) and (c) meet all four requirements under subsection 45(1) of the *Planning Act*.
- [16] The Committee notes that the City’s Planning Report raises “concerns with the proposed front yard parking variance to increase the maximum driveway to 9 metres which is 58.9% of the front yard”. The report also highlights that “[t]he increased driveway width removes opportunity for soft scaping in the front yard”.
- [17] The majority of the Committee also notes that no compelling evidence was presented that variances (a) and (c) would result in any unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring properties.
- [18] Considering the circumstances, the majority of the Committee finds that, because the proposal fits well in the area, variances (a) and (c) 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.

- [19] The majority of the Committee also finds that variances (a) and (c) maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan because the proposal respects the character of the neighbourhood.
- [20] In addition, the majority of the Committee finds that variances (a) and (c) maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law because the proposal represents orderly development that is compatible with the surrounding area.
- [21] Moreover, the majority of the Committee finds that variances (a) and (c) are minor because they will not create any unacceptable adverse impact on abutting properties or the neighbourhood in general.
- [22] Conversely, based on the evidence, the Committee is not satisfied that variances (b) and (d) meet all four requirements under subsection 45(1) of the *Planning Act*.
- [23] The Committee is not satisfied that variances (b) and (d) maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law because the proposal does not represent orderly development that is compatible with the surrounding area.
- [24] The Committee also finds that variances (b) and (d) are not minor because they would create an unacceptable adverse impact on the neighbourhood.
- [25] Failing two of the four statutory tests, the Committee is unable to grant variances (b) and (d).
- [26] **THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT ORDERS** that the application is granted in part and requested variances (a) and (c) to the Zoning By-law are authorized, **subject to** the location and size of the parking space complying with the plans filed with the Committee of Adjustment on March 9, 2026, as they relate to variances (a) and (c). Variances (b) and (d) are not authorized.

"Fabian Poulin"
FABIAN POULIN
VICE-CHAIR

"Jay Baltz"
JAY BALTZ
MEMBER

"George Barrett"
(with noted dissent)
GEORGE BARRETT
MEMBER

"Heather MacLean"
(with noted dissent)
HEATHER MACLEAN
MEMBER

"Julianne Wright"
(with noted dissent)
JULIANNE WRIGHT
MEMBER

I certify this is a true copy of the decision of the Ottawa Committee of Adjustment, dated **April 17, 2026**.

“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 May 7, 2026**.

- **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](#)

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