

Mature Neighbourhoods Zoning Overlay (Infill I)

and

Alternative Provisions in the Urban Area (Infill II)



Monitoring Process

- Council directed staff to monitor both zoning by-laws created through the Infill studies for 2-year period
- Staff reviewing these by-laws together, as combined, these affect infill and additions
- Staff will report back to Council with one combined report

Seeking Input

- Seeking input from:
 - Existing communities affected by the MN Overlay
 - Communities requesting/considering whether to become subject to the MN Overlay
 - Communities affected by Infill II, in Wards 7-18
 - FCA
 - Stakeholder groups from both MN Overlay and Infill II
 - Greater Ottawa Homebuilders Association, developers, architects, planners
 - Interest groups, interested residents and other stakeholders

Seeking Input

- input has been received from residents since these by-laws came into effect in June 2015 from:
 - Individual members of the MN Overlay stakeholders group
 - Individual Members of FCA
 - Community Associations who would like to be considered for inclusion in the Overlay
 - Members of the Greater Ottawa Homebuilders Association (GOHBA) and the Urban Infill Subcommittee

Meetings

- Staff has met with some neighbourhoods who would like to be considered for inclusion in the MN Overlay, upon their request:
 - Overbrook
 - Manor Park
 - Lindenlea
 - Britannia
- Staff is reviewing the appropriateness of whether these communities represent mature neighbourhoods

Analyzing Additional Inner Urban Neighbourhoods

- Staff is analyzing other neighbourhoods, adjacent to those currently in the MN Overlay:
 - Vanier
 - West of current boundary at Sherbourne, north of Carling Avenue to Britannia, including:
 - Laurentian
 - Woodroffe Lincoln Heights
 - Carlington West – Glabar – Mckellar Heights
 - Part of Cummings, south of La Cité Collegiale to Blair Road
 - Carson Grove-Carson Meadows to Blair Road

Internal Review

- collating and reviewing SCAs
- Training of, trouble-shooting for, Development Review staff reviewing SCAs
- collating and analyzing Committee of Adjustment Panels 1 and 2 because these have been the most frequent type of development application, since June 2015
- Inventory of legally-created FYP spaces completed, per OMB mediated settlement

Internal Review

- Hampered by 2-year Transition Phase for both by-laws (just ended June 12 and July 8, 2017)
- **Many dwellings built since 2015 were grandfathered and cannot be considered with respect to whether new regulations are effective**
- Many applications have not resulted in built dwellings yet
- Requires caution when reviewing

Internal Review

- Staff analysis of C of A applications/decisions affecting MN Overlay and Infill II provisions:
 - Site-specific versus trends in type of relief requested
 - Are applications seeking major relief (e.g. jumping Character Groups, reducing multiple yard setbacks, seeking front yard parking spaces, etc.)
 - C of A application of these zoning regulations: is intent of MN Overlay and Infill II are being upheld?

What we have found so far

- Planning consulting firms requested staff provide detailed presentation of how to complete SCA
- Quick and positive uptake by planning and architecture firms, ease of completing SCA process within a few weeks of enactment
- Initial meeting with GOHBA indicates some concerns with MN Overlay process

What we have found so far

- Residents who prepare their own SCA state not difficult or time-consuming
- Some landowners/developers submit designs to request whether these are in keeping with the confirmed SCA prior to submitting development application
- Some urban neighbourhoods like the concept of the Overlay and are requesting inclusion in Overlay
- urban neighbourhoods we have met with within former Ottawa have stated they appreciate the rules of Infill II

What we have found so far

- Streets where multiple SCAs have been completed (up to February 2017):
 - Roosevelt
 - Carleton
 - Atlantis
 - Dovercourt
 - Tweedsmuir
 - Northwestern
 - Golden
 - Armstrong
 - Wesley
 - Glebe
 - Main

Initial Findings – MN Overlay

- Some 251 SCAs have been completed (to end of May 2017), or 10.5 per month
- SCAs have been completed for all components of the development review:
 - Severance
 - Minor variance
 - Zoning
 - Site plan control
 - Building Permit
 - Private Approach Permit

Initial Findings – MN Overlay

- All dominant Character Groups have been represented
- Only 2 C of A applications went forward without having completed SCA (shortly after enactment)
- In both cases, Committee requested detailed information of look along street at meeting or adjourned
- Immediately following enactment, despite Transition Clause, Committee referred some applicants to the Low Rise Design Guidelines to ensure new dwelling would fit in

Initial Findings – MN Overlay

- Minor variance applications requested relief to:
 - reduce front yard/corner side yard setbacks, other than average of abutting lot(s)
 - Reduce lot width, which may affect the width available for the driveway (Character Group)
 - increase width of driveway, beyond Table 139 (10), the standards of which were agreed to during OMB mediation
 - Increase driveway width:lot width (few)
 - decrease habitable floor area on first floor – 2 granted
 - Legalizing existing legal NC front yard parking space (x2)
 - All granted
- SCAs not required when relief sought for:
 - Lot width, lot area, Infill II regulations only

Initial Findings – Alternative Provisions

- minor variance requests to:
 - reduce the minimum rear yard setback, rear yard area, interior side yards (as well as front and corner side yards) - most granted
 - Increase permission to project into rear yard (stairs)
 - Reduce RYS and FYS (often along with ISYS), granted a few times
- A few requests to increase height of dwelling: 11 granted, 1 refused (February 2017)
- A few requests to increase the height of a rooftop deck, or rooftop access: 5 granted, 1 refused
- Two requests for relief from rooftop terrace setback
 - 4 granted, 1 refused
- Applicants often submit revised plans where impact would be reduced – more in keeping with the intent of Infill II

Issues to be considered

- Requests to increase height of rooftop access
- Requests to remove setbacks for rooftop terrace
- Increase in height of dwelling
- Projections of decks near grade, and of stairs into RY
- Permitting multiple variances to all yard setbacks on a site

Next Steps

- Continue to analyze data
- Continue site visits to possible new neighbourhoods within MN Overlay
- Meeting in September, advertised
- Stakeholder meetings with CA reps and GOHBA
- Planning report to PC by end of 2017