

**EXTRACT OF DRAFT MINUTES 33  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
11 OCTOBER 2016**

**EXTRAIT DE L'ÉBAUCHE DU  
PROCÈS-VERBAL 33  
COMITÉ DE L'URBANISME  
LE 11 OCTOBRE 2016**

---

**OFFICIAL PLAN, ZONING AND RELATED BY-LAW AMENDMENTS: SECOND  
DWELLING UNITS IN ACCESSORY BUILDINGS (COACH HOUSES)**

**ACS2016-PIE-PGM-0142**

**CITY WIDE**

---

## **REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

**That Planning Committee:**

- a. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;**
- b. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;**
- c. recommend that Council repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units;**
- d. recommend that Council receive the Coach Houses Development Charges Background Study, attached as Document 3;**
- e. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Development Charges By-law 2014-229, as detailed in Document 4;**
- f. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Site Plan Control By law 2014-256, as detailed in Document 5;**
- g. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Parkland Dedication By-law 2009-385 as detailed in Document 6; and**
- h. approve the Public Consultation Section, attached as Document 7 of this**

**report, be included as the “brief explanation” in the Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in tandem with this report, subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and 4 p.m. of the day prior to Council’s consideration.**

A PowerPoint presentation, which also incorporated information with respect to Agenda Item 2 (Permitted Building Heights for Accessory Buildings), was provided by the following staff of the Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department: Messrs. Tim Moerman, Planner; Alain Miguelez, Program Manager, Zoning, Intensification and Neighbourhoods; and, John Smit, Director, Economic Development and Innovation. A copy of the presentation is held on file.

The following staff also responded to questions: Mr. Tim Marc, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the City Clerk and Solicitor; Mr. Frank Bidin, Chief Building Official, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department; and, Ms. Lee Ann Snedden, Chief, Development Review Services, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development department.

The committee heard eight delegations on this matter.

- \*Heather Pearl, representing Federation of Citizens’ Associations of Ottawa, accompanied by Sheila Perry, Vice-President and Liaison, Planning and Zoning, raised concerns about the proposal with respect to Coach Houses, particularly the potential for negative impact in the urban area. The concerns were centered primarily on potential impact to trees and neighbouring properties. They felt the by-law should be referred to staff for further consultation to ensure that, when implemented, it appropriately meets the intended goal of providing affordable housing, without creating unintended negative consequences, and be based on principles that promote sustainability, protect urban ecosystems, human health and community character.
- \*Duncan Bury, Champlain Park Community Association, was sympathetic to the provincial direction set out in the *Planning Act* regarding the need for affordable housing, but raised concerns about the Coach House proposal. His primary concerns related to potential loss of adequate open / green space, potential damage / loss of mature trees, and a “one size fits all” approach that shows no regard for individual character or neighbourhood distinctiveness. He asked that

the report be referred back to staff for further consultation and development.

- \*Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, President, Old Ottawa East Community Association, was pleased with the proposed (one-story) height limitation but was concerned with how that height might be calculated in specific situations and how a two-storey structure might be approved through the Committee of Adjustment. She also raised concerns with respect to setbacks, building mass and visual obstructions, permitted projections, the grandfathering clause for pre-existing accessory structures, and potential urban forest implications.
- Marlene Koehler was generally supportive of the Coach House concept, but doubted it would have much of a positive impact on affordable housing. She felt the proposal should be referred back to staff for further review.
- Murray Chown, on behalf of the Greater Ottawa Homebuilders' Association and the Urban Infill Council, was supportive of the proposal but felt there would likely be limited uptake due to the varying technical issues involved. He supported the notion of a two-year review, as was approved with the In-fill II Bylaw.
- Shirley Dolan requested the proposal be referred back to staff for further consideration and clarification of the rural provisions for Coach Houses, and she suggested that the processes and requirements be made more equitable between urban and rural areas.
- Rod MacLean, Katimavik Hazeldean Community Association, stated that the construction and appearance of Coach Houses should be compatible with their existing neighbourhoods.
- Bradley Mazurek felt that the housing market does not show support for this type of housing with the height confines as proposed and that the proposed height limitations might not allow for the gentle intensification that is intended.

*[\* Individuals / groups marked with an asterisk above provided written comments; all submissions are held on file with the City Clerk.]*

The committee received the following correspondence, as noted with an asterisk above, between 4 October 2016 (the date the report was published in the committee agenda) and the time public delegations were heard on 11 October 2016, a copy of which is held on file:

- Comments dated 5 and 11 October 2016 from the Federation of Citizens' Associations of Ottawa via Sheila Perry, Vice-President and Liaison, Planning and Zoning, and Heather Pearl, Co-Chair, Champlain Park Community Association
- Comments dated 7 October 2016 from Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, President, Old Ottawa East Community Association
- Comments dated 10 October 2016 from Duncan Bury, President, Champlain Park Community Association.

**Motion N<sup>o</sup> PLC 33/1**

Moved by Councillor J. Leiper

**WHEREAS coach houses are a proposed new use in Ottawa; and,**

**WHEREAS a significant uptake of those might have significant environmental impacts including impacts to trees and permeable surface; and,**

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the report be amended to include a two-year review period after which staff will report back on the effectiveness and implications of the coach house rules implications.**

CARRIED

Item 1 of Planning Committee Agenda 33, as amended by Motion N<sup>o</sup> PLC 33/1 and set out in full below, was put to Committee.

**That Planning Committee:**

- recommend that Council approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;**
- recommend that Council approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;**
- recommend that Council repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units;**
- recommend that Council receive the Coach Houses Development Charges**

**Background Study, attached as Document 3;**

- e. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Development Charges By-law 2014-229, as detailed in Document 4;**
- f. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Site Plan Control By law 2014-256, as detailed in Document 5;**
- g. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Parkland Dedication By-law 2009-385 as detailed in Document 6;**
- h. recommend Council approve that the report be amended to include a two-year review period after which staff will report back on the effectiveness and implications the coach house rules implications; and**
- i. approve the Public Consultation Section, attached as Document 7 of this report, be included as the “brief explanation” in the Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in tandem with this report, subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and 4 p.m. of the day prior to Council’s consideration.**

CARRIED with the following Direction to Staff:

That, notwithstanding the two-year review period, should staff notice a more significant volume of coach houses being constructed than currently anticipated, an update be brought forward to committee within an earlier timeframe.