



RESIDENTIAL FOURTH DENSITY (R4) ZONING REVIEW

As We Heard It

AS OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2017



City of Ottawa
Planning, Infrastructure
and Economic Development

ottawa.ca/R4zoning
November 2017

ottawa.ca
3-1-1    
TTY 613-580-2401

Number and location of air-conditioning units

Location of air-conditioning units is a serious issue, and needs assistance from the building permits department. Sound pressure assessments are something that zoning may use as a tool. Each condenser unit for a split system has a sound rating in the product specifications. This rating can be assessed in context for acceptability, or could provide a limit on the number of units or proximity to property lines. (Individual)

The location of air conditioning units on exterior walls is more than a nuisance issue. Recently-constructed multi-unit buildings in our neighbourhood have all the exterior AC units - one per apartment – on one side of the building. Zoning for multi-unit buildings should require a roof top unit. (Individual)

Window air conditioning units should not be permitted if they are facing a neighbouring property zoned in R1 and R2. (Community Association)

Rules are needed regarding how many and where air conditioning units can be placed with respect to neighbouring properties. It is unacceptable to have 4 air-conditioning units on each side of a single family house just 2' from the property line (an actual situation in an R3 neighbourhood in our community). In an R4 zone, there is a potential for even more air-conditioning units to be located just 2' from neighbouring properties. (Community Association)

No further regulation regarding the location of air conditioning units is required. (Developer)

Amenity and green space:

We want to ensure that the outcome of this review will not reduce any currently applicable amenity space requirements. (Community Association)

A potential conflict may occur on R4 zoned properties between the required rear yard setback and the required amenity space per unit. The intent of both the Infill II and Converted Dwellings By-laws is to ensure that a minimum of 15 square meters at-grade amenity area is required per dwelling unit up to and including eight units. Depending on the quantity of units and the size of the building lot, it is possible that the building setbacks would not accommodate the required amenity space requirement. A requirement for indoor garbage storage or bike storage in the rear yard area could add further constraints to the developable area. This conflict could have a significant impact on housing affordability in R4 zoned properties. Perhaps one solution that the community groups could support is a tree compensation plan in lieu of the additional

amenity space. Depending on the location on the garbage storage, perhaps the location of these trees could also provide privacy and a buffer to existing adjacent landowners. (Developer)

The introduction of a requirement for garbage storage requires a concurrent change to the requirement for amenity space introduced by the “conversion by-law” in 2014. For buildings with only two or three units it will be a challenge to meet the current requirement of 15 square meters per unit, while at the same time providing for a garbage enclosure. For buildings with four or more units, the current requirement to provide 15 square meters per unit is already a challenge and an impediment to the development of this form of housing. The introduction of a requirement for garbage storage further aggravates this situation. A flat rate of 60 square meters of amenity space for two unit or three unit dwellings is totally inappropriate. There is no justification for extending the amenity space requirement to include two unit dwellings. Increasing the amenity requirement for three unit dwellings is also without justification. Any discussion of a flat rate for amenity space should include a discussion of the purpose and function of this space. A reduced rate of 10 square meters of amenity space per unit has merit. There needs to be a cap on the amenity space requirement for multi-unit buildings. It is inappropriate to require that 100% of amenity space be “soft” landscaping. This eliminates the ability to provide a patio and or sitting area to be used by the occupants of the building. Another complication is the desirability to provide an accessory structure that accommodates required bicycle storage in the rear yard amenity area. We agree that the conflict between the requirement to provide amenity space, and the requirement for a minimum of 30% landscaping needs to be resolved. (Developer)

I would oppose any reductions to rear yard amenity space and landscaped area requirements due to increased garbage storage requirements. The City’s limited, critical greenspace shouldn’t be reduced as a trade-off for landlords/developers having to contain their garbage. (Individual)

Green space and development spacing have been dramatically reduced by policy changes over the last 5 years. More green space for downtown Ottawa and no more over development incentives. (Individual)

Green spaces in neighborhoods need to be preserved/increased. Spaces for parks, communal gardening and trees. Parking lots, pavements, roads, can be limited to increase green spaces. Roof top gardening should be encouraged. (Individual)

Bedroom Counts:

The recommendation to limit bedrooms in a dwelling unit to four, together with the recommended relief on the limitation of four units in the “junior” R4 zones, will address community concerns with respect to the proliferation of “bunk houses”. (Developer)

The example of a possible rule provided in the Discussion Paper (no more than half of units to contain more than two bedrooms) sounds like a good idea; but then the

comment pasted on your website — regarding having a triplex where all three units might have three bedrooms (which makes sense) — would not fit within the possible rule. I think this idea would benefit from further discussion, brainstorming or other attention. (Individual)

Many people I know who live on their own live in a unit that has two bedrooms and a den (or three bedrooms) in a townhouse or duplex structure. (I recognize that affordability is an issue and that the people to whom I refer have a lifetime of working to support them in their current dwellings. (Individual)

If we consider the number of people in refugee families recently arrived from Syria (e.g. two parents, three to five children, one grandparent), we need to provide rental apartments that are “big enough.” (Individual)

Limiting bedroom counts should be coordinated with the building permit department. Bedroom count is only one aspect of the issue. One could imagine that bedroom count could be linked to other provisions such as toilets and showers, and interior common space area such that each bedroom had a reasonable degree of service. This would provide a natural limit to the number of bedrooms in a building rather than an arbitrary number. This kind of an approach is beyond the typical scope of zoning. (Individual)

Planning (and especially the OMB) has become very sloppy about counting rooms. There is no assessment of the potential of a room, and it has been observed on a number of occasions that if a room is called an office on the plans, but has a window and a closet that would allow it to be characterized as a bedroom, it is still accepted to be an office. This practice must change, as it robs the OMB and planning process of credibility. It is completely unacceptable to communities. It also is on the boundary between typical planning concerns and building permit concerns. More detailed and consistent definitions in the zoning bylaw would help the situation. (Individual)

The discussion paper raises the possibility of controlling “oversized dwelling units” by limiting the number of bedrooms permitted in a unit. This suggests that there is a definition of “bedroom” in the zoning by-law. If we are to develop a definition of “bedroom”, I wonder if it would be helpful to require that such a room must have a window. I believe that requiring windows is one means used by other municipalities to address the “oversized dwelling unit” issue. (Individual)

Once the concept of “bedroom” has been clarified, I would support the idea of limiting the number of bedrooms in a dwelling unit. Four or five bedrooms would seem to be an appropriate maximum for all residential zones except for R1. In the case of R1 zones, I see no need to restrain the prospective builders of massive showpiece homes from engaging in ostentatious display. (Individual)

A possible limit of four or five bedrooms need not constrain development of affordable housing in existing large structures if secondary dwelling units continue to be allowed. (Individual)

With respect to the zoning changes proposed in Discussion Paper #1, I am not sure that the idea of requiring half of dwelling units in a building to be limited to two bedrooms is the right approach. I do not see what would be wrong with a low-rise apartment building with three and four bedroom apartments designed to appeal to families with children. (Individual)

I am particularly pleased to see the acknowledgement of concerns relating to Oversized dwelling units (ODUs, page 5) with unusually high bedroom counts... I can only heartily agree that such housing appears to have limited longer-term viability. (Individual)

Great assessment that something has to change here. Due to the inner city house price increase, costs to build increase, taxes and city fee (developmental, park land, etc..) it has made it impossible to have a financially viable investment without making these larger units - Couple that with the current restrictions of the amount of units you are able to have on an average size lot. You max out at 3 or 4 units. Larger bedroom counts per unit is not ideal, however was a necessity under the old/current rules. (Developer)

Your Discussion Paper hit the nail on the head. Under the current rules ODU's are a necessity for the investor and to keep rents down for the tenants. (Developer)

I support limits on bedroom counts if the City provides some relief elsewhere in the zoning bylaws and site plan control. Units with large bedroom counts are 100% in response to site plan control and to provisions in the zoning bylaw that limit the number of units in a building. Developers would much prefer to have many smaller units but have been forced to use large bedroom counts to maintain the feasibility of their projects. It is no secret that some developers have utilized large bedroom counts in their smaller projects but if you look at their larger projects where there is no limit on the number of units and site plan control cannot be avoided, it becomes clear that when given the choice, they much prefer to have smaller units. That being said, the administrative costs associated with utilizing a large number of small units in a development are disproportionally higher than a small number of large units and the City should look to provide some assistance here. For example, the development charges associated with four 1-bedroom apartments are much higher than the development charges for one 4-bedroom apartment. Similarly, four 1-bedroom apartments triggers four parklands contributions whereas one 4-bedroom apartment only requires one parkland contribution. Four times as much outdoor amenity space is required for four 1-bedroom apartments. (Developer)

I am in favour of implementing limits on new multi-residential construction in Ottawa. Specifically, the limiting of apartments to not more than 4 bedrooms with a mix of 2 bedroom units within the same structure as detailed in the report. (Individual)

While a limit on bedrooms in dwelling units is offered as a possible solution in the paper, you outlined numerous difficulties with such an approach in our November 22 discussion, e.g., by suggesting that developers could simply call rooms computer rooms or music rooms or offices and then subsequently have them used as bedrooms. (Community Association)

We recommend that in all cases, at least one-third of the units be one-bedroom, and at least one-third be two-bedroom, and only one unit is ever permitted to have four bedrooms. The City should be proactive in its support for this, by ensuring that site plan review considers the number of bedrooms rather than numbers of units, as this will yield a clearer future perspective on potential occupancy numbers. (Community Association)

We support restricting dwelling units to a maximum of 4 bedrooms. We believe oversized dwelling units should not be permitted. (Community Association)

I believe you have a very strong grasp on the fact that even as a builder, investor, developer we do not want to build 4+ bed units, however it is a necessity under the current rules. We builders would prefer lower bedrooms per unit and as property managers, it would be an option that we would rather provide and manage. However, we need to be able to get enough income within the building to allow the build to move forward. (Developer)

The larger units, 3 beds and 4 bedroom "family units", are hard to build and economically unfeasible. I have several 3 bedroom apartments and they are the hardest to rent. I agree 3 beds are needed in the core. I would request you give an incentive to building these. Reduced or no development charges, tax break etc. (Developer)

Committee of Adjustment

The City must adopt a policy of not supporting minor variances to lot frontage or lot area requirements. (Individual)

The practice of the Committee of Adjustment regularly giving away frontage and lot area for buildings larger than would otherwise be allowed is a cause of great concern to communities. It is not acceptable that city planners just shrug and say the CofA is autonomous. This is the situation where the city having "no concerns" with an application is felt to be most egregiously harmful to community interests. (Individual)

City's planning staff should not be supporting projects (or indicating no concerns as feedback on Committee of Adjustment minor variance applications) that go beyond the scale allowed, e.g., where lot sizes restrict allowed housing to no more than a duplex. The city should not be supporting triplexes (which in some cases are of a scale more akin to a 4 storey building that is more in scale with allowed development in an R4 zone). (Community Association)

We strongly support an effort to include guidance in the Official Plan on how to determine whether something is a minor variance or a rezoning. We believe that the Committee of Adjustment process to permit minor variances is flawed, and has often worked against compatible development in Sandy Hill. We believe that when an application for a minor variance is received it should be considered collectively with all previous variances, severances and rezonings that have been granted to a property, regardless of its owner – as such changes are cumulative in nature, and can easily become major rezonings over time. This one correction in the CoA process, along with

more guidance as you proposed, could considerably help Sandy Hill and other mature neighbourhoods to retain their character. (Community Association)

Committee of Adjustment applications are frequently used to achieve a virtual rezoning of a property. Measures to overcome creeping rezoning must also be addressed. (Community Association)

There is nothing that can be done through this or any other study to limit the authority of the Committee of Adjustment under the Planning Act to receive and consider applications for minor variance. (Developer)

Community

I'm concerned about community. Sandy Hill is a community of people who know neighbours, contribute to the Book Fair for Prime Minister's Row last Sunday, attend the Bettye Hyde fundraiser next Saturday, and support a Syrian Family who live among us now. Knowing our neighbours is difficult to do when the buildings next door and across the street are full of students. We may acknowledge each other, the students and we, but there doesn't develop any feeling of neighbourliness. It can't very well, can it; students are transient. I see no time when they will not be. I work for the local newspaper, IMAGE, and we have received letters saying how sad it is to leave the neighbourhood but the students next door create noise late at night and don't take care of their garbage and it's now intolerable. Not all students are messy and noisy but many are. (Individual)

Our vision for Sandy Hill is a community that values its historical assets, promotes social, cultural and demographic diversity, is environmentally sustainable and provides opportunities to all its residents to enjoy a high quality of life. In our minds, a major outcome of this project is to provide an environment that encourages the feeling of community. Our comments below are meant to support the achievement of this vision. Our view is that zoning is meant to guide development, not just accommodate it. (Community Association)

Having attended the public meeting at the Sandy Hill Community Centre and read the recommendations document it seems to me that the key issue related to development in Sandy Hill is not being addressed, i.e., the over-intensification and densification of development largely to meet the needs of one demographic - students at the University of Ottawa. This is having very serious adverse and long-term detrimental impacts on the neighbourhood which cannot be reversed. (Individual)

Development Charges

Lower costs for development charges on low-med rise apartments, to promote the "traditional" unit size to come back. (Developer)

I support reviewing development charges to better align with unit size. (Developer)

There is confusion with regard to the idea of payment (of development charges) for services used. I am not under the impression that there is any connection any more. Trying to use development charges to address issues at the scale of bedroom count may well open a can of worms. I don't think this would be workable. (Individual)

Density

R4 review should guide new development, including infill, in a manner that increases density at a much slower pace than is happening now. (Community Association)

R4 review should guide new development, including infill, in a manner that respecting the original intent of the R4 zoning, that is, to provide a slow evolution to denser development. (Community Association)

R4 review should guide new development, including infill, in a manner that supports densification in the areas of our neighbourhood that have already been zoned for it, but are far from attaining targeted levels (e.g., the TOD area around the Lees LRT station and Rideau St.). (Community Association)

Just as we have minimum density targets, we should identify maximum desired densities by zoning type in order to help ensure dense but livable neighbourhoods. (Community Association)

Sandy Hill does not need more people within its residential core, nor does it need more purpose-built student housing. Rather it is the inverse – Sandy Hill needs to be left alone for a while to give it a chance to re-find a healthy balance between permanent and transient residents (now lost) and to allow families, young professionals and seniors to be able to afford to move back in and help it flourish. (Individual)

In sum it appears that everything is being done to facilitate 'improved' development with a view to densification, but no thought is being given as to whether densification is actually appropriate in Sandy Hill in relation to the City's goals. In this context I would also point out the argument for increasing student housing around the Campus LRT is totally disingenuous. The entire point of light rail is to move people around and to integrate groups of people throughout the city so as to support a diverse fabric of citizens living, working and playing in different areas. As such the role of LRT is not at all about consolidating student housing around the university but in fact the opposite; the presence of the LRT on campus should actually preclude a need, desire or effort to concentrate purpose-built student housing in one single neighbourhood. (Individual)

Design and Compatibility

Greed and trash architectural "ill-fill" is destroying what once was a lovely neighborhood. We are maxed out on ugliness and a transient population that could care less. (Individual)

Does the city not take into consideration the existing neighbourhood? Old Ottawa East is a beautiful, eclectic neighbourhood full of all demographics. Myself and my

roommates are some of the student-aged population here (~21 years of age). We chose this setting because of the quiet atmosphere. It is close enough to downtown but does not have the crazy, disruptive, and unsafe environment of Sandy Hill and other areas downtown. There are young children, seniors and many pet owners that live here. In order to keep this area safe, I believe it is important to keep the existing neighbourhood intact. Bringing in oversized buildings has proven to be disruptive for the environment and the people that live here. The developers are specifically targeting students to live in their buildings because they know the location is prime, and that students are willing to spend money on a horrible living experience. With the influx of young students and other people, it is causing a heavy toll on all of us who live here. We have to deal with by-law not being followed for noise, people drinking in public, destroying property and more. I think it would be wise for the city to enforce by-laws on the building before it is built, rather than having to come every weekend because of the noise/disruptances going on. I care about my neighbours and hate having to worry about children or animals getting hurt because of the heavy flow of new residents. This is not to say that students are to blame, but the way the developers geared their ads was STRICTLY to entice students. They had it in their kijiji ad titled "Perfect location for students". Regardless of what demographic inhabits the space, the large amount of people is detrimental to the neighbourhood as a whole. (Individual)

There is a significant issue with the definition of compatibility. The Infill bylaws have set a benchmark on the nature and scale of the compatibility discussion, but that is not satisfying to many residents as it is too coarse. Furthermore, the City in many cases will not defend its bylaws at Committee of Adjustment, so the feeling in the community is that "the laws don't hold". The discussion of the use of "no concerns" in commenting on CofA applications is a major one. (Individual)

A clear statement of principles around building design and compatibility is required for this to be a useful discussion. The Infill 1 bylaw made a bold and still controversial (in some circles) partial definition of compatibility. This approach could be extended, but would have to give explicit guidance on things like the scale of building components and the relationship of floor lines, door and window heads across properties. Most municipal attempts to address design directly have been failures. An indirect approach is needed. (Individual)

While I am eager to see development which is compatible with the existing community, I hesitate to support design controls beyond the current application of Site Plan Control to buildings of more than three dwelling units. (Individual)

The discussion paper notes that intensification outside target areas needs greater clarification. I agree. Seeking compatibility in stable neighbourhoods must not mean stasis and resistance to every attempt at intensification of development. (Individual)

I think it is important to remember that, while some areas may be zoned as R4, many of them currently have single family dwellings on them and they likely abut properties that also have single family dwellings on them. Making sure that front, side and rear-yard setbacks respect both zoning and current character will be critical in ensuring

acceptability of low-rise apartment buildings up to four storeys, as residents on the third and fourth storeys of any such buildings would “look over” adjacent properties — maintaining privacy is important. It should be noted that Dow’s Lake is understood to be part of The Glebe and a request has been made to amend the definition of the Mature Neighbourhoods Overlay for The Glebe (that currently has Bronson as its western boundary) to extend to include the full Dow’s Lake neighbourhood. (I infer this would make Queen Elizabeth Driveway the western boundary). (Individual)

In Discussion Paper #1, page 4, third full para that begins “The R4 family of zones was applied to these areas in recognition of their historically diverse housing stock which has long included low-rise multi-unit dwellings.” I like the content of this para and believe that, if its content is respected, then residents should be re-assured regarding the introduction of additional low-rise apartment buildings. Indeed, I have walked past numerous older low-rise apartment buildings that fit nicely into their respective streetscape characters. The concern remains regarding newer building materials that may not fit the look, buildings closer to the sidewalk than neighbouring buildings, and rear building walls with “too small” a rear yard that have the effect of overhanging the yards around them. (Individual)

I believe that design and compatibility is addressed with the process that is currently in place. The process is fair and as long as the build is in keeping with the neighbourhood and a fair streetscape analysis. I think that it would be a step in the right direction if certain neighbourhood had a set of “approved” or set “strongly recommended” building exterior building materials. Example, if the city outlined clearly that a certain neighbourhood, say Sandy hill or the Glebe has a certain brick, stucco colour, etc. on the approved or recommended list - Have this out and known to builders even before they buy a property. This would make sure that neighbourhoods are keeping their character. (Developer)

The reality is that builders are fine with working within the recommended finishes to keep the neighbourhoods character, however city feedback (UDRP) is always given too late in the development process and results in costly changes. I am not saying change the process, just give more “recommendations” or “approved materials” public and specific for different areas/neighbourhoods. (Developer)

Many residents of OOE remain concerned that the goal for compatibility, fit and gradual increase in density are not being met by recent zoning revisions, and that the current proposals for the R4 zone will not promote these goals either. The criteria developed to date in other zoning amendments have not satisfied community concerns; more consideration is needed in terms of implementation of goals on which we agree. (Community Association)

Infill 1 and 2 have not achieved the desired outcomes we would have hoped for in Sandy Hill. They have not resulted in more compatible infill development. To the contrary, we have seen development continue at more or less the same pace and in the same manner, with most development geared to one demographic, most of it being out of scale with its surroundings, and much of it consisting solely of oversized dwelling

units. City planners assured us on numerous occasions during the Infill 2 study that issues around height and setbacks that were not adequately addressed during the Infill exercises would be addressed during this R4 review. (Community Association)

R4 review should guide new development, including infill, in a manner that respects and augments the existing built character of our neighbourhood. (Community Association)

While the challenges outlined in the Discussion Paper exist, in our view “the ability to develop new and cost-effective low-rise, medium-density housing” must occur within the context of the goals of a particular neighbourhood – in Sandy Hill’s case, to be a neighbourhood that is historic, diverse and green and that welcomes people of different ages, cultures and incomes. Heritage preservation is vital to preserving and promoting the character of our neighbourhood. Again, your colleague, Jennifer Keesmaat, Chief Planner of the City of Toronto, recognizes this and has said, “Cities concerned with resiliency, as well as preserving diversity, affordability and jobs, must consider heritage conservation as key.” So we want to see the aspect of form and character of developments, including the importance of heritage preservation, streetscape and neighbourhood character, clearly recognized and addressed by this review and its recommendations. (Community Association)

Much more needs to be done to require high quality, durable design that reflects the character and quality of developments already present in Sandy Hill. We favour development projects that have improved and built on what already exists (versus “building new”) as examples of what will help us attain our goals. If buildings continue to be built out of scale and with incompatible design elements (tiny windows, aluminum cladding, small common rooms, no storage space, etc.), they will fail to promote demographic and social diversity and certainly will not preserve the heritage character of the neighbourhood. These concerns are not currently being addressed in the zoning bylaw. (Community Association)

We recommend that the language in the revised R4 zoning by-law recognize that large segments of the R4 zone contain building stock of an historic nature, of distinctive character and of high quality construction. The by-law needs to support development that adds to this building stock at the same time as respecting its character, along with providing diverse housing options. We further recommend that staff propose specific requirements (e.g., minimum percentage window area on street elevations) to address these issues, including requiring a Streetscape Character Analysis for all new buildings in Sandy Hill, regardless of the number of units. Finally, we recommend that zoning tools be used (Heritage overlay, Heritage Designation, Heritage Conservation Districts, etc.) to extend the protection of our existing heritage building stock. (Community Association)

The Residential Infill studies, parts 1 and 2, were both intended to address compatibility and community character, but so far seem to have had little impact on development. Part of the problem being that not all types of development in R4 zones are yet subject to the requirements of these by-laws, in particular the streetscape character analysis.

We recommend therefore that the streetscape character analysis be applied to all forms of residential development in the R1 through R4 zones. (Community Association)

The concerns regarding the current R4 zoning are not clearly defined which makes it difficult to determine how these issues should be addressed. What is meant by “adversely impacting the character...of communities in the inner urban area”? I wonder if this statement is supported given that many of the areas noted in the discussion paper have had a history of rooming house accommodation. (Individual)

The discussion paper refers to challenges facing established communities in terms of ensuring that change and intensification are compatible with their existing character. As noted above, the area that I live in has experienced densification and transformation over the period that I have been here, and change will naturally continue. However, we are currently witnessing a change in our area that is neither gradual nor appropriate. Recent neighbourhood expressions of frustration reflect the speed with which rooming house-type projects are being proposed and are able to proceed, with no apparent means to address the phenomenon via zoning provisions. I hope that the R4 zoning review and ensuing decisions will produce an effective way of addressing this key concern. (Individual)

There is confusion with regard to the idea of payment (of development charges) for services used. I am not under the impression that there is any connection any more. Trying to use development charges to address issues at the scale of bedroom count may well open a can of worms. I don't think this would be workable. (Individual)

Diversity of housing stock

New construction in Sandy Hill is excluding diverse and important housing market stakeholders – players that contribute to our community's social capital and fabric. Our goals for this R4 review are for it to guide new development, including infill. (Community Association)

“The idea of diversity of new housing stock needs considerable development and specific descriptions, if it is to stand up to the economic pressures of a specific neighbourhood at a specific time.” What is really meant by this phrase? Does the city have a different definition than the neighbourhoods? In the absence of positive action the discussion of “diversity” looks like “laissez-faire”. (Individual)

My impression is that relatively few large apartments in low-rise buildings are being built and many existing units which could accommodate a family are being split into smaller units more suitable for singles or couples. I would hope that any change in the zoning for such dwellings does not undermine efforts to see a diversity of households in the central city. (Individual)

I agree with the promotion of mid-density, ground-oriented housing and wonder if some R3 areas should be considered for rezoning to R4 to permit further expansion of this desirable form of development. (Individual)

In the last year or so, there has been a sharp increase in developer interest in Old Ottawa East north of the Queensway and activity in this area related to the construction of multi-unit buildings, with high bedroom counts, on lots that previously held single family houses. I understand that the City's current zoning provisions offer no means of addressing this practice, which appears to circumvent rooming house regulation. My concern is that a tipping of the balance of housing stock in such a small neighbourhood would harm the character of the community. (Individual)

In considering the purpose of R4 zoning to "allow a wide mix of residential building forms ranging from detached to low rise apartment dwellings, in some cases limited to four units, and in no case more than four storeys, in areas designated as General Urban Area in the Official Plan" , I think we need to remember that Bronson Avenue currently has a significant number of single family and semi-detached dwellings and that it will be important to retain the mix — I would hate to see it developed into a "tunnel" of four-storey apartments (or, worse-yet, higher apartments for which variances might be granted, along the lines of what has been done to Wellington/Richmond Road in a number of stretches)! (Individual)

I appreciate the acknowledgement of the need for single people (e.g. those just beginning their careers) to have affordable housing in inner city communities, as well as the fact that there exists a demand for different housing types and tenures over the course of a person's life (noted on page 6 under Diversity of new housing stock). In this context, I think we need to remember that there are some people, including families, who will spend their entire life living in a rented apartment and using public transit, and for whom an inner city rental unit is most desirable. (Individual)

The need for diversity of housing stock is extremely evident in Sandy hill where the high rise student housing price point is extremely out of reach for many students. The mid rise apartment dwelling units allows to price the rents lower than these high rise apartment buildings. (Developer)

R4 review should guide new development, including infill, in a manner that appeals to a more diverse range of housing market stakeholders. (Community Association)

The majority of new development in our neighbourhood over the past ten years has predominantly served one demographic; it is time to cater to other future residents by guiding development to provide more diverse housing stock. On the question of affordable and accessible housing, we would like to point out the already high percentage of such housing in our neighbourhood. By incorporating its own policy on affordable housing on medium- to high-rise apartment buildings in TOD areas and on main streets into the revised R4 zoning bylaw, the City will be able to augment the percentage of affordable housing in Sandy Hill. (Community Association)

We recommend that the revised by-law require new developments to have a mix of unit sizes, ranging from one to four bedrooms, in order to encourage a diverse base of residents and alleviate some of the issues inherent in "high occupancy" units (in particular, the ghettoization of certain streets in Sandy Hill). The density held by existing

low-rise apartments in Sandy Hill is above that of most types of single family homes in the neighbourhood, but less than the new high-occupancy builds we have witnessed over the past decade. For us, the existing low-rise apartments (that generally sit on double lots) represent a sustainable density level for Sandy Hill. This means that 16+ residents housed on the size of lot prevalent in Sandy Hill is too many. (Community Association)

The most significant concern we have besides protecting community character is the loss of diversity in our neighbourhoods. Healthy communities need a diverse mix of people, including families, seniors, youth, etc. However, due to the proliferation of one type of dwelling, even if varying by neighbourhood, will result in communities becoming denser but less diverse. In some neighbourhoods, virtually all new builds consist of only micro-units, while in other neighbourhoods the issue is the opposite, that virtually all new development consists solely of oversized dwelling units. The outcome though is the same, that neighbourhoods are slowly but surely losing diversity and versatility. There is nothing surprising about this, the economics of development make it very difficult to maintain diversity in our neighbourhoods unless the City adopts diversity supportive planning policies. We ask that the R4 express an appropriate stand on this matter. (Community Association)

More must be done to encourage a mix of unit sizes, as this offers opportunities for more diverse demographics. It's also worth noting that studio, one-bedroom apartments, and units with four or more bedrooms, are very limited in terms of their demographic market, while two and three-bedroom apartments offer much more versatility. So, some way to ensure a mix of units, particularly more two or three-bedroom units, is needed. The proposed guidance for R4 must be adjusted accordingly. (Community Association)

I'm in favor of striking a balance between the needs of new and older residents. We need to create more affordable/social housing in all neighborhoods particularly those downtown, close to campuses where the need for such housing is great. (Individual)

Downzonings

Since R4 zoning is maxed out and causing deterioration, it is a logical move to reduce the zoning to R3- or perhaps a new kind of zoning that protects neighbourhoods that have been trashed like ours. I call on councillors to get creative- and find a solution to the mess created by ill-fill and greed. (Individual)

Consideration should be given to changing the zoning in Sandy Hill to R3. (Individual)

I believe that downzoning must seriously be considered as an option – I recognize that you don't think downzoning actually addresses the problems the neighbourhood is facing, and I'm open to being convinced of that, however I would like to see the City consider other ways to ease development pressures on the neighbourhood and disincentivize further densification of the residential core of the neighbourhood. (Individual)

Sandy Hill is already a very dense neighbourhood and we wonder why other neighbourhoods that are not included in this review are not zoned R4. Those areas

have space for intensification and many are just as close to rapid transit. We are losing families and long standing residents with the incessant over-building and resultant growing garbage and noise all around us. We know we don't have any hope of going to R1 but why not R3 zoning? (Individual)

Enforcement of By-laws

Short of cash for proactive bylaw enforcement? There is an annual transfer to municipalities from the Province of Ontario nicknamed the "Heads and Beds" levy in which Ontario gives a municipality \$75 for each head in a provincial institutional bed: hospital, university/college, jail and psychiatric institute (I think). it is transferred in acknowledgement of the fact that these "heads" are not contributing to the tax base and that they are a draw on the municipal infrastructure and services. With nearly 100,000 post-secondary students in Ottawa, that amounts to \$7.5M annually. What is that money being spent on? How about taking some of that to pay for proactive patrolling of Sandy Hill to look for property standards, garbage, parking and noise violations? There is a movement afoot among certain municipalities (Kingston, London, etc.) to see the levy increased from \$75 (set in 1986) to \$146 (<http://www.thewhig.com/2012/11/09/point-of-view-heads-and-beds-levy-outdated-unnecessary>). I don't think Ottawa is a signatory but it should be. Free money. (Individual)

From my own experience, I think the biggest problem in Sandy Hill is actually not with the zoning but rather with the City's approach to enforcement of its own bylaws, from noise to garbage to property standards. From a policy perspective, zoning and bylaw enforcement go hand in hand: the City establishes certain rules for what sort of activity can and cannot take place in a particular area (commercial, residential, industrial, agricultural) and then puts in place bylaws to guide residents on what is acceptable behaviour and what is not within that zoning area. ... There is a social contract between all parties in Sandy Hill that we will all agree to live together in R4 zoning - students, families, professionals, tenants, etc. - and that we will all respect each other and get along because, hey, there are bylaws that apply to everyone. However, the City's systemic failure to adequately and effectively enforce its own bylaws to ensure that people act appropriately is now manifesting itself in pushback from homeowners against any further development... The way they see it, the developer always wins... And homeowners? They get told that some new guidelines are coming forth that may address some of their concerns... (Individual)

I think the City needs to seriously reconsider a new approach to bylaw enforcement in neighbourhoods like Sandy Hill and Old Ottawa South, where there has been a large amount of new student housing added to the local stock and where residents are pushing back. Reactive enforcement is not working - I have a whole bunch of stats to share with you on this if you are interested - I have already shared it with Councillor Fleury. In neighbourhoods with high-density, high-transient student populations, the high turnover means new tenants and new problems and new education each and every year. City resource allocation, however, is such that there is no increased enforcement for our neighbourhoods, not even reactive enforcement. Decisions like

punting after-hours noise complaints to the police to deal with are now coming back to roost in light of police service looking to save their own resources. The City is loath or unable to take problematic property owners to court for the actions of their tenants. Property standards violations resurface again and again at the same addresses. Some of my friends have had to live beside dilapidated and vacant properties for more than a decade with no action by either the property owner or the City save painting over some graffiti and cutting the grass once in a while. ... homeowner FEEL like nothing has changed and that the City, by continuing to allow more and more high-density student housing to go in, is exacerbating the problem. (Individual)

Stop reactive bylaw enforcement for Sandy Hill and other neighbourhoods with a high volume of complaints to 311. Come up with another approach for “special areas” that actually meets the needs of the residents. Treating all parts of the city the same does not mean all parts of the city end up the same level of service. Sometimes it is necessary to treat different parts of the city differently in order for all parts to have the same outcome at the end. It is not unfair to do this - it is call substantive equality and it is a defensible policy to adopt in light of systemic challenges with bylaw enforcement in places such as Sandy Hill. (Individual)

Proactively patrolling certain neighbourhoods will permit residents to see their interests being protected and promoted - peaceful enjoyment, good quality of life - despite a growth in student housing. I cannot speak for all homeowners but I would hazard that most have a greater problem with the non-enforcement of bylaws on over-developed and under-managed/maintained properties than they do with students that live there. Based on my own experience, tenants take cues on how to behave based on where they live. If they live in a dump and the landlord only comes by to collect the rent, why would they care about their neighbours? Proactive patrolling and enforcement will also send a clear message to landlords who neglect to maintain their properties on the outside ... Without the City upholding the enforcement end of the social contract, there is no “hammer” to educated first-time tenants or force unscrupulous landlords to comply. (Individual)

Focusing on R4 zoning is good and may yield something in a few years time (like turning the wheel on a supertanker - it will eventually change course) but I encourage the City to also give the homeowners a “win” in the meantime by way of greater and more effective enforcement of bylaws. (Individual)

R4 review should guide new development, including infill, in a manner that at least keeps at current levels the City resources that are being spent to counter the negative effects of the existing too-dense developments. (Community Association)

Four-unit limit in junior (R4A-R4L) zones

Review to avoid the oversized units that have resulted from conversions, yes, but let's be cautious. Encouraging many small units might result in the creation of many “too small” units with limited long-term viability, as expressed in the last bullet above under the heading: Limit bedroom counts in dwelling units. As well, a street that might happily

accommodate one or two four-unit low-rise dwelling units might be overwhelmed by the same-sized buildings housing eight, 12 or 16 units: the sheer number of people and resulting noise, garbage, etc. would, I believe, have a negative impact on the streetscape and neighbourhood character. (Individual)

Figures 2 through 5 in Discussion Paper #1 are helpful. While I understand the challenge of the building that fits the current four-unit limit, I find that moving to 12 or 16 seems extreme (with likely consequences as noted in the above bullet); eight units sounds more reasonable. Again, I would think the question of the area of each apartment would need to be taken into consideration. (Individual)

I agree that the four unit limit for “junior” R4 zones should be re-examined. Reconsideration is particularly required if we go on to contemplate the relationship between minimum lot size and permitted number of units. My layman’s interpretation of the zoning by-law is that only four units can be accommodated in R4A and R4B in which the minimum lot size is 540 m² whereas there is no limit applied to R4U where the minimum lot size is 360m². If we are to limit the number of units, surely there should be some relationship to the size of the lot. (Individual)

Raising the four-unit limit in the junior R4 zones is an excellent solution. (Developer)

Allow higher unit density in low-rise apartments, and concurrently allow minor variances to be accepted if they are minor. In a single stroke, this would remove the need for builders to focus on massing of oversized dwellings and low-rise apartments. (Developer)

I support raising the four-unit limit. Most of the low-rise apartment buildings that exist today could not be built today because of the 4-unit limitation that exists. For example, see Rosemount Avenue between Gladstone Avenue and the Queensway. There are three low-rise apartment buildings on this segment of the street that are not overbearing and that could not be built now with the existing R4K zoning. 84 Rosement has 12 units. Of course, today’s setbacks and amenity space requirements would also prevent these from being built today in full compliance with the zoning by-law. (Developer)

In ‘Junior’ R4 zones low-rise apartment buildings should be allowed to have more than four units if a minimum unit size will be guaranteed (size to be determined). This would prevent exclusive zoning. (Community Association)

The maximum number of apartments should be tied to the lot size and the minimum unit size. (Community Association)

On the number of units, we would like to see some modelling done for the different lots sizes in Sandy Hill, to see what no limits on the number of units, but limits on bedrooms, would mean in practice. If density was well controlled though limits on the number of bedrooms, and the City were able to enforce this through a rental property licensing scheme, then we might be willing to support no limits on the number of units per building. Though we remain skeptical that developers will in Sandy Hill will opt for more units with fewer bedrooms per unit since this increases the number of kitchens and

bathrooms required, as well as the amount of amenity space they must provide. We recommend that in all cases, at least one-third of the units be one-bedroom, and at least one-third be two-bedroom, and only one unit is ever permitted to have four bedrooms. The City should be proactive in its support for this, by ensuring that site plan review considers the number of bedrooms rather than numbers of units, as this will yield a clearer future perspective on potential occupancy numbers. (Community Association)

If the unintended consequence of the four-unit limit was to encourage some developers to create even bigger units within the same envelope, then I think it would help to make a provision to avoid this situation, rather than overcrowd a lot (i.e. make it so that avoiding oversight such as Site Plan Control is not feasible). (Individual)

I understand trying to stop the 10 bedroom unit houses. I think that by allowed more units (as you have in this proposal) you will be alleviate that problem. Students don't like living in these units. They have already seen a drop in rent making these not very feasible. (Developer)

A building full of bachelor apartments is not what the market is demanding right now. We need to keep regulation as flexible as possible to allow the developers to react to market changes quickly. For example, if this review had been done 10 years ago, none of these "10 room units" would have been built as they would have build a 10 plex with proper site plan. 10 or 12 plex is far more valuable than a triplex with 10 rooms each but costs almost the same to build. (Developer)

We fully support the recommendation to review the four-unit limit in the junior subzones and review the minimum lot sizes for low-rise apartment dwellings, to provide opportunities to develop additional units in R4 zones that are appropriately located for intensification. We also support the recommendations to make the lot size requirements of R4 zones consistent with the lot fabric where these zones have been applied, particularly in areas appropriate for intensification. We would like to understand why recommendations for changes have been limited to the R4B, R4C, R4E, R4G, R4H, R4K, R4N, R4S and R4T subzones. (Developer)

Garbage storage

My neighbourhood has a triplex with 34 bedrooms going in, which is startling enough as it is for thinking about just the PEOPLE coming into the neighbourhood. But thinking about the impact on the existing grounds is gruesome. The tenants that live at the existing rooming house down the street are destroying the neighbourhood, to put it simply. For the first few weeks, the developers never even put a garbage facility for the tenants. Therefore, 12 people were just throwing garbage bags onto their front lawn, all of which were getting torn a part by animals and turning their yard into a landfill. I am concerned for the environment and our neighborhood for this new building. How is a building with almost triple the amount of people going to deal with garbage disposal if they cant even do it for 12? In addition to garbage, there is NO PARKING. What if all 34 people have cars? Where are they supposed to go? We have had multiple issues with the new tenants blocking our driveways, which is a huge hazard. The city surely must

have something in place to discuss parking issues when developing such a large dwelling? (Individual)

It is not at all clear why required indoor garbage storage is being considered for detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, or townhouses. It is our experience that ground oriented units are able to manage garbage storage. We would think that the concern is more related to multiple unit buildings where there is no space in the upper unit(s), or an area accessible at grade for garbage storage. This proposal should only affect “duplexes”, “three unit dwellings” and “low-rise apartment dwellings”. We reserve the opportunity to comment further on the suggested minimum area of 7 square metres for garbage storage. It is expected that in most cases garbage storage will be provided in an “accessory building”. An accessory building for garbage storage (or any other use) must be located in accordance with the provisions of the zoning by-law. The introduction of a requirement to provide garbage storage for these forms of housing will necessitate the reconsideration of amenity space requirements as suggested and may also require a review of provisions for accessory buildings. (Developer)

Garbage storage is an important element, and like circulation, exiting, and sanitary facilities for dwellings could be used to find a natural maximum room count. One might also add gas and electric meter enclosures to the list. (Individual)

Require indoor garbage storage for multiple-unit housing forms is a good suggestion. I expect the community would support it. (Individual)

The question of garbage storage and of air conditioning unit noise (or ventilation or heating noise) could be considered by expanding the application of Site Plan Control. If the number of bedrooms in a unit is controlled, perhaps it is not necessary to extend Site Plan Control for buildings of three units or less. I am not well informed of the problem but it strikes me as overkill to apply Site Plan Control to every duplex or triplex in order to address garbage issues. (Individual)

I agree with requiring indoor garbage storage for multiple-unit housing forms. At the risk of incurring the ire of my neighbours, I might even suggest that the City move towards such a requirement for all housing forms, including single-family dwellings. As climate change creates warmer summers, outdoor garbage storage anywhere might prove undesirable. (Individual)

Find a solution with the frequency of garbage pick up in these zones. The city cut back to 1x every 2 weeks. This is not enough. (Developer)

Garbage storage within the unit will help for the “eyesore” however will this just mask the issue. There are landlords that don’t take garbage seriously and this will allow the garbage to pile up lending a risk to tenants. More rodents within the buildings, etc. (Developer)

There are new regulations with Carriage houses at rear, is this a possibility to allow enclosed garbage housing units as a separate building at the rear of the lot. Similar looking at the dwelling units however used for garbage storage. (Developer)

I also believe that garbage needs to be addressed however I think that there is a responsibility for the city to support these zones and do a better job while holding owners/ builders to higher standard and a cost efficient and clean solution to housing the garbage on site (maybe indoor are rear of lot). (Developer)

Garbage management inside the dwellings is also impracticable, unsanitary, and disgusting. Who wants to live in a place where they are forced to keep and manage 2 weeks of garbage, recycle, green and black bins? How about the smells in hot summer days, the risk of vermine, and visual appeal. Garbage and bins are simply meant to be outside. But need to be managed with adequate enclosures. The City is doing the right thing when asking about the garbage management. It forces the builder to include it in the plans. I do support the City and the community on this point, but with the garbage outside, not inside. (Developer)

I do not support requiring indoor garbage storage. This may be an issue in areas where students reside but it is certainly not an issue throughout the city. Garbage issues should be handled by the City's enforcement branch through the property standards bylaws. There are no widespread issues with garbage in areas of the city where there are a high number of duplexes, triplexes, and low-rise apartment buildings such as Vanier, Overbrook, and Carlington. These buildings have existed for decades so I do not agree that we have to take these measures to fix an issue that does not exist. Requiring a building to have an indoor garbage storage will only make it so that less of the building envelope can be used to generate income and will adversely affect the feasibility of smaller developments. There are already a lot of barriers to overcome in the development of small multi-residential buildings, why add another one? If the City does move ahead with this initiative, an outdoor storage shed attached to the building or detached from the building should be permitted in the rear yard and some relief from the rear yard amenity space requirements should be provided in order to account for this. If duplexes, triplexes, and low-rise apartment buildings are targeted by this initiative, then so should homes with secondary dwellings or coach houses, as well as any other projects with multiple units (i.e., semi-detached, townhomes, stacked townhomes, etc.). (Developer)

Indoor garbage storage should be mandatory if the outside garbage storage would be facing a neighbouring property zoned in R1 and R2. (Community Association)

As per the earlier discussion (under parking), we support the City proposal "that indoor garbage storage of a certain size must be provided in any duplex, triplex or low-rise apartment dwelling". (Community Association)

We support including requirements for indoor garbage storage in multiple-unit housing forms in the revised R4 zoning by-law. (Community Association)

We support the move to require indoor garbage storage. We ask that this be reviewed in conjunction with responsible staff at the City to see if something can also be done to ensure that oversized dwelling units have to pay more for garbage pick-up since they naturally produce more garbage. (Community Association)

I own a sixplex and we have recycling coming every week. We were provided carts for this. Large blue, black and green bins. However, for garbage we cannot use the larger bins and must use regular cans. This creates a problem. In Gatineau they use carts, and the trucks have a small lifter to assist the guys to lift them. Many of these small infill sites not allow for bins as it is required to be winched. They are down small alley ways etc. The contractor cannot "walk" a wheeled a bin. Carts would solve ALL these problems. (Developer)

I would propose all units in the r3 and r4 zoning 3 to 12 units be allowed to have weekly garbage pick up and use large Carts. The same service we have for recycling. Even if we still had 1 bi weekly but allowed to use carts. This is HUGELY important, but both would 100% solve the problem of stinking garbage, neighbours complaints, rodents, bugs, and a whole host of health issues. (Developer)

Indoor garbage should be contained in the building itself, not in a shed. (Individual)

I feel very strongly that garbage must be contained inside these potential apartment buildings, not in a separate shed. These sheds are not very well constructed and never big enough for the amount of garbage produced by numerous residents so the doors are left open and garbage is strewn around by animals. Keep the garbage contained inside and require the land around the building to be landscaped, allowing room for trees to grow. (Individual)

Height and scale

On the height question, we recommend that the greater heights (13.5m/14.5m) currently allowed for larger lots in the R4 subzones be brought into line to match the existing 11m height allowance, which is consistent with the R4 zoning statement that it does not permit any more than four storeys. With regard to the Discussion Paper's comments on lot consolidation, we concur that further consideration is required and recommend that either lot consolidation not be allowed at all, or that a maximum lot size be established, and would welcome further discussion of the appropriate limits. (Community Association)

The discussion paper identifies some of the issues around scale, but the associated recommendations don't seem to help to protect community character in any way. The issue being that most new development in the R4 zones is out of scale with neighbouring properties. In some cases the issue is height, while in others it is the construction of new buildings or additions that reach much more deeply into rear yards. Therefore, we ask that more consideration be given to reducing out of scale height limits and increasing rear yard setback requirements. (Community Association)

The Official Plan already says the right things about scale, in that it calls for new development to be compatible with existing development. Scale in terms of height and setbacks is one of the most critical ways to ensure compatibility. However, the zoning bylaw does not reflect this requirement and the discussion paper doesn't seem to make any recommendations in this regard, and should be corrected. (Community Association)

I am very concerned that there are no proposed changes to height or mass (indeed height & setbacks are not properly addressed). (Individual)

Heritage

Heritage preservation, including maintaining streetscapes and the unique character of Sandy Hill is critical to us, and should be to the City as well. Intensification seems to be a goal that trumps all else, but it needs to be recognized that heritage preservation supports density. As one of your colleagues, Jennifer Keesmaat, Chief Planner of the City of Toronto, has said, "Areas that preserve heritage buildings also tend to be denser, more diverse, more affordable + provide more opportunity for new businesses." In other words, our contention is that continuing to allow the wanton demolition of homes in Sandy Hill in the name of intensification in fact undermines the goal of a dense, diverse, affordable urban core. (Community Association)

The first Discussion Paper talks about community character and compatibility, but doesn't address the important issue of heritage preservation. Lack of compatibility of new development is one of the biggest concerns of our member associations. Despite Official Plan language encouraging compatible design, respect for community character, and heritage preservation, most of the development we are seeing in areas zoned R4 throughout the City do not meet these objectives, so we are asking for a statement of additional direction as part of your recommendation. (Community Association)

I was alarmed to hear the City of Ottawa's zoning representative, talk about how buildings have begun to reach the end of their 'life expectancy' and are ripe for new infill. Seriously, the City of Ottawa does not encourage the preservation of older homes? Now here's the death bell for any hope of saving any sense of a heritage community! In Europe houses from the 1400s are saved from destruction, or even reconstructed at huge expense, to preserve a sense of past; in Quebec City the preservation of historic homes and buildings has resulted in HUGE tourist dollars. So why not in Ottawa and in Sandy Hill where we harbour one, if not the, largest collection of historic buildings Ottawa? (Individual)

My section of Chapel St, on the east side, has small clapboard houses built around 1892 in every second lot because they farmed the plot next to them. Most of Hesse homes have been remodels over the years but if you squint hard you'll see that every second house is very similar. Only during the 1940s did they really infill the farmed plots. This historic aspect will soon be lost forever as the houses are further converted in much larger apartments and torn down. (Individual)

Inclusionary zoning

To help address the shortage of subsidized housing, would the City consider mandating that one or two units in any newly built low rise dwelling be designated as RGI (Rent Geared to Income) units? It might be a good way of Degrhettoizing and nurturing healthier integration, decreasing social - criminal problems. (Individual)

Inclusionary zoning is also critical to ensuring diversity. Our communities need to offer housing for people of various socio-economic means. We would like to see a requirement that all new developments over a specified, appropriate number of units provide a percentage of those units for affordable housing. (Community Association)

Rooming houses are not usually purpose built. Owners have difficulty obtaining insured financing and with current restrictions. Similarly the student housing available does not meet the need due to the lack of support for developers. Additional restrictions by the City of Ottawa will not improve the availability of affordable options. (Individual)

Inclusionary zoning: Neighborhoods should include space for social/coop housing. We need to make all neighborhoods more inclusive to tenants with no-to-low income. Permits should be denied to developers who refuse to provide inclusive housing. (Individual)

Lot consolidations and maximum lot size

Lot consolidation and repurposing is a must for diverse neighbourhoods. There is no need for further restrictions, or bylaws or guidelines for projects involving lot consolidation. If one builds 4 townhouses, or one large low-med rise apartment or condo dwelling in an R4 zone should not be an issue. These various size, shape, and style of property is what makes a diverse, functional and affordable neighbourhood. It caters to the mature single family homeowners (SFH), the young families in townhouses, or students in smaller apartments. The City has to also put demographic cycles in their considerations. In 5-10 years from now when the millennials no longer want to live in bachelors, they will want larger townhomes, or SFH in mature neighbourhoods. Lot consolidation will be the only avenue for builders and families to enjoy affordable housing in these mature neighbourhoods. Maybe these properties will be so inviting that even retired folks will consider them inside of a 4000 sqft Victorian home. (Developer)

Lot consolidations should be considered fair game. What is important is that the building type planned is on a lot that permits it under CZBL 2008-250 (rather than getting variances from lot size/standards through the C of A.) (Individual)

Lot consolidation and the construction of larger buildings is a question of streetscape design and should be considered in a review of Infill 1. which raises questions similar to those addressed in "infill 1". We are soon coming to the time for a review of "infill 1" and the issue of lot fabric, streetscapes and grain of development might best be considered in that review. (Individual)

Agree that the City should consider maximum lot sizes for low-rise apartment dwellings. Enabling balance through forethought and judicious zoning to avoid the possible impacts of excessive lot consolidation makes sense (and is much easier than trying to "fix" such impacts after the fact). (Individual)

I do not support maximum lot sizes for low-rise apartment dwellings. I fear that this could prevent very appropriate and legitimate developments from occurring. Nobody is

consolidating residential lots to construct low-rise apartment buildings right now because it is simply not economically feasible. Developers will buy land zoned for mid-rise or high-rise development instead of buying residential lots at “retail” price only to be able to construct a low-rise apartment building. (Developer)

Discussion Paper #1 recognizes how lot consolidation can negatively affect neighbourhood character but doesn't really propose how to resolve this issue. On the current allowed height for larger (consolidated) lots in R4 subzones S, M, P and T, we would note that the Zoning By-law provides some guidance regarding the intent of R4 zoning as it applies to inner-urban neighbourhoods: "(1) allow a wide mix of residential building forms ranging from detached to low rise apartment dwellings, in some cases limited to four units, and in no case more than four storeys, in areas designated as General Urban Area in the Official Plan". (Community Association)

This issue of lot consolidation is raised in the discussion paper, but no real solution is offered. This is an important issue with potentially huge impact and we hope to see it studied and thoughtfully addressed. Ultimately, we would like to see some measures related to lot consolidations that consider the impact and ensure the new lot fabric would still be consistent with the existing lot fabric. (Community Association)

Agree with the staff recommendation that there should not be a regulation setting a maximum lot size for low-rise apartment dwellings. (Developer)

Minimum lot sizes

I cautiously disagree with changing the minimum lot size for low-rise apartment buildings: ...The example of one in five lots in Sandy Hill as meeting the current minimum size requirement sounds good to me: any more risks affecting the character of the neighbourhood. If there were a way to limit development of low-rise apartment buildings to 1.5 or two in five, that might work, but the concern would be allowing the take-over of the neighbourhood by low-rise apartment buildings ... not the mix contemplated in the purpose of R4 zoning. (Individual)

The report doesn't address anything in the R4M + zones. There is also the same problem (alignment of minimum lot sizes with actual lot fabric.) Example that R4S that has frontage to the street of 40ft is limited to 3 units. (Developer)

It is highly recommend to not tie the number of units to the size of the lot. A builder (and the City) will generally increase the profitability of the project if smaller units can be built. For example for the same size building on an acceptable lot with no minor variance: 12 bachelors = 12 beds vs 4 three bedroom units = 12 beds. The 12 bachelors are worth almost double that of the 4 three bedrooms. Tying the number of units to the lot size with negatively impact the builder, and will force them again, in every possible measure to build a massively ugly box to save on cost. Instead of building an architecturally beautiful, inviting and financially viable building. Builders WANT to build beautiful properties. It's the restrictions, bylaws and guidelines that negatively impact the viability forcing them again to be "creative" and do the very minimum. (Developer)

I support reviewing minimum lot sizes. Minimum lot width and lot area requirements should not prevent a development from occurring if all other provisions of the zoning bylaw are met. Over the last two years, the Committee of Adjustment has received quite a large number of requests to construct triplexes on lots that do not comply with the minimum lot width and minimum lot area requirements of the zoning by-law. These developments are consistently approved provided that they mostly comply with the other performance requirements. I would be pleased to provide you with a list of most of these properties upon request. (Developer)

The minimum lot size for a low-rise apartment building, as outlined in the current by-law, must be maintained. (Community Association)

I like to add a comments on the lot width in R4 Zone, how about if you reduce the lot width down to 11 m. for low rise building, instead 12 m you will make lots of property owners happier , and that could save them lots minor variance application process. (Developer)

I am worried about the impact of permitting apartment buildings on smaller lots and relaxing limits on number of units. I admit to not fully understanding your rationale for why this, counterintuitively, is a good thing. (Individual)

Regarding the proposed reduction of lot size for apartment buildings, I am concerned that there will not be enough land to absorb large amounts of rainfall and the result will be overflowing sewers and flooded basements. This impacts more than just immediate neighbours on either side of the developments. I wonder if the city planners even considered this possibility. (Individual)

If apartment buildings are allowed on smaller lots, where do the windows, kitchen vents and air conditioners go? Existing residents shouldn't have to endure the resulting noise and invasion of privacy. Site plan control needs to remain for all new developments. (Individual)

On the number of units, we would like to see some modelling done for the different lots sizes in Sandy Hill, to see what no limits on the number of units, but limits on bedrooms, would mean in practice. If density was well controlled though limits on the number of bedrooms, and the City were able to enforce this through a rental property licensing scheme, then we might be willing to support no limits on the number of units per building. Though we remain skeptical that developers will in Sandy Hill will opt for more units with fewer bedrooms per unit since this increases the number of kitchens and bathrooms required, as well as the amount of amenity space they must provide. (Community Association)

The discussion paper proposes decreasing minimum lot sizes for apartment buildings. We have concerns about permitting apartment buildings on undersized lots and feel that your proposal would need to be modeled before such a change was made. We are open to reviewing the subzones, as the maximum and minimum lot sizes don't always

make sense, but this would require much more time and community engagement.
(Community Association)

Putting the heritage characteristic of our community aside, then there's the make up of who lives in those houses. We have all seen that the City's intention of infill has led to the destruction of family living in large areas of Sandy Hill with the building of student bunk houses. Personally I do not agree with encouraging the building of apartments on smaller lots or more apartment units as is part of ASH's proposal to compromise with the City. I see this only leading to a new 'test period' of a few years where developers will further exploit our community. The City's view is obvious if 'Tim's' theory of the life expectancy of the buildings in Sandy Hill is representative...all homes are past their life expectancy and should be torn down! (Individual)

According to the Project overview, a key consideration for the R4 zoning review is “Ensuring that the new low-rise apartment buildings permitted in the R4 zones are compatible and fit with their neighbourhoods in both form and function.” If the changes to maximum unit counts and minimum lot sizes as laid out in Discussion Paper #2 is adopted, this will be a challenge, particularly in the R4N areas of Overbrook to which 7f would apply. If this recommendation is adopted along with changes to Site Plan Control, the burden of that challenge would rest on the Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development, and squarely on the staff exercising Site Plan Control. The consequences would be left with us. (Community Association)

Official Plan policies

I'm not sure the OP needs additional policy statements. However a more developed discussion of implementing the statements already present would be beneficial. I suggest that is beyond the scope of this study. (Individual)

We agree that no changes to the Official Plan are required to implement the City's preliminary recommendations in the R4 review. (Developer)

In our previous letter, we noted the flawed language of the Official Plan and the unfortunate temptation it gives rise to, for planners to seize on defined minor mitigating measures to justify decisions in favour of plans which are fundamentally ill-conceived and should be rejected or radically revised. We note now, with some alarm, that your earlier suggestion (in Discussion Paper 1) of policy rewrites made more specific in order to better protect stable neighbourhoods from incompatible development, has been dropped. (Community Association)

Oversized dwelling units

I support the proposal to allow oversized dwelling units, but only in detached dwellings. (Developer)

The Discussion Paper outlines the issues with ODUs well. However, it would benefit from recognizing 1) the costs the City is incurring to counter the negative effects of this type of dwelling and, 2) the developments already in the pipeline that will cater to the

housing demand near the University of Ottawa. The data in the attached Annex shows 62 developments under 'conversions' and a further 17 under 'infills' ... most of which could be classified as ODUs... and which have resulted in about 720 additional bedrooms added within the R4 zones in Sandy Hill since 2011. (Community Association)

We recommend that the revised R4 zoning by-law include a definition of an ODU, that it define ODUs as having more than four bedrooms per dwelling unit, and that it limit where ODUs can be built by using an immediate area concentration limit. This limit should be based on consideration of whether density targets in nearby zoned-for-higher-density areas (such as TODs and main streets) are or are not being met. We further recommend that the revised R4 zoning by-law prohibit the construction of any additional ODUs in Sandy Hill. (Community Association)

The number of bedrooms in an oversized dwelling unit should be restricted to six units, unless the builder/developer can prove a residential use otherwise. (Community Association)

Permit oversized dwelling units, but only in detached dwellings: Agreed. Again, determining the right number of bedrooms to define this category would benefit from further study ... my initial impression is that eight bedrooms would be too many. (Individual)

Permitting oversized dwellings, but only in detached dwelling, suggests that oversized dwellings would be permitted in R1 and R2 neighbourhoods. This would be fine by me, but I expect the neighbours would resist the idea, especially if the dwelling was near a college or university. One wouldn't want to recreate a Windfields vs. Death scenario. (Individual)

With the proposed changes, there doesn't seem to be any effective way to mitigate the problems caused by the existing over sized dwelling units. Bylaw either does not have enough resources to respond to problems in a timely manner or they don't take our concerns seriously and the garbage keeps mounting all over our neighbourhood. We desperately need rental property licensing to manage this multitude of rooming house type of buildings already on our streets. (Individual)

Parking

Discussion Paper #2 makes reference to older planning assumptions regarding the inclusion of parking lots. I still think that smaller apartment buildings will generate the need for parking and, if none is provided, overload the already congested on-street parking. If residents do not have cars, they will still need vehicles when moving in and out, and perhaps have the occasional visitor. I would not rule out the need for parking and, even if there is none, would it not be great to see any additional space dedicated to trees or other green space (especially if there are to be more small apartment buildings)? (Developer)

Permitting the construction of buildings of up to 12 units (without regard for bedroom count) with zero parking space facilitates high occupancy multi-unit buildings on small lots, a main concern being examined in this review. The R4 review should therefore reconsider the provision. (This is quite apart from the impact on street parking, which my neighbours recently raised in the context of a proposed 34-bedroom project.)
(Individual)

Requiring no parking for up to 12 units encourages rooming house type developments in R4 zoning with parking on the streets. Students do drive cars and new parking garage construction at Carleton as well as the studies that they did confirms the reality.
(Individual)

Students do drive cars and new parking garage construction at Carleton as well as the studies that they did confirms the reality. (Individual)

Parking is also an issue in OOE, particularly in the OOE neighbourhood north of the Queensway. This is an area where lack of parking has been exacerbated by the parking of contractors and now by the more limited parking available as a result of winter conditions. Further planned developments, which do not need to contain any on-site parking, are a major worry for many of the residents. (Community Association)

We respectfully request that City staff monitor the impacts of the parking changes implemented and report back to City officials on these impacts. (Community Association)

We further suggest that there is a link between the City's elimination of the need for parking for buildings with less than 12 units and the issue of garbage management. This parking change has in many cases eliminated an access to the rear yard that is sufficiently wide to allow for proper garbage storage in the rear or side yards.
(Community Association)

This is something I see as a major issue. It is not possible to force rear parking on many sites. When possible it takes away from much needed amenity space that will be used for safe area for people and families to play. No one wants their kids kicking a ball on the front yard close to the road. We also don't want a picnic table on the front of our properties. Please find a balance here. To completely exclude all front parking creates more problems. (Developer)

In many cases of townhome or stacked developments I would 100% rather see front parking and have back yards for families to live in. This again really causes safety issues and a reduction in quality of life. Instead of banning it, find ways to make it more feasible. (Developer)

This also causes a problem of lack of density. If we have account for a laneway to the back yard that pretty much takes the space of one more home. This means we have to charge more per townhome in addition to considerably more asphalt vs green space.
(Developer)

At the end of the day, in Ottawa a large portion of people need cars. There are not many rear lane properties and even then back yards are needed. Taking all of our green back yard and making it asphalt parking lots does not help. Thinking buyers will not demand parking is foolish. We cannot build a townhome or stacked unit and not provide parking very few people would buy it. (Developer)

Process

Could you please confirm that existing developments being proposed under current zoning (like the one at 41 Concord) will not move forward until the review is complete? It would be completely unfair to residents if the City allowed development under R4 zoning, while simultaneously reviewing whether R4 zoning remains appropriate in its current form. We consider this to be a matter of fundamental procedural fairness. The City claims to balance the interest of residents and developers. In whose interest is the decision to permit projects to proceed, knowing that there is sufficient levels of residential concern to warrant a review of the underlying zoning? Who specifically signed off on the decision to permit the project at 41 Concord to proceed, knowing that the zoning rules were under review –a review that was launched prior to the details of the project being made public? What message to residents does the City consider it will send if it approves a project under current zoning while it is under review, then changes the zoning in a manner that would have seen the project not approved under the eventual/new zoning? (Individual)

Direct Democracy: Ottawans need to have a vote on these decisions. Local communities need to be more engaged in formulating zoning bylaws with the goal of building community consensus and giving residents, old and new, a direct say in the character of their neighborhood. Community referendums can be held on alternative community design plans/zoning rules. (Individual)

The rules surrounding adjacent properties owned by the same person should be changed so that there is public input into treating adjacent properties as one property for zoning. Rather than automatically being viewed as one property, it should require the same application process as severing a lot. This must include public scrutiny so that residents have input into the size and use of larger buildings, particularly where parking is or may be an issue. (Individual)

Rooming houses

I support clarifying the distinction between a dwelling unit and a rooming house. (Developer)

Definitions of apartment, rooming house, and other forms of joint tenancy need to be developed. It appears from discussions with builders that the permits branch has its own definition of a rooming house that is not the same as that used by planning. (Individual)

Clarifying the difference (definitions) between a dwelling unit and a rooming house is important work and is strongly supported. The review and upgrading of definitions

should also capture apartments, and specifically apartments in larger dwelling units. (Individual)

With respect to the distinction between a dwelling unit and a rooming house, it may be useful to consider the definition of “rooming house”. My reading of the zoning by-law is that there must be at least four rooming units in a rooming house. This would mean that the traditional arrangement of “taking in boarders” or “taking in roomers” would only push a residence into a new definition once a certain number of rooming units is installed. Use of the number four in the rooming house definition may lend support to the idea of limiting bedrooms in dwelling units to a similar number. (Individual)

One issue which is not raised in the discussion paper, but may also be relevant, is the prohibition of rooming houses and retirement homes in the “junior” R4 subzones. As I have noted above, it seems that the traditional and informal taking in of “roomers” or “boarders” does not seem to be severely restricted but once the magic number of four is reached, many subzones make this forbidden. This may add complexity to the current review of R4 issues but it could be meaningful in an effort to secure affordable housing. (Individual)

‘Rooming house’ issue: I can confirm that at least one developer in this neighbourhood has marketed a new multi-unit building by the bedroom (vs. the apartment). I encourage the examination of zoning provisions with a view to ensuring that the intent of the rooming house regulation is not circumvented. (Individual)

Clarify the difference (definitions) between a dwelling unit and a rooming house: Agreed. Let’s benefit from the learnings in other municipalities. (Individual)

Our community would welcome clearer definitions within the zoning bylaws of the City (and consistent across all areas of City enforcement), and particularly would like to ensure that there is a proper regulation of developments which have been functioning like rooming houses but have been regulated as dwelling units. (Community Association)

Our comments: We support the Review clarifying the zoning definitions for rooming houses. (Community Association)

Our recommendation: We suggest the work the Review undertakes on this issue be used to revise the existing Rooming house by-law. It should also be used as the City progresses in its work to establish the parameters of a rental property licensing scheme. (Community Association)

“Defacto” rooming houses have become prevalent in many parts of the City, including in areas that are not zoned R4. We agree that the definitions and rules regarding rooming houses need to be cleaned-up and clarified. Ultimately though, we feel that any changes brought in relation to rooming houses will not prevent those operating “defacto” rooming houses from continuing to do so. As such, rental property licensing must be introduced in Ottawa and must include a requirement for an annual inspection of all rental properties. (Community Association)

I am aware that the developer has made sure that on paper, everything looks fine. That there are only 3 leases being signed for the triplex. There is no way to ensure that ONLY one person lives in each room. And I know for a fact, most of the tenants in the house did not even know each other before signing the lease - they just had to sign one all together, but the house is still functioning as a rooming house. The developer is a liar, a smart business liar, and is taking advantage of his knowledge of loopholes to get this job done. (Individual)

What is the city doing to ensure by-laws are enforced? This new building plan has a proposal for THIRTY-FOUR BEDROOMS. Surely, the builders are trying to get away with this being apartment style rooming, but from the experience of their existing infrastructure, that is surely not the case. The developer appears to be using loopholes in the City R4's zoning rules and it is contingent that the party in charge of these zoning rules please discuss this with the developers. Rooming houses have to undergo much more scrutiny and screening in order to be accepted. I'm unsure why the city even allowed the first building with only 12 single bedrooms to be built so easily without any questions. The developers know a way to scam the city, and the city has not done its due diligence to ensure that all by-laws and zoning rules were being complied by. And now they are looking to do it again. I urge ALL of you to look into this as soon as possible, as the developers are already getting ready to tear down this old house, with dollar signs in their eyes. (Individual)

The only option brought forward that seems to have some promise, would be to “clarify the rules established to ensure clear distinctions between rooming houses and other multi-unit developments”. I would like to see the City put forward a distinct category of multi-unit occupancy for both rooming houses and student housing. This would address our reality. Any other changes proposed would not. (Individual)

A purpose built rooming house model may be a better option. Everyone ones wants to get rid of these but they serve a very important niche in the market and provide low cost housing. Many of the homeless, and most desperate would take rooms. The city spends millions on hotels for shelter overflow. Clearly there is a lack of supply here. (Developer)

Clarify the difference (definitions) between a dwelling unit and a rooming house: This change to the zoning by-law is long overdue, and clarification will be greatly appreciated. (Developer)

The need for this type of accommodation for the impoverished is not well addressed in the recommendations. Couch surfing and shared housing are necessary evils for those with mental health issues or others who are chronically underemployed. Any proposed recommendations should address these needs. (Individual)

The rooming house bylaw speaks to renting out not more than three rooms. That has disappeared in your recommendations. You seem to be legalizing what was considered illegal. (Individual)

If you made it easier to build rooming houses but maybe limit the maximum number in an area or per street. (Developer)

Secondary dwelling units

Site plan approval is required for most projects that include 4 or more residential units, but there are instances in which secondary dwelling units can result in 4 or more units without site plan approval. For instance, a pair of semi-detached homes can be constructed and then secondary dwellings for a total of 4 units; or 3 townhomes can be constructed, severed and a secondary dwelling can be added to each townhome for a total of 6 units.... These can be done on much on smaller lots and in lower-density neighbourhoods such as the R2 and R3. Therefore, the impact of a 4-unit building made up of semi-detached homes and secondary dwellings will have a greater impact its surroundings than a 4-unit low-rise apartment building built on a large lot in a high-density zone. It is rather confounding that the City has made it quite easy to implement this type of density in R2 and R3 zones but yet so many obstacles continue to exist in order to add the same density in an R4 zone. (Developer)

We are unaware of any issues that would warrant the recommendations to limit the number of bedrooms in secondary units, or the need to set a maximum size on secondary dwelling units that wouldn't already be addressed by the recommended limit on bedrooms in dwelling units. We need a better understanding of the concern associated with a larger secondary dwelling unit being constructed as part of a larger detached dwelling. This is particularly applicable in the rural area where very large homes are built on very large lots, and a larger secondary dwelling unit could easily be developed as part of the home. This recommendation highlights our concern that many citizens, builders and community associations across the City may not be following this discussion and may be startled to learn too late in the process that changes have been made to provisions for Secondary Dwelling Units in the zoning by-law. (Developer)

The secondary dwelling unit in the basement of my house is larger than 80 square metres, as the average floor size of most bungalows is. I do not understand why the city planning staff pushed for discreet intensification through coach houses, yet they are trying to eliminate discreet intensification by limiting the size of secondary dwelling units. If there is an issue of landlords cramming bedrooms into basements in neighbourhoods surrounding the 3 post secondary institutions in the city, then why not only impose limits on those areas only? This will create undue adverse impact for families with aging parents, adult children and will not help housing affordability city wide. (Individual)

Site Plan Control

In the discussion of definitions above a similar situation to the example given exists. Sorting out an honest definition of a triplex would reduce the burden on Site Plan Control applications. Including an assessment of the scale of the building would help further refine and improve the use of site plan control. I believe the community association would support his proposal. (Individual)

The Discussion Paper notes that current zoning is silent on a number of the issues. I support the suggestion that revised zoning should address the issues (e.g. garbage storage, noise associated with greater density) rather than leaving such items to become a problem. If I understand correctly, there is an exemption from the Site Plan Control process for buildings of three units or less, and that this has proven to be a motivator for some developers to pursue ODUs. The simple solution appears to be to remove the exemption, although it is unclear whether such a move would create an undue burden for City planners. (Individual)

This seems to have been addressed when the city changed the ability to send a project through site plan at “manager discretion”. I would support having a set guideline for site plan and not leave it to the discretion of a manager. (Developer)

One matter that I cannot stress enough is that the biggest impediment to the development of low-rise apartment buildings in Ottawa is site plan control. It adds significant cost, uncertainty, and delays to the development process and in my opinion, adds very little value to low-rise developments. The approval process for low-rise apartment buildings must be reevaluated if the City wants to encourage this type of housing. (Developer)

Given that many units can be built as secondary dwelling units (e.g. a pair of semis, each with an SDU gives four units), it seems rather inconsistent to require site plan approval for one form of development and not for another when they both achieve the same number of residential units. For instance, in order to construct a low-rise apartment building with 4 units, one is required to provide (among other things) an environmental site assessment, a planning rationale, a geotechnical analysis and a noise study yet no such studies are required for the construction of the same number of units or more by combining semi-detached homes or townhomes with secondary dwellings and/or coach houses on the same property. Furthermore, the construction of low-rise apartment buildings will only occur in areas where the (higher density) zoning permits them. (Developer)

One of the biggest issues associated with site plan approval is that it triggers a parkland contribution. A parkland contribution is not required for a 4-unit building made up of semi-detached homes and secondary dwellings provided that the property is not severed yet, a parkland contribution is required for a 4-unit low-rise apartment building. Based on typical land values in Ottawa where 4-unit low-rise apartment buildings can be built, this works out to about \$35,000 to \$55,000. This is a lot of money for a small development especially when the other costs associated with site plan approval (e.g., application fee, technical reports, amendment to technical reports and architectural drawings due to City feedback, development agreements, etc.) are factored in. Despite having to make a parkland contribution, a 4-unit low-rise apartment is still required to provide 45 m² of outdoor amenity space whereas no such requirement exists for a 4-unit building made up of semi-detached homes and secondary dwellings. (Developer)

Eliminate any type of site plan control for any developments (e.g., low-rise apartment buildings, townhomes, etc.) up to and including 6 units given that the zoning bylaw currently allows 6 units to be constructed without site plan control. (Developer)

For low-rise developments exceeding 6 units and up to about 20 units (to be determined), create an abbreviated site plan control process. For low-rise developments exceeding about 20 units (to be determined), the same process would apply, however, civil engineering work to assess the grading, site servicing and adequacy of public services would be required because changes to existing infrastructure could actually be needed. Public consultation would also be required. (Developer)

Everything else should be handled elsewhere during the site plan control process. For example, a geotechnical analysis is required when the site has been excavated but this costs only a small fraction of the price of a typical geotechnical analysis. For smaller developments up to about 20 units, grading, site servicing, storm water management, etc. would be addressed during the building permit review process in the same way it is for detached, semi-detached, and townhomes. (Developer)

We support the idea of having Site Plan Control based on the scale of the building, and not merely the number of units. (Community Association)

We concur that site plan control should apply to more forms of development and that issues of the overall square footage and the number of bedrooms should be taken into account, not just the number of units. We suggest that any development with 4 or more units, or with 10 or more bedrooms in total, or exceeding 3,500 ft², should be subject to site plan control. (Community Association)

Disagree with the suggested requirement for site plan control for any building 400 square metres or greater will capture many forms of development that are not currently subject to site plan control. A triplex with three floors and basement will easily exceed 400 square metres (100 square metres/floor). A large detached home in the rural area could also be captured by this requirement. There is no justification for capturing these forms of development under site plan control. We understand that a requirement for site plan control for any building 600 square metres or greater has been suggested by others. We would support setting the standard at 600 square metres. (Developer)

I would prefer to maintain the current Special Site Plan Control for Sandy Hill. (Individual)

Transition Clauses

A transition clause will be required if the recommended by-law changes result in more restrictive provisions (eg. garbage storage, amenity space). (Developer)

We also recommend making a direct reference to the City's Urban Forest Management Plan and its requirements with respect to Distinctive Trees and the need in general to preserve trees on properties. Trees can obviate or at least reduce the need for air conditioning units, and their preservation and planting must be supported in some way

in the revised zoning by-law and in the Site Plan application process for any multiple-unit building in which air conditioning units are proposed. It should also be recognized that one of the most important reasons for adequate set-backs is to contribute to a healthy urban tree canopy. (Community Association)

Another issue affecting community character is the loss of mature trees. Much more must be done to preserve our urban tree canopy. The R4 zone provisions are directly implicated. One of the objectives of setbacks should be to ensure that there is room for mature trees. Generally speaking, setback requirements as they currently are do not support the maintenance of mature trees nor the expansion of the urban tree canopy. This is inconsistent with the recent consultation on Ottawa's urban forest strategy. (Community Association)

I am pleased to see that you are examining the wider range of tools that may help to achieve the desired results of the zoning review ... my gut reaction is that the City should do what it needs to do to achieve the desired outcomes. The caution would be to ensure that changes such as those to Development Charges would not have unintended consequences (e.g. encouraging developers to avoid any family-sized apartments). As well, I'd like to think that any changes to the Official Plan would provide additional information towards goals, rather than changing direction (e.g. residents may become discouraged if the City were to revisit issues where residents thought they had achieved a target result, only to have the topic reopened and needing to have the debate all over again). (Individual)

The City should work with communities to identify the major and minor streets in each neighbourhood and assign where apartments (and small mixed-use buildings) may go, and by extension where they are prohibited. (Individual)

We need to empower Ottawans to build their own homes. The tiny home movement is growing and there is huge demand for spaces to build such homes. Green spaces (alongside other purposes) can be reserved for communal tiny homes. These dwellings are cheaper, more sustainable, can be mobile, can be built in a way that meets local concerns. (Individual)

We on Concord St N have already had to deal with construction of a rooming house this past year already(59 Concord Street N), which was horrendous. We had to deal with constant water and hydro shut-offs, large machines disrupting quiet hours, horribly rude/sexist construction workers, etc. The builders told us when they were ripping down the existing house, that they would be living there in the new building they construct. It turns out they were lying and built a 12 unit complex. This was alarming. That meant a minimum of 12 new people moving into the neighbourhood. The kijiji ads they posted were not just advertising as 3, 4-bedroom apartments, but as individual rooms - aka a rooming house. But the building itself was not licensed as a rooming house, which begins to concern me about the lack of by-laws being enforced by the city. (Individual)

I cannot put it into words more simply other than the city has not done it's due diligence when it comes to these buildings. It is clear to me that the city is worried about money,

and money only. The builders will bring in more people that can "help" the existing economy, which is a total hoax to me. I would hope that the city cared about its existing population more than this, to just allow building developers to do whatever they so please. I have been informed of MANY instances this has happened, and frankly I think the city needs to address this issue NOW. (Individual)

Change is not a goal unto itself – it is simply a process that needs to be appropriately managed in order to shape outcomes and achieve desired results. (Individual)

One item that did not get addressed in the resolution of the OOECA appeal against 11.0 m three-unit dwellings in R3 zones was with regard to definitions. A building that is 3 ½ stories tall and has four full height inhabitable floors can be given two definitions depending on minor tweaks. It can be a four unit dwelling (low-rise apartment) if in an R4 zone, or it can be a three-unit dwelling if in an R3 zone with the basement added to the ground floor. If the third and second floor were combined the building would be a stacked townhouse. All of these variations describe the same building height, area, and bedroom count plus or minus one or two. The land use area that the different building types require however is very different. Apartments, even low-rise ones, and stacked townhouses require larger lots, which is appropriate for greater occupant density. Both better definitions and clear city responses at CofA are needed to provide the clarity that community association's desire. (Individual)

Might the area of a unit be useful as a measure for defining dwelling units? (Individual)

You spoke about our need to change in order to address current and future needs and expectations. We all agree but this kind of change with 24 students/building is destroying parts of our community. I feel that the city, with the help of the University, is aiding the destruction. You say that we are close to the LRT and can expect to plan for higher density than we now experience. That's true - for that area that is within 600 metres of the station. It begs the question of how much density is needed. And there are parts of Sandy Hill that are further away from the LRT station than 600 metres. Shouldn't that part of our community be subject to reduced density requirements? (Individual)

The R4 zoning review is an opportunity to repair some of the existing problems within this residential zoning type, and to restrict the damage being done by densification and reduced parking requirements. (Individual)

Our city downtown area is quickly becoming an area unfriendly to local shopping being replaced by wall to wall condos and apartments. (Individual)

Where can you buy groceries within a kilometer of Parliament Hill? Creating more bedrooms is not the solution. (Individual)

I agree with much of what has already been posted on your website. Developers and community associations have raised valid concerns and the challenge the City has is to find the balance between the two. I believe that intensification is both unavoidable and

desirable and to take an anti-development position is ineffective in light of City and Provincial Policy that support intensification. (Developer)

I think residents and community associations are reacting negatively to R4 in places like Sandy Hill because they see some property owners exercising their right to develop their property in manner befitting “highest and best use” but doing it in a manner that is having negative impact on the quality of life of those living around them. The kind of intensification seen in Sandy Hill, for example, since 2001, has been largely adversely transformative for the non-transient, non-landlord residents, i.e., homeowners. Where once a family of four or five may have lived and that had a footprint of a single family with a single car and one or two garbage cans and a few friends coming by once in a while, there are now four apartments with a total of 24 beds with 24 individuals with probably more than a few cars and many garbage cans and many, many more friends coming by, and all of them living in a building that now towers over the neighbouring properties and taking away privacy and sunshine. You have heard this all before during our fight to put an end to conversions and in our comments for Infill 1 and Infill 2 guidelines. There are countless examples of family homes and even entire streets being converted to student housing. Intensification is something the City and the province endorse and support but homeowners, for the most part, hate it. (Developer)

Based on personal experience, the maxing out of R4 zoning is done for two reasons. First, there is a demand for student housing. A property owner looking to supply housing can either use the existing envelope or renovate/add on to the existing envelope. When doing the latter, the cost to construct additional bedrooms begins to drop dramatically the more bedrooms that are added, incentivizing an owner to get both a high and fast return on investment (ROI). We faced this exact situation when a few permanent residents on Goulburn Avenue bought a dilapidated property across the street that, but for our intervention, would surely have become a 4-unit, 24-bedroom building. The house was a total gut. When we ran the numbers to revert the house to a four-bedroom, single family home, we stood to lose over \$200k. Maintaining it as a three-bedroom and four-bedroom duplex meant a loss of only \$60k. A four-plex with two bedrooms in each unit, however, which required a 11-foot addition on the back, allowed us to break even, and put us into a position where the building would pay for itself and over time. We chose this route because it was the least invasive and least disruptive to the neighbours, would attract couples and professionals, and was something we could manage ourselves on a day-to-day basis. Our ROI will take time and we are patient. Out of curiosity, we ran the numbers on what it would have cost us to put on a bigger addition and create four four-bedroom units and it was actually not that much more money than the two-bedroom model we chose (less than \$100k) but the monthly income was nearly doubled and the bank would have valued it much, much higher. This brings me to the second reason why developers are maxing out the R4 in Sandy Hill - they can pull a lot more equity out of a four-unit, 24-bed building than they can out of a four-unit, eight-bed building. In our case we could have pulled an extra \$180k out of our property. I know of one developer (and I am sure there are more) that did this over and over again, subdividing family homes into two units or more, putting in second and third kitchens and bathrooms for \$60k-\$100k, and then going back to the bank to refinance and pull out an extra \$100k-\$160k on their investment which they promptly used to

acquire another property. Banks place a much higher value on a 2-unit building than a single family home of the same square footage. And don't forget the monthly income that a 24-bed building can generate: even at only \$500 per room it is \$12,000/month or \$144,000 a year. Some property owners are very good and conscientious about their developments and others are not, and the ones that are not will always want to squeeze maximum value out of their property regardless of impact on neighbours. They will push boundaries on Infill 1 and 2 and the R4 zoning, just as they did the old conversion bylaw. They are not interested in the intent behind the any zoning amendments or tweaks - they will find a way to remain compliant but are not interested in abiding by or upholding the spirit of the law. (Developer)

I have read the comments on the webpage and report and they appear to be heavily spearheaded by the community associations, which appear to have the underlying motto of "minimal development in my backyard" in a city that has put zoning amendment to promote intensification. (Developer)

It is clear and obvious that the Community Associations are NOT addressing the root cause of all these "oversized dwellings" and ANY of their suggestions. The single, and only reason these oversized dwellings exist is to make the property cost effective for the builder and ultimately for the residents. By adding more rules, guidelines and bylaws will simply shift the problem to lower zones (R3, R2). The zoning restrictions is addressing the underlying motive of the builder, the financial viability of the project and affordability for the residents, hence where 100% it's restrictions becomes shortfall solutions. In recent years, the City has levied and increased their myriads of tax, fees, development charges, and permits requirements. These have changed the cost structure for builders. Lower fees would relieve pressure on the builder and the tenant, and massing would be less important, over architectural design and appeal. Having every project go through site plan for properties in R4 zones is simply impracticable, cost prohibitive, and forces builders to be even more "creative". The builder, the city staff, the renters and community as a whole are worst off. (Developer)

As a former student, and now a young professional, I know first-hand that students and my generation almost never have their voices heard. After reviewing your discussion paper what jumped out at me was that I am almost certain no young student residents, or young professionals renting in the area were consulted. (I do not know this for sure so please correct me if I am wrong). This demographic is not likely to make their voices heard because they are often struggling to keep their heads above water in the current economic climate. The amount of education and experience required now for so called 'entry level positions' is unprecedented and difficult to acquire without time money and lots of effort. These positions are then often poorly paid, with little or no benefit package, and more often than not they are short to medium term contracts with almost no job security. This demographic was likely not consulted at all. This is the next generation. The demographic that was likely consulted the most and made their voice heard loud and clear through community groups and being at city hall mid-day on weekdays (which is obviously nearly impossible if you work full-time) was the baby-boomers and Gen X'ers. This demographic of people benefited from some of the most socially progressive policy we have ever seen in Canada, were able to find long-term,

stable, well-paying and benefit package jobs with ease. They were also able to own homes in neighborhoods like Sandy Hill. The market hadn't exploded and neither had the student population yet. There is a huge gap in equality and economic power between these demographics. It is often an inequality that is glossed over. My point is thus, please do not make any decisions without at the very least considering the impact it will have on the stakeholders that cannot influence this change, but will nevertheless be impacted. Sandy Hill must remain a diverse and multi functional neighborhood. Don't let it become the reserve of wealthy homeowners. (Individual)

Thank you for meeting with members of Action Sandy Hill (ASH) on the evenings of October 12 and November 16, 2016, to discuss the R4 Zoning Review. We would like to provide you with our comments regarding this review and subsequent changes that will be made to the R4 zoning by-law. The following is a summation of our concerns, and our recommendations, regarding the R4 review. We want to ensure that the recommendations of this review will address heritage preservation, neighbourhood character, diversity, density, and the application of planning tools. (Community Association)

As we stated at our meetings, we are not against density or intensification. We are however, against intensification at any cost, which often has significant negative impacts on the quality of life in our neighbourhood. When, for example, one property that previously housed four or five residents now houses 24 or more, we feel that density has been carried too far. The pressures on the neighbours have proven to be too onerous, and the costs to the City to enforce noise, garbage and property standard by-laws too high. Increased demand on by-law enforcement means budget monies are not being spent for productive ends (i.e., are being wasted due to poor planning). This kind of density coupled with blatant disregard for heritage preservation and the built character of our neighbourhood has reduced our quality of life. As you'll see from the attached Annex (which includes data from building permit records), Sandy Hill has seen numerous developments completed or approved in the last 5+ years, all together adding capacity for about 6500 more residents. (Community Association)

There is one more link to be made with other City policies (beyond the urban tree and garbage bylaw links made above) – that of construction and demolition waste and landfill dumping fees. According to the City's IC&I Waste Diversion Strategy and Implementation Plan, construction and demolition materials were to be banned from City landfills by 2014. This is one measure that could help discourage the demolition of the quality construction found in many Sandy Hill homes. We would welcome an update on the results of this ban to date, and how it can be reinforced in order to contribute to the preservation of heritage buildings and other character buildings that contribute to the historic/unique feel of neighbourhoods such as Sandy Hill. Surely with the ever-increasing focus on environmental sustainability, encouraging construction of high quality, durable buildings and preservation of existing ones must be a desired outcome. (Community Association)

There are several key principles that the FCA believes all planning and zoning decisions should support, these include: Preservation of individual community character;

Conservation of our built and natural heritage; Environmental sustainability; and, Respect for public input and engagement. (Community Association)

Staff were to monitor the implementation of Infill 1 and 2, and to report back to Council. This review is relevant to the R4 zone review. Yet we have yet to see any such reporting, has this been done? If yes, when will the results be shared with the public? (Community Association)

We remain concerned about affordability of housing for families in urban areas, and don't feel that any of the recommendations in the discussion paper would do anything to encourage construction of new housing geared to families or to affordable housing. (Community Association)

The discussion paper addresses some issues related to site servicing, like garbage and air conditioning units, but fails to address others, including noise and light pollution, and on-site water management. We would encourage you to review these issues as they can have significant impact on quality of life. We would also stress that consideration must be given to the link between the lack of urban tree cover and the need for air conditioning. If we can rebuild our tree canopy this could help to naturally cool areas thereby decreasing the need for air conditioning. (Community Association)

We would encourage you to examine the possibility of requiring a minimum amount of common space (living room, kitchen, bathrooms, etc.) based on the number of bedrooms. Such a formula could help to ensure more versatile and livable units. (Community Association)

We note the interconnectivity and interdependence of many of these recommendations. For example, removing the limit on the permissible number of units in junior R4 subzones would not be beneficial unless limits on oversized dwelling units, and on the permissible number of bedrooms on a lot were also adopted. Given the ease with which the number of bedrooms could be misrepresented, licensing of all rental properties is also necessary to permit inspection and enforcement of this limitation. As such, it is critical that all recommendations be adopted together. (Community Association)

After consideration, we like your recommendations. We see them as intelligent, an ingenious response to serious problems that must be addressed. However, before declaring ourselves, we must ask you two questions: (1) Can you assure us that your recommendations would be adopted as a package? The deletion or watering down of one or another element - such as occurred after the public participation phase of the INFILL II exercise - would probably result in they're being counter-productive, in even more undesirable, unintended consequences. (2) Can PIEDD assure us that, should these recommendations pass, Site Plan Control will act with more determination and assertively to ensure that the increased development they would allow in our community - on Donald, on Columbus, on "the Royals" and on other streets in Overbrook - would not be permitted to disfigure or disrupt, but will occur in a manner sensible of the existing community, sensitive to streetscapes and compatible with the character of our neighbourhoods? (Community Association)

I'm writing to voice my support for the proposed changes to the R4 zoning in Sandy Hill community. As a property owner and landlord in the area, I think that the proposal does a good job of balancing both the need for densification and for neighbourhood character in our urban areas with consideration for families and a diverse community. Limiting the number of bedrooms in multi-unit buildings is necessary to allow for housing types that can allow a range of tenants. The removal of the 4 unit restriction in the junior R4 zones will allow of the development of true small apartment buildings on larger lots which can accommodate a range of tenants. (Individual)

I think it's time at we create an R4 exception zone for ALL of Sandy Hill to preserve its character, which includes families and not just students as it's residents! It preserves an appropriate backdrop for the many historic buildings and puts a stop to the proliferation of student residences immediately! Some areas of Sandy Hill, especially south of Laurier, have reached the 'tipping point' of what should be considered an appropriate mix of student (transient) to permanent residents. I have very little against students and it's because of the vibrancy that they bring to our community that I live in Sandy Hill but that vibrancy has become a completely out of control party! But more importantly a community needs long term residents who are committed to their place and have an invested interest to ensure it remains liveable....something that Sandy Hill is beginning to lose and far too quickly. (Individual)

Thank you for your hard work on this review. It is long overdue. I am a property owner owner in the center town/lower town. In addition I help developers finance and locate properties to develop. Many of your suggestions are wonderful. I was very happy to see a streamlined site plan process. please make this as simple as possible. This one of the single largest blocks to small creative development. (Individual)

Families need affordable places to live with safe places for kids to play. (Developer)

It makes sense to make the most use of existing buildings. Housing providers/tenants should be encouraged to house as many people as possible in order to maximize the use of existing buildings. I understand that some older residents do not like the presence of students, poorer tenants. I believe the way forward is for community associations to encourage dialogue between new and old residents to ensure there is understanding and harmonization of objectives. (Individual)

I do not see how your recommendations to our r4 zoning will improve our situation. The problem remains too many people and no one responsible for the property. 139 Henderson is mixed apartments but awful. So is 245 Laurier east which now has 15 apartments one including 4 rooms. It is crazy the efforts being made by private citizens to hold on to what was a vibrant community. (Individual)

I really do think the city needs to look at Sandy Hill in a context and I don't see this in your recommendations. Apartments that you describe as offering better choice have been removed from our midst. The Viner development alone has removed a huge chunk. We have lost retirement homes and rentals to student purpose housing. The change on the street is drastic. (Individual)

We have been tasked with educating tenants, landlords, neighbours, politicians, city officials, city staff, the university. And that, over and over. I think we should be rewarded for our efforts. R4 is not a viable solution. We are supposed to be family oriented neighbourhood. I don't see any change in what you propose, but a continual erosion of a mixed neighbourhood. (Individual)

As both a resident of Sandy Hill and a director on the community association board (ASH) I am very pleased by the proposed changes to the R4 zoning. I think that the proposal does a good job of balancing both the need for densification in our urban areas with a balance for families and a diverse community. Limiting the number of bedrooms in multi-unit buildings is necessary to allow for housing types that can allow a range of tenants. The removal of the 4 unit restriction in the junior R4 zones will allow of the development of true small apartment buildings on larger lots which can accommodate a range of tenants. I fully support the proposed changes you have put forward. (Individual)

Your document demonstrates a lot of careful thinking, respectful listening, and lots of focused hard work. Thankyou. (Individual)

As a 5-year resident of Sandy Hill I love the neighbourhood and want to see it fulfill its tremendous economic, social and cultural potential. However the current state of Sandy Hill – arguably the most historically important neighbourhood in the country, in the capital of a G7 country and within a stone's throw from Parliament - is an embarrassment. In its current state it is neither healthy nor resilient and it is failing to leverage important opportunities in relation to heritage, tourism, economic growth, equality/affordability, vibrancy/public health and sustainability. (Individual)

I know that the City recognizes there are problems, and I am certainly aware of your dedication and work in seeking to address these. Accordingly, my below comments are offered with a view to providing a frank assessment of the current state of the neighbourhood, some thoughts on factors that have driven that decline, and some ideas related to mitigating the problem. I am cognizant that many of these go beyond strictly R4 issues, and instead relate to issues of strategic planning, economic development and city-building as a whole. I have therefore taken the liberty of copying Stephen and Mathieu on this message. I don't expect you will be able to follow up with me on each of these issues, and I recognize there may be points on which we disagree, but I certainly remain at your disposal to discuss further and offer additional input in to the review process from the perspective of an informed citizen. (Individual)

In my view, the City can no longer simply assert that the market is driving demand for development in Sandy Hill and all we can do is manage it. The City must take on responsibility for influencing market demands in a more proactive way, using the entire panoply of sticks and carrots at its disposal. (Individual)

Here is it important to note that the City continues to scold residents for resisting change, despite the fact that the only change Sandy Hillers have seen in almost a decade has been entirely negative and has led to a systematic dismantling of the

health, happiness and beauty of the neighbourhood, its social fabric and its built heritage. Indeed all of this change (with the notable exceptions of the Carriage House project, the All Saints project and the recent arrival of Happy Goat Coffee!!), has been entirely antithetical to the City's own purported goals; some of these goals may be met by a certain degree of development, but most of them are served by other kinds of tools and mechanisms. (Individual)

As with change, densification is not a goal unto itself. As such, it is important to recognize that the transformation which is needed in Sandy Hill to meet Provincial/Municipal/Residential goals is not necessarily more density, but rather a host of other things like improved property standards enforcement, more greenspace and softscaping, better services and amenities, increased demands on developers/landlords to incorporate affordable housing and proactive property standards and bylaw enforcement. (Individual)

Increasing density via development is but one tool that can help a city achieve its strategic goals, and in some cases – like that of Sandy Hill – it can actually work at cross-purposes to those goals. Indeed the City's current approach to development in Sandy Hill privileges transient lodgers over permanent residents; decreases the diversity in the neighbourhood by targeting housing for solely one demographic (students) at the expense of all others (i.e. recent loss of two seniors residence due to conversion into sole-use student apartments, permanent conversion of family homes into bunkhouses); consolidates wealth outside of the community in the pockets of absentee, non-resident landlords; fails to provide affordable housing options; creates unhealthy, unhappy, unsafe living conditions for students; and undermines appropriate development along the nodes where it should be happening (i.e. 700 new beds in the neighbourhood in problematic oversize dwelling units pop up while the Trinity project on Chapel & Rideau founders because it cannot find a market to sell its units with around 700 new beds....) (Individual)

I must take issue with your comments and rationale regarding the need for development as a way to replace building stock that has come to the end of its life cycle. Having lived extensively overseas for many years (Barcelona, Milan, Geneva, Paris, Mumbai, New York), as well as in a number of Canadian cities (Calgary, Vancouver, Toronto), I am familiar with very old and very new cities. (Individual)

The current arguments used to justify demolition and re-development in the Ottawa context are specious; the issue is almost entirely unrelated to the longevity or natural lifespan of extant building stock, but rather tied to a system in which premeditated demolition-by-neglect has paid off significantly for developers. (Individual)

Not only does the current system incentivize an approach to consolidating land and demolishing heritage structures because the City has repeatedly accepted developer arguments that it is too expensive to revamp neglected buildings (e.g. Claude Lauzon, Viner Developments, Dworkin Furs etc.), it also provides no disincentive through tax levies or other proactive property/bylaw enforcement. The combination of these factors is what is leading the destruction of most of Ottawa's built heritage, not the end of their

natural life spans. My own house (a pre-Confederation Victorian) is a perfect example of this – having been maintained properly over 150 years, it is as strong and solid now as the day it was built. I would be cautious in using such arguments to justify demolition and development in a neighbourhood like Sandy Hill, where frankly most of the original housing stock is of much better quality and in much better shape than the cheap infill, conversions and new builds that we've been enduring over the last decade. (Individual)

I am convinced that rental property licensing is still needed. (Individual)

One question that was not answered was what research was done on how other cities are dealing with these issues. There were a couple of slides but the city should share its research findings with our communities. If no research has been done, it should be. Ottawa can learn from the experiences of other cities. (Individual)

The developers of the oversized 'bunkhouses' always seem to be one step ahead of the city planners whatever you do. Has the department thought of some fallback regulation or rule to enforce if developers come up with another way to get past new zoning to continue their assault our neighbourhood? Sandy Hill residents are tired of these constant studies and reviews to patch up problems that the city has allowed with its lack of planning. Most of us are not experts in urban planning and expect city staff to act in our best interest. Right now our neighbourhood is being destroyed block by block and it has to stop. (Individual)

On behalf of the Overbrook Community Association, here are our comments. You have done a good job of describing the unintended and undesirable consequences of current R4 regulations. We concur with the need you have identified for modest, affordable housing in the inner urban area, suitable for students, young people starting out on their careers, low-wage service workers and others who can't afford a condominium or don't want to live in a high-rise. We believe the measures you propose would effectively encourage low-rise apartment buildings which will meet this need; also that they would deter conversions to and the construction of rooming houses on streets where they don't fit, and help to mitigate nuisances which rooming houses have been found to generate. On the other hand, we are very aware that the relaxation of performance standards that you propose would provide for a level and density of development in Overbrook much greater than what is presently allowed. (Community Association)