



Rawlson King

**Councillor / Conseiller,
Rideau-Rockcliffe**

Comprehensive Zoning By-law
Position Paper

December 2025

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Key Achievements	4
Major Concerns	4
Our Core Principles	4
Required Actions Before Final Approval	5
Introduction, Context, and Accountability.....	5
Heritage Conservation Districts: Rockcliffe Park and New Edinburgh.....	8
Rockcliffe Park: Preserving a National Historic Site.....	11
New Edinburgh: Successful Heritage-Growth Balance.....	12
Beechwood Corridor: Supporting Commercial Vitality.....	13
Wateridge Village: Coordinated Development Success.....	14
Manor Park: Harmonizing Mid-Century Character with Growth.....	15
Lindenlea: Protecting Garden City Character.....	16
Overbrook: Balancing Intensification with Community Needs.....	18
City-Wide Issues Affecting Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward.....	19
Implementation, Monitoring, and Next Steps.....	22
How Residents Can Engage.....	25
Conclusion.....	26
Contact Information.....	29
Acknowledgments.....	29
Appendix A: Comprehensive Analysis of the City of Ottawa's New Zoning By-law.....	30
Fundamental Changes from Current By-law.....	30
Housing Provisions and Density.....	31
Parking and Transportation.....	34
Mixed-Use and Commercial Zones.....	36
Environmental and Sustainability Provisions.....	39
Rural Area Provisions.....	41

Implementation and Transition.....	42
Public Consultation Summary.....	44
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	46
Appendix: Staff-Recommended Changes Summary.....	49

Executive Summary

This Position Paper provides a clear account of what the Final Draft By-law gets right, where it falls short, and what actions are required before Council adopts the new by-law in January 2026. It reflects extensive community input and analysis of the Final Draft released on September 8, 2025.

Key Achievements

- **New Edinburgh:** Height limits of 11 metres preserved, maintaining compatibility with the Heritage Conservation District.
- **Wateridge Village:** All identified technical zoning errors corrected; Secondary Plan alignment achieved.
- **Lindenlea (Thomas Adams Area):** The 8.5-metre height limit maintained through Exception 1493.

These outcomes show what is possible when staff respond directly to community concerns and heritage context.

Major Concerns

- **Complete removal of zoning-level Heritage Overlay protections,** including height, massing, and addition controls that previously safeguarded heritage character.
- **Rockcliffe Park:** Application of generic neighbourhood zoning fails to reflect its unique heritage character and its status as Canada's only residential National Historic Site.
- **City-wide elimination of minimum parking requirements** without accompanying on-street parking management tools, creating challenges in Overbrook, Lindenlea, and portions of Manor Park.
- **Weakened rear-yard transition policies** along mainstreets, which may negatively affect low-rise residential areas.

These gaps require targeted corrections before the final by-law is enacted.

Our Core Principles

To ensure zoning supports rather than harms our communities, implementation must follow four principles:

1. **Heritage First:** Zoning must reinforce—not dilute—Heritage Conservation District Plans.
2. **Context Sensitivity:** Each community's unique built form and character must shape zoning outcomes.
3. **Balanced Growth:** Intensification must align with infrastructure, parking, and transit capacity.
4. **Meaningful Engagement:** Residents must have a clear path to influence decision-making and understand how the by-law affects their streets.

Required Actions Before Final Approval

- Amend Section 209 to define and highlight the process for a property within an HCD.
- Restore or replace key removed heritage form controls, particularly for Rockcliffe Park.
- Correct remaining technical errors and finalize mapping updates.
- Accelerate parking permit program expansion and develop neighbourhood parking strategies.
- Strengthen transition requirements along mainstreets and require active ground-floor commercial uses.

This Position Paper outlines exactly what needs to change, what must be monitored, and how we will ensure accountability as the new Zoning By-law is implemented. This paper also has an appendix which provides a comprehensive analysis of the City of Ottawa's New Zoning By-law. Please note that despite our comprehensive effort to review multiple drafts of the Zoning By-law, that this document might contain errors and is not an exhaustive exercise.

Introduction, Context, and Accountability

Purpose of This Position Paper

The City of Ottawa's comprehensive zoning by-law review represents a defining moment for the diverse communities within Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward. Following extensive consultation with residents, community associations, and heritage organizations, this position paper presents my office's detailed recommendations to City staff as they prepare the final zoning by-law for Council consideration in January 2026.

Our ward encompasses some of Ottawa's most historically and culturally significant neighborhoods, including Rockcliffe Park (a National Historic Site and Heritage Conservation District), New Edinburgh (a Heritage Conservation District with unique industrial heritage), Manor Park (with distinctive mid-century character), Wateridge Village (a significant new development on the former CFB Rockcliffe site), Overbrook (presenting opportunities for sustainable intensification), and Lindenlea (defined by garden city planning principles and mature landscapes). The diversity of these communities requires a nuanced, place-based approach to zoning that recognizes their unique characteristics rather than applying one-size-fits-all solutions.

This paper serves multiple purposes: it documents the outcomes of the zoning review process to date, provides accountability regarding which community requests were addressed and which were not, and presents forward-looking recommendations for the final by-law and its implementation. Residents deserve transparency about both the successes and shortcomings of the zoning review process.

Summary of Outcomes to Date

The Final Draft zoning by-law, released in September 2025, reflects some community input but falls short in several critical areas. This section provides residents with a clear, honest assessment of which advocacy efforts succeeded and which did not.

Heritage Protection Framework

Status: NOT ACCEPTED - Heritage protections were significantly weakened rather than strengthened.

Our ward's requests for strengthened heritage protections were largely rejected in the Final Draft:

- **Heritage Overlay Removed:** The heritage overlay that existed under Zoning By-law 2008-250 was completely removed. Section 60 of the previous by-law provided specific form controls for heritage properties, including height and roofline limits, gross floor area caps, and side-yard requirements. These zoning-level protections are now gone.
- **No Replacement Controls:** Despite removing the heritage overlay, staff did not provide equivalent form controls in the new by-law. Properties within Heritage Conservation Districts now rely solely on HCD plans and the Ontario Heritage Act for protection, without the additional layer of zoning-level control.
- **Limited HCD-Specific Provisions:** Only one heritage-specific exception was created (Exception XX20 for Clemow-Monkland HCD to address front yard setback patterns). No similar provisions were implemented for Rockcliffe Park or New Edinburgh.

General Transitions Only: While citywide transition provisions were implemented for areas adjacent to Neighbourhood zones, these are not specifically tailored to Heritage Conservation Districts as requested.

Rockcliffe Park

Status: SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS - Heritage-calibrated standards not implemented; 11-metre heights applied.

- **11-Metre Height Limit Applied:** The Final Draft implements a citywide 11-metre (3-storey) height limit in N1 and N2 zones, including in Rockcliffe Park. This represents a significant increase from the traditional standards that have preserved the community's horizontal, garden suburb character.
- **No Heritage-Specific Calibration:** Rockcliffe Park is zoned with standard Neighbourhood zones (N1, N2, N3) without special provisions recognizing its National Historic Site status or the requirements of its Heritage Conservation District plan.
- **Error Correction Achieved:** Staff did correct one error - properties at 550 and 560 Maple Lane were corrected from N4F (4-storey) to N3F (3-storey) maximum, as the 4-storey zoning had been applied in error.

New Edinburgh

Status: ACCEPTED - 11-metre height limits maintained in N4 zones.

- **Height Limit Maintained:** Staff confirmed maintaining the 11-metre height limit in N4 H(11) zones within New Edinburgh, which was a key community request.
- **Mapping Corrections:** Staff corrected technical errors in mapping layers to ensure N4 zones properly display with 11-metre limits and appropriate suffixes.
- This outcome represents a significant success and demonstrates that heritage conservation and appropriate growth can be balanced when community concerns are properly addressed.

Beechwood Corridor

Status: PARTIALLY ACCEPTED - General mainstreet provisions apply; no corridor-specific coordination.

- **Standard Mainstreet Zoning:** Beechwood Avenue received standard MS zoning that permits diverse commercial uses and mixed-use development, providing the flexibility requested for business diversity.
- **No Public Realm Coordination:** The requested alignment with the Public Realm Design Plan was not implemented through zoning provisions. Coordination will need to occur through site plan control and other processes.

Wateridge Village

Status: LARGELY ACCEPTED - Technical corrections made; secondary plan alignment achieved.

- **All Technical Issues Resolved:** Staff corrected zoning mismatches (H3I/H2I, CM2/CM2A to CM1/CM1A), removed daycare prohibition from Wanaki Road exception, corrected visitor parking schedule (Wateridge now in Area C), and clarified park zoning.
- **Secondary Plan Alignment:** The Final Draft aligns with the Wateridge Village Secondary Plan, preserving the original development vision.

Manor Park and Lindenlea

Status: PARTIALLY ACCEPTED - General provisions apply; limited community-specific measures.

- **Lindenlea Success:** Exception 1493 was maintained for the Thomas Adams area, preserving the 8.5-metre height limit in this portion of Lindenlea - a community-supported outcome.
- **Standard Zoning Applied:** Both communities received standard neighbourhood zoning without specific provisions addressing their unique mid-century (Manor Park) or garden city (Lindenlea) character.
- **Outstanding Manor Park Issues:** Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay boundary corrections and Hemlock corridor rezoning (N4 to N3) remain unresolved.

Overbrook

Status: SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS - Parking minimums eliminated contrary to community requests.

- **Parking Minimums Eliminated:** Contrary to requests for addressing parking shortages, minimum parking requirements were eliminated citywide in urban areas. The on-street parking permit program expansion is delayed until a 2027 study.
- **Front Yard Parking Ban:** The prohibition on front yard parking in most areas compounds existing parking pressures.
- **Communal Parking Provisions:** New provisions allowing communal parking lots may provide some flexibility but do not address immediate on-street parking competition concerns.

Key Principles Guiding Our Recommendations

Despite the mixed outcomes to date, this position paper advances recommendations guided by four core principles:

- **Heritage First:** Heritage conservation must be the primary consideration in all zoning decisions affecting our two Heritage Conservation Districts (Rockcliffe Park and New Edinburgh) and designated properties
- **Context Sensitivity:** New development must respect and enhance existing community character across all six of our ward's distinct neighborhoods
- **Balanced Growth:** Intensification must be coordinated with infrastructure capacity, community livability, and environmental sustainability
- **Meaningful Engagement:** Residents must have real influence over decisions that affect their neighborhoods, with transparent processes and accountability

Heritage Conservation Districts: Rockcliffe Park and New Edinburgh

Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward contains two of Ottawa's Heritage Conservation Districts: Rockcliffe Park and New Edinburgh. These designations, made under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, recognize the exceptional heritage value of these communities and require that development respect and enhance their heritage character. The zoning by-law must support and implement these heritage protections, not undermine them.

The Heritage Overlay Removal Challenge

Under Zoning By-law 2008-250, heritage properties benefited from Section 60 Heritage Overlays that provided specific zoning-level form controls. These included:

- Addition height and roofline limits that preserved building envelope compatibility
- Gross Floor Area (GFA) caps (typically 30%) that prevented massive additions overwhelming heritage buildings
- Side-yard increase rules that maintained spacing between buildings
- Consistency in how heritage character was protected through enforceable zoning provisions

The Final Draft removes these protections entirely. While staff provided written justification in June 2025, no equivalent replacement controls were added to the new by-law. This creates a significant gap in heritage protection, as properties within Heritage Conservation Districts will no longer have the additional layer of zoning-level form control that previously existed.

The Final Draft Zoning By-law includes a specific exception for the Clemow-Monkland HCD because its primary heritage attribute - a uniform front yard setback - was simple to translate into a single numeric zoning standard. By contrast, Rockcliffe Park and New Edinburgh rely on multiple, interdependent heritage attributes such as massing, spacing, landscape character, and horizontal built form, all of which were previously protected through the Heritage Overlay. With those protections removed and no replacement standards introduced, these HCDs now lack the zoning tools needed to implement their adopted heritage policies. The Clemow exception demonstrates that zoning can support HCD character where required, and the same approach must now be applied to Rockcliffe Park and New Edinburgh.

What Protections Remain

Without the heritage overlay, heritage properties now rely on:

- **Heritage Conservation District Plans:** Statutory documents approved under the Ontario Heritage Act that establish policies and guidelines for development
- **Heritage Permit Process:** Required for alterations, demolitions, or new construction within HCDs
- **Section 209 Heritage Provisions:** Limited provisions in the new by-law that apply to designated properties but lack the specific form controls of the old overlay

Critical Gap: The shift from zoning-level controls to reliance solely on HCD plans and heritage permits creates risk of inconsistent application. Zoning by-laws are more directly enforceable and provide clearer standards than policy documents. Removing this layer weakens heritage protection.

Requested Actions to Strengthen Heritage Protection

Given the removal of heritage overlays, I am requesting that City staff implement the following measures to ensure Heritage Conservation District plans remain effective and enforceable:

A. Reaffirm HCD Plan Authority

Request to Legal and Heritage Staff: Provide written confirmation that where the new Zoning By-law provisions conflict with existing HCD Plan provisions - including height, massing, lot coverage, lot configuration, landscaping/green space, building placement, and streetscape context - the HCD Plan shall prevail and govern.

This confirmation should explicitly state that HCD Plans are statutory documents approved under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and therefore take precedence over any zoning provision enacted under the *Planning Act*.

B. Internal Heritage Impact Screening

Implement Internal Process: For all permit or development applications within Rockcliffe Park or New Edinburgh HCDs (or immediately adjacent where visibility or context may be affected), implement an internal heritage impact screen before applications are declared complete or processed further.

Define criteria for applications requiring closer scrutiny:

- Proposals involving height above adjacent streetscape
- Significant massing or lot coverage increases
- Demolition of contributing buildings
- Major landscape or site-plan changes affecting heritage character

C. Notification and Escalation Protocol

Implement Notification: For applications meeting heritage sensitivity criteria - even if they do not require rezoning - flag them to the Councillor's office for review and discussion with heritage staff. This ensures community and heritage considerations are factored into decision-making.

Maintain a transparent log of flagged applications for accountability.

D. Amend Section 209 to Establish HCD Plan Primacy

Proposed Motion Language: Add explicit language to Section 209 (Heritage Provisions) establishing the primacy of HCD Plans:

"Where a property is located within a Heritage Conservation District designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, the provisions of the applicable Heritage Conservation District Plan shall prevail over any conflicting provision of this By-law. In particular, but not limited to, regulations governing building height, massing, lot coverage, lot configuration, building placement, landscaping, and streetscape context shall defer to the Heritage Conservation District Plan. Any development, alteration, or demolition within a Heritage Conservation District shall require compliance with the applicable Heritage Conservation District Plan, including any required heritage permit or heritage approval process."

This amendment would provide legal certainty and prevent future conflicts or misinterpretation of how HCD plans interact with zoning provisions.

Public Communication

Heritage and Zoning FAQ Required: Staff should prepare and publish a citywide "Heritage & New Zoning" FAQ aimed at HCD residents explaining:

- What HCD Plans are and how they interact with zoning
- The processes staff undertake when an application is submitted in an HCD
- What residents can expect regarding notification and opportunity for input
- How heritage protections are preserved under the new Zoning By-law

Rockcliffe Park: Preserving a National Historic Site

Rockcliffe Park holds the unique distinction of being Canada's only residential National Historic Site, as well as a Heritage Conservation District under the Ontario Heritage Act. This dual recognition reflects exceptional heritage significance that demands the highest level of protection through zoning provisions calibrated to preserve its distinctive character.

Heritage Overlay Removal Impact

The removal of Section 60 Heritage Overlay provisions has particularly severe implications for Rockcliffe Park. Under the previous by-law, the overlay provided:

- Strict addition height and roofline controls that maintained the community's horizontal character
- 30% Gross Floor Area cap that prevented massive additions overwhelming existing buildings
- Side-yard increase requirements that preserved the spacious, parkland character

No Equivalent Replacement: Staff did not provide replacement controls in the new by-law to compensate for these lost protections. If replacement controls are not provided in the final by-law, a formal heritage motion will be required to restore appropriate form controls.

Height Limit Concerns

11-Metre Standard Applied: The Final Draft implements an 11-metre (approximately 3-storey) height limit in N1 and N2 zones throughout Rockcliffe Park. This represents a significant increase from traditional standards and is incompatible with the community's heritage designation.

The Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District plan and National Historic Site designation both recognize the low-rise, horizontal character as a defining heritage attribute. The traditional height standards preserved this character by limiting buildings to approximately 2.5 storeys. The 11-metre limit fundamentally changes what can be built.

Community Concerns and Requests

The Rockcliffe Park community has consistently articulated concerns about:

- **Height Compatibility:** Buildings approaching 3 full storeys are incompatible with the established heritage character
- **Setback Preservation:** Any reduction in generous front, side, and rear setbacks would damage the parkland character
- **Density Controls:** Zoning must reflect the low-density character essential to the heritage designation
- **Loss of Form Controls:** Removal of GFA caps and addition height limits creates risk of inappropriate alterations

My Recommendations

I am formally requesting that City staff:

Implement Heritage-Calibrated Standards: Ensure height limits, setbacks, and density provisions in Rockcliffe Park are specifically calibrated to protect its National Historic Site status and HCD heritage values. Generic neighbourhood standards are inadequate for a community of this exceptional significance.

Restore Form Controls: Provide replacement controls equivalent to the removed Section 60 overlay, including additional height limits, GFA caps, and side-yard requirements. These controls are essential to preventing inappropriate alterations that would damage heritage character.

Review Secondary Plan Integration: Examine how the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan and Secondary Plan interact with zoning provisions, per Section 41.2 of the Ontario Heritage Act, to ensure proper implementation and coordination.

Implement Recent Council Direction: My recent motion directed staff to consider proposed new policies in the Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan related to ensuring compatibility with heritage values and attributes. These considerations must be reflected in final zoning provisions.

Legal and Policy Framework

The *Ontario Heritage Act* provides specific requirements for Heritage Conservation Districts. Additionally, Rockcliffe Park's National Historic Site designation carries federal heritage obligations. The zoning by-law must provide tools necessary to fulfill these obligations and protect Canada's only residential National Historic Site for future generations.

New Edinburgh: Successful Heritage-Growth Balance

New Edinburgh demonstrates how heritage conservation and appropriate growth can successfully coexist. The Heritage Conservation District designation recognizes the neighborhood's unique industrial heritage and residential character, while recent development has shown that sensitive intensification can enhance the community.

Key Success: Height Limit Maintained

11-Metre Height Limit Confirmed: Staff confirmed maintaining the 11-metre height limit in N4 H(11) zones within the New Edinburgh HCD and broader neighborhood. This was a priority community request and represents a significant advocacy success.

This height limit ensures:

- Compatibility with historic industrial buildings and residential structures
- Appropriate intensification (up to 3 storeys) without overwhelming heritage fabric
- Consistency with Heritage Conservation District policies
- Clear standards for both applicants and residents

Technical Corrections Achieved

Staff successfully addressed technical mapping and zoning issues:

- Corrected N4 height display to 11 metres across all mapping layers
- Ensured proper display of height suffixes and overlays (e.g., H(11))
- Completed N3/N4 parcel audit to verify zoning accuracy
- Fixed inconsistencies between zoning text and mapping

Ongoing Needs

While the height limit success is significant, New Edinburgh shares Rockcliffe Park's concerns about:

- **Heritage Overlay Removal:** Loss of Section 60 form controls affects New Edinburgh heritage properties
- **Need for HCD Plan Primacy:** Explicit language in Section 209 establishing that the New Edinburgh HCD Plan prevails over conflicting zoning provisions
- **Heritage Impact Screening:** Internal processes to flag heritage-sensitive applications

Model for Heritage-Sensitive Intensification

New Edinburgh's success in balancing heritage conservation with appropriate growth should inform approaches in other heritage areas. The community demonstrates that protecting heritage character and enabling development are not mutually exclusive when appropriate standards and processes are in place.

Beechwood Corridor: Supporting Commercial Vitality

Beechwood Avenue represents one of Ottawa's most successful main street revitalization stories. This vibrant commercial and cultural corridor draws visitors from across the region and serves as an economic anchor for surrounding neighborhoods. The zoning by-law must support continued success while coordinating with ongoing public realm improvements.

Public Realm Design Plan Coordination

Critical Gap: The City's Public Realm Design Plan for Beechwood will provide a comprehensive vision for enhanced pedestrian environment, landscaping, lighting, and public spaces. However, the Final Draft zoning does not include specific provisions to align development with this plan.

Standard Mainstreet zoning (MS1/MS2) applies to Beechwood, which permits diverse commercial uses and mixed-use development. While this provides the requested business diversity flexibility, it lacks provisions for:

- Mandatory active ground-floor commercial uses to maintain street vitality
- Building setbacks and heights specifically coordinated with public realm improvements
- Design standards ensuring pedestrian-oriented streetscapes

My Recommendations

Explicit Commercial Use Requirements: Require active ground-floor commercial uses on Beechwood to prevent dead frontages and maintain the corridor's economic vitality. Mixed-use buildings must provide sufficient commercial space, not token retail.

Coordinate with Public Realm Plan: Align building height, massing, and setback requirements with the Public Realm Design Plan objectives. Planning and public realm design teams must coordinate to ensure integrated implementation.

Stakeholder Engagement: Maintain transparent, ongoing engagement with the Vanier BIA, community associations, and local businesses. Their input is essential for ensuring zoning supports commercial success.

Clear Communication: Provide clear information to businesses and property owners about how zoning changes will support revitalization goals and work in tandem with public realm improvements.

Wateridge Village: Coordinated Development Success

Wateridge Village represents a significant planning achievement - a major new community development on the former CFB Rockcliffe site with comprehensive Secondary Plan guidance. The zoning review process successfully addressed all major technical issues raised by the community.

Issues Identified and Resolved

The Wateridge Village Community Association identified several technical concerns during the review process. Staff successfully resolved all of them:

Zoning and Mapping Alignment

- Corrected H3I/H2I zone mismatches
- Updated CM2/CM2A zones to correct CM1/CM1A mainstreet designation
- Retained Wateridge Village Subzone per Secondary Plan

Park Zoning Clarification

- Confirmed park uses are permitted across all zones except heavy industrial

- Clarified that conceptual parks remain FAC zoned until subdivision creates dedicated park parcels

Wanaki Road Exception

- Removed prohibition on daycare uses
- Retained retail limitations consistent with Secondary Plan policies

Visitor Parking

- Corrected Schedule A-3: Wateridge Village now properly designated as Area C, requiring 0.1 visitor spaces per dwelling unit
- This correction recognizes Wateridge Village's transit access while acknowledging it's not yet fully served during buildout

Outstanding Policy-Level Considerations

Two policy-level matters remain but are not zoning errors. The Wateridge Village Community Association considers these acceptable for now:

- Retail trigger thresholds (8,000 m² and 2,500 m²) per Secondary Plan
- Conceptual parks remaining FAC zoned until subdivision creates dedicated parcels

Assessment

Wateridge Village represents a success story in the zoning review process. Staff were responsive to community concerns, made necessary technical corrections, and ensured alignment with the Secondary Plan. This outcome demonstrates the value of clear community input and staff responsiveness.

Manor Park: Harmonizing Mid-Century Character with Growth

Manor Park's distinctive mid-century suburban character, established street patterns, and mature landscapes define the community. While proposed zoning changes are generally consistent with Official Plan designations, specific concerns remain about boundaries and transitions.

Outstanding Technical Issues

Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay Boundary

Issue: The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay extends into Meadow Park using an incorrect boundary line. This affects which properties receive higher-density zoning.

Staff investigated boundary corrections but indicated this may require a Council motion to resolve. Community input should be sought on the appropriate boundary location.

Hemlock Corridor Zoning

Issue: Hemlock corridor is zoned N4 (permitting 4-storey development) when N3 (3-storey maximum) would be more appropriate given the surrounding context and street character.

Staff reviewed rezoning feasibility but indicated this likely requires a Council motion. The community should determine whether N3 zoning better reflects the desired character for this corridor.

City-Wide Issue Affecting Manor Park

Rear-Yard Transition Concerns: The Final Draft weakens rear-yard transition requirements for mainstreets in exchange for small front setbacks. This particularly affects older inner-urban areas like Manor Park where low-rise residential streets abut mainstreets.

Community concerns include:

- Risk of tall buildings with inadequate transitions to low-rise neighborhoods
- Lack of mandatory active ground-floor uses on Mainstreets
- Need for stronger protections for established residential streets

My Recommendations

Resolve Boundary Issues: Correct the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay boundary through technical amendment or motion, with community consultation to ensure appropriate line placement.

Review Hemlock Corridor: Consider rezoning Hemlock from N4 to N3 to better reflect surrounding character, following community consultation.

Strengthen Transition Requirements: Restore stronger rear-yard transitions for mainstreets, particularly in inner-urban areas. This is essential for protecting residential street character.

Infrastructure Coordination: Ensure improved public transit and active transportation infrastructure is coordinated with intensification to support reduced parking provisions.

Lindenlea: Protecting Garden City Character

Lindenlea's garden city planning heritage, mature tree canopy, generous lot sizes, and cohesive residential character make it one of Ottawa's most distinctive neighborhoods. The zoning review achieved significant success in preserving character in one area while raising ongoing concerns about parking and implementation timing.

Key Success: Thomas Adams Area Height Limit

Exception 1493 Maintained: Staff maintained the 8.5-metre height limit for the Thomas Adams area of Lindenlea through Exception 1493. This represents a community-supported outcome that preserves the low-rise character of this historically significant portion of the neighborhood.

This success demonstrates that community-specific heritage character can be protected through exceptions where appropriate. The 8.5-metre limit ensures that development in the Thomas Adams area remains compatible with the original garden city design principles.

Outstanding Concerns

Implementation Timing

Issue: The Lindenlea Community Association requested early 2026 adoption of Exception 1493. While staff confirmed the exception applies, they cannot guarantee the adoption schedule due to the overall by-law implementation timeline and potential appeals.

Clear communication about when exceptions take effect is essential for property owners and residents to understand what standards apply to development applications.

Parking Requirements

Community Opposition: The community strongly opposes elimination of minimum parking requirements, citing narrow streets, winter parking challenges, and existing on-street parking pressures.

City staff response:

- Removing minimums does not ban parking - developers can still provide it
- Maximum parking rates were increased to provide flexibility
- Visitor parking requirements were removed
- Communal parking provisions were expanded

Community Position: Lindenlea residents argue that transit improvements must come first before parking reductions. The narrow streets and mature character make on-street parking competition particularly problematic.

Possible Direction

Phased Implementation: Consider maintaining minimum parking rates in areas with infrastructure constraints until transit service standards are met. This could apply to neighborhoods like Lindenlea with narrow streets, limited transit access, and existing parking pressures.

Alternatively, expand on-street parking permit programs proactively in advance of development rather than waiting for the 2027 study currently scheduled.

My Recommendations

Preserve Character Elements: Continue to maintain height limits and density controls that protect Lindenlea's garden city character throughout the neighborhood, not just the Thomas Adams area.

Address Parking Proactively: Rather than waiting for problems to emerge, implement on-street parking management solutions before development occurs. The 2027 timeline for permit program expansion leaves a two-year gap.

Protect Green Space: Ensure setback and lot coverage provisions safeguard the open green spaces and mature landscaping that define the neighborhood's character.

Overbrook: Balancing Intensification with Community Needs

Overbrook presents significant opportunities for affordable housing and neighborhood revitalization through appropriate intensification. However, the community faces immediate challenges with parking and has expressed clear priorities about where and how growth should occur.

Critical Parking Issues

Existing Shortage Compounded: Overbrook already experiences significant on-street parking shortages. The elimination of minimum parking requirements and prohibition on front-yard parking in most areas will compound these existing pressures.

The community identified specific concerns:

- Limited on-street parking availability in existing residential areas
- Insufficient parking supply for current residents
- Front-yard parking ban removes flexibility that could address shortages
- New development without parking requirements will increase competition for existing spaces

Staff Response

Staff provided the following responses:

- Enhancements to on-street parking management are planned
- Height and transition policies have been clarified
- Intended intensification areas (corridors vs. interior streets) have been defined
- Front-yard parking expansion (Schedule A5 Area B) provides some flexibility

Gap in Response: While these measures help, they do not fully address the immediate parking shortages or provide a timeline for implementation. The on-street parking permit program expansion is delayed until 2027, leaving a significant gap.

Intensification Strategy

Community Position: Overbrook supports intensification but wants it focused on major streets and transit corridors, not interior low-rise residential streets. The community seeks to preserve the scale and character of established residential areas while enabling growth in appropriate locations.

Key priorities:

- Strengthen transition rules for interior low-rise streets adjacent to higher-density corridors
- Ensure new development on corridors includes adequate parking
- Avoid overscaled infill with inadequate transitions to existing buildings
- Maintain architectural diversity and character

My Recommendations

Proactive Parking Management: Implement on-street parking management improvements and expand permit zones before development occurs, not after problems emerge. This requires accelerating the timeline currently planned for 2027.

Strategic Intensification: Focus higher-density development on major streets and transit corridors while preserving residential character on interior streets. This requires strengthening transition provisions.

Community-Specific Parking Strategy: Develop an Overbrook-specific parking strategy that pairs zoning changes with concrete solutions to existing and anticipated parking pressures. This may require a Council motion to implement effectively.

Design Controls: Strengthen design guidelines and height controls to ensure new development fits well with Overbrook's architectural heritage and avoids creating oversized or monolithic structures.

City-Wide Issues Affecting Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward

Several citywide provisions in the new zoning by-law have particular implications for our ward's communities. These issues require attention during final by-law development and implementation.

Parking Requirements Elimination

The Change

Minimum parking requirements have been eliminated citywide in urban areas, with the exception of Village zones (V1, V2, V3) which retain a requirement of one space per dwelling unit.

Impacts on Our Ward

This citywide change creates significant challenges in several ward communities:

Overbrook: Existing parking shortages will be compounded by new development without parking

Lindenlea: Narrow streets and limited transit make parking elimination problematic

Manor Park: Interior residential streets may face increased parking competition

Timing Gap

2027 Study: Expansion of the on-street parking permit program is delayed until a comprehensive study in 2027.

My Position

While parking requirement elimination aligns with broader planning objectives and may be appropriate near rapid transit, implementation must be coordinated with:

- Proactive expansion of on-street parking permit zones before problems emerge
- Transit service improvements to provide genuine alternatives to car ownership

Proposed Ward 13 Parking Plan

The elimination of minimum parking requirements citywide represents a major shift in planning policy. In Ward 13, where several neighbourhoods already face parking constraints, this change must be paired with proactive management tools rather than delayed until 2027.

Accelerate the On-Street Parking Permit Expansion

The City's plan to study parking permits in 2027 leaves a multi-year gap while new development proceeds without parking requirements.

Request: Begin the study in 2026 and prioritize wards already experiencing pressure.

Develop Neighbourhood-Specific Parking Strategies

Different communities face different constraints:

- **Overbrook:** Existing shortage + front-yard parking restrictions
- **Lindenlea:** Narrow streets, winter conditions, high on-street demand
- **Manor Park:** Growing pressure near mainstreets

Each neighbourhood requires a tailored strategy including:

- Seasonal parking considerations
- Permit zones or pilot projects
- Parking management tied to transit improvements

Link Parking Reductions to Transit Readiness

Parking elimination should be synchronized with:

- Frequency and reliability improvements
- Bus and LRT access
- Accessibility considerations

Rear-Yard Transitions and Mainstreet Standards

The Issue

Weakened Rear Transitions: The Final Draft reduced rear-yard setback requirements for mainstreets in exchange for small front setbacks (1.5 metres above 30 metres in height). Previously, towers required 30-metre rear setbacks; this has been reduced to 25 metres.

For inner-urban areas like Manor Park and portions of Overbrook where low-rise residential streets directly abut mainstreets, this creates risk of inadequate transitions.

Missing Active Use Requirements

The by-law does not mandate active ground-floor commercial uses on mainstreets. This is particularly concerning for corridors like Beechwood where commercial vitality depends on continuous active frontages.

My Recommendations

Restore Stronger Transitions: Increase rear-yard setback requirements for mainstreets, particularly where they abut established low-rise residential areas. The 25-metre rear setback for towers is insufficient for proper transition.

Require Active Uses: Mandate active ground-floor commercial uses on mainstreets to maintain street vitality and support local businesses.

Context-Specific Review: Review transition provisions specifically for older inner-urban areas where mainstreets directly interface with established residential neighborhoods.

Height Limits in Neighbourhood Zones

The Standard

The Final Draft establishes 11-metre (approximately 3-storey) height limits in N1, N2, and N3 zones citywide within the urban boundary. This represents a standardized approach intended to provide consistency and enable gentle density increases.

Heritage Area Concerns

For heritage areas like Rockcliffe Park, the 11-metre standard is inappropriate. Heritage Conservation Districts and neighborhoods with established lower heights require heritage-calibrated standards, not generic citywide limits.

The success in New Edinburgh (maintaining 11-metre limits in N4 zones) and Lindenlea Thomas Adams area (maintaining 8.5-metre limits) demonstrates that context-specific height limits can be implemented where justified.

My Position

Heritage Calibration Required: Heritage Conservation Districts must have height limits calibrated to their heritage character, not generic citywide standards. Rockcliffe Park requires lower limits consistent with its National Historic Site status and horizontal garden suburb character.

Use Exceptions Appropriately: Where community character justifies different height limits, exceptions should be applied. The Thomas Adams area exception in Lindenlea provides a successful model.

Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay

The Framework

The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay applies higher-density zoning (typically N4, N5, or N6) within 400 metres walking distance of rapid transit stations or 150 metres of Hubs and Mainstreets. This is intended to support transit-oriented development and complete communities.

Ward 13 Application

The overlay affects portions of several ward communities, particularly areas near:

- Beechwood Mainstreet corridor
- St. Laurent Mainstreet (affecting Manor Park)
- Future rapid transit along Blair Road corridor

Boundary Issues

Technical boundary issues exist in Manor Park where the overlay extends into Meadow Park using an incorrect boundary line. These require correction through technical amendments or Council motions.

My Position

Support Transit-Oriented Development: The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay concept is sound - focusing intensification near transit and mainstreets makes planning sense.

Correct Technical Errors: Boundary errors must be corrected to ensure the overlay applies to appropriate properties. Community consultation should inform boundary adjustments.

Ensure Adequate Transitions: Where the overlay creates significant height differences between properties, adequate transition provisions must protect established residential character.

Implementation, Monitoring, and Next Steps

The comprehensive zoning by-law will be one of the most consequential planning decisions Council makes in this term. Proper implementation and ongoing monitoring are essential to ensure the by-law serves our communities well.

Immediate Priorities for Final By-law Development

Before Council consideration in January 2026, staff should address:

Heritage Protection Provisions

- Add explicit language to Section 209 establishing HCD Plan primacy over conflicting zoning provisions
- Provide replacement controls for the removed Section 60 Heritage Overlay, particularly for Rockcliffe Park
- Implement internal heritage impact screening process for applications within or adjacent to HCDs

Technical Corrections

- Correct Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay boundary in Manor Park
- Review Hemlock corridor zoning (N4 vs. N3)
- Ensure all mapping layers accurately reflect approved zoning

Parking Management

- Accelerate on-street parking permit program expansion (currently scheduled for 2027)
- Develop community-specific parking strategies for areas with existing shortages (particularly Overbrook)
- Coordinate transit service improvements with parking requirement elimination

Mainstreet Standards

- Strengthen rear-yard transition requirements for mainstreets adjacent to low-rise residential areas
- Require active ground-floor commercial uses on Mainstreets
- Coordinate Beechwood corridor zoning with Public Realm Design Plan

Implementation Framework

Phased Approach

The by-law will not take effect all at once. Appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) are expected for various provisions. Staff must clearly communicate which provisions are in effect, which are under appeal, and what standards apply during the transition period.

Digital Twin Development

The City's Digital Twin development will be essential for understanding by-law impacts. This tool should provide:

- Clear visualization of what can be built under new zoning
- Modeling of cumulative development impacts on infrastructure
- Public access for residents to understand zoning on their properties
- Decision-support for planning staff and Council

Staff Resources

Implementation will require adequate staff resources for:

- Development review and application processing
- Heritage permit coordination and review
- Public education and interpretation questions
- OLT hearing preparation and defense of provisions
- Monitoring and reporting on by-law performance

Monitoring and Adjustment Framework

The by-law must include clear mechanisms for monitoring impacts and making necessary adjustments. I am requesting that staff establish:

Annual Reporting

Annual reports to Council tracking:

- Development applications and approvals by zone type
- Housing unit creation by type and location
- Heritage permit applications and outcomes within HCDs
- Parking impacts and on-street competition issues
- Infrastructure capacity and service level impacts
- Committee of Adjustment variance patterns

Community-Level Monitoring

For ward communities with specific concerns (Rockcliffe Park heritage character, Overbrook parking, etc.), establish community-specific monitoring to track whether the by-law is achieving intended outcomes or creating unintended consequences.

Adjustment Mechanisms

Establish clear processes for making adjustments based on monitoring findings:

- Technical corrections for errors or unintended consequences
- Creation of new exceptions where community-specific issues emerge
- Policy adjustments based on performance data
- Comprehensive review timeline (recommend 5 years post-implementation)

Coordination with Other Planning Initiatives

The zoning by-law must be coordinated with:

- **Site Plan Control Guidelines:** Updates needed to align design requirements with new zoning framework
- **Secondary Plans:** Ongoing reviews to ensure consistency with zoning implementation
Heritage Conservation District Plans: Regular review to ensure zoning supports HCD objectives
- **Public Realm Design Plans:** Active coordination for corridors like Beechwood Avenue
- **Transportation Master Plan:** Parking and transit service coordination
- **Climate Resilience Strategy:** Alignment with environmental objectives

How Residents Can Engage

The zoning by-law review process continues to provide opportunities for residents to participate and influence outcomes. Active community engagement is essential to ensure the final framework reflects local priorities.

Before Council Consideration (January 2026)

Written Submissions

Residents can submit written comments directly to City staff and Council members. Effective submissions:

- Are specific about particular properties, zones, or provisions of concern
- Provide evidence supporting positions (examples, photos, policy references)
- Suggest specific solutions or amendments rather than just identifying problems
- Reference relevant Official Plan policies, heritage plans, or planning principles

Public Meetings

In June 2025, my office held a New Zoning By-law information session for Ward 13 residents and the City held public meetings through the Zoning By-law Review process. These provide opportunities to:

- Ask questions directly to planning staff
- Hear staff responses to community concerns
- Connect with other residents who share similar concerns
- Understand the overall process and timeline

Committee and Council Meetings

When the by-law comes to the Joint Agricultural and Rural Affairs and Planning and Housing Committee and Council, residents can:

- Register to speak at Committee (limited time, but direct input to decision-makers)
- Submit written comments that become part of the official record
- Contact their Councillor to discuss specific concerns

After By-law Adoption

Appeals to Ontario Land Tribunal

Once adopted, the by-law may be appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal. Residents should be aware that:

- Appeals can affect which provisions are in effect and when
 - Community organizations may participate in OLT proceedings
- The appeal process can take considerable time

Ongoing Engagement

After adoption, residents should:

- Monitor development applications in their neighborhoods
- Participate in heritage permit reviews for HCD applications
- Engage with Committee of Adjustment variance applications
- Work with community associations on implementation monitoring
- Contact my office about concerning applications or trends

Working Through Community Organizations

Ward 13 benefits from active, informed community associations and organizations that provide effective channels for collective advocacy:

- **Rockcliffe Park Residents Association**
- **New Edinburgh Community Alliance**
- **Manor Park Community Association**
- **Lindenlea Community Association**
- **Overbrook Community Association**
- **Wateridge Village Community Association**
- **Vanier BIA (Beechwood corridor)**

These organizations have expertise in planning matters and can amplify individual concerns through collective representation.

Heritage-Specific Engagement

For heritage-related concerns, residents can work with:

- **Heritage Ottawa:** City-wide advocacy organization with expertise in heritage conservation
- **My office:** I can facilitate connections with heritage staff and escalate concerns

Conclusion

The comprehensive zoning by-law review represents a critical juncture for Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward's six distinct communities. The decisions made in this process will shape our neighborhoods for generations, affecting everything from heritage character preservation to housing affordability, from commercial vitality to environmental sustainability.

A Mixed Record

This position paper has documented a mixed record of successes and shortcomings in the zoning review process to date:

Significant Successes:

- **New Edinburgh:** Maintained 11-metre height limits with strong community support
- **Wateridge Village:** Resolved all technical issues through responsive staff work

- **Lindenlea Thomas Adams Area:** Preserved 8.5-metre height limit through Exception 1493
- **Technical Corrections:** Fixed numerous mapping and zoning errors across the ward

Serious Concerns:

- **Heritage Protections:** Complete removal of Section 60 Heritage Overlay without equivalent replacement controls
- **Rockcliffe Park:** Generic neighbourhood zoning inadequate for National Historic Site status
- **Parking:** City-wide elimination of minimums compounds existing shortages in Overbrook and other areas
- **Mainstreet Transitions:** Weakened rear-yard requirements create risks for low-rise residential streets

What Must Happen Next

The recommendations in this position paper provide a clear path forward. City staff must:

- Strengthen heritage protections by amending Section 209 to establish HCD Plan primacy and provide replacement controls for the removed heritage overlay
- Implement heritage-calibrated zoning for Rockcliffe Park that recognizes its exceptional National Historic Site status
- Address parking management proactively with accelerated permit program expansion and community-specific strategies
- Strengthen mainstreet transition requirements and require active ground-floor commercial uses
- Correct technical boundary errors and resolve outstanding community-specific issues
- Establish robust monitoring and adjustment frameworks to track by-law performance

Principles That Must Guide Implementation

As this by-law moves toward final adoption and implementation, four principles must guide all decisions:

Heritage First: In Rockcliffe Park and New Edinburgh - our two Heritage Conservation Districts - heritage conservation must be the primary consideration. Once heritage character is lost, it cannot be recovered. The zoning by-law must provide the tools necessary to protect these irreplaceable assets.

Context Sensitivity: Each of our six communities has unique characteristics that require tailored approaches. Manor Park's mid-century character, Lindenlea's garden city planning, Wateridge Village's coordinated development, and Overbrook's revitalization opportunities all demand context-specific solutions rather than one-size-fits-all standards.

Balanced Growth: Our ward must contribute to meeting Ottawa's housing needs and supporting commercial vitality. However, growth must be balanced with infrastructure capacity, environmental sustainability, and quality of life. Intensification without adequate parking, transit, or transitions creates more problems than it solves.

Meaningful Engagement: Residents must have real influence over decisions affecting their neighborhoods. The zoning review process has demonstrated both the value of community input (when it's heeded, as in New Edinburgh and Wateridge Village) and the frustration when it's ignored (as with heritage overlay removal and Rockcliffe Park standards).

My Commitment as Your Councillor

I am committed to:

- **Advocating Vigorously:** I will continue working with City staff and Council colleagues to implement the recommendations in this position paper. Where necessary, I will bring forward motions to address gaps and concerns.
- **Monitoring Implementation:** I will track how the by-law is implemented and whether it achieves intended outcomes or creates unintended consequences. Annual accountability reporting will keep residents informed.
- **Facilitating Engagement:** My office will continue providing residents with opportunities for input, information about development applications, and assistance navigating planning processes.
- **Protecting Community Interests:** I will ensure that ward-specific concerns are heard at Council and that generic citywide solutions don't override legitimate community needs.
- **Demanding Accountability:** Staff must respond substantively to community concerns, not just acknowledge them. Where responses are inadequate, I will escalate issues and demand better outcomes.

A Call to Continued Engagement

The zoning by-law process is not over. Between now and Council consideration in January 2026, and continuing through implementation and appeals, residents must stay engaged:

- Submit written comments on this position paper and the final draft by-law
- Attend the Joint Committee session
- Work through your community associations for collective advocacy
- Monitor development applications in your neighborhood
- Contact my office with concerns, questions, or suggestions

Together, we can ensure that the new zoning by-law protects our heritage, enhances our communities, and serves the needs of all residents - today and for generations to come.

Contact Information

For questions about this position paper, the zoning by-law's impact on your property or community, or to provide feedback:

Councillor Rawlson King
Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward (Ward 13)
City of Ottawa
rideaurockcliffeward@ottawa.ca
613-580-2483

Stay engaged with planning matters in our ward by attending community association meetings, following updates through my office, and participating in public consultation opportunities.

Acknowledgments

Councillor Rawlson King would like to extend his personal thanks to residents and community associations who have advocated for more effective and responsive land-use regulation in the City of Ottawa. He also thanks his staff member Michelle Nash for contributing meaningful input to the creation of this position paper.

Appendix A: Comprehensive Analysis of the City of Ottawa's New Zoning By-law

The following comprehensive analysis provides detailed information about the Final Draft of the new zoning by-law, including technical provisions, implementation considerations, and citywide impacts. This analysis complements the ward-specific recommendations and accountability assessment presented in the main body of this position paper.

Comprehensive Analysis of the City of Ottawa's New Zoning By-law Final Draft Analysis December 2025

The City of Ottawa's new Zoning By-law represents the most significant overhaul of local land-use rules in more than a decade. Its purpose is to implement the new Official Plan, increase housing supply, support 15-minute neighbourhoods, and streamline development processes. While many citywide objectives are advanced, the impacts on Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward vary substantially across our six distinct communities.

Fundamental Changes from Current By-law

Zone Structure Reorganization

The new by-law fundamentally restructures Ottawa's zoning framework into a more streamlined approach organized by transects and function.

Transect-Based Approach

The by-law introduces a transect system that recognizes different urban contexts:

- **Area A - Downtown Transect:** The urban core with highest densities and most intensive development
- **Area B - Inner Urban Transect:** Established urban areas with good transit access and mixed-use character
- **Area C - Outer Urban Transect:** More recent urban development with evolving character
- **Area E - Suburban Transect:** Lower density suburban areas with auto-oriented development patterns

Primary Zone Categories

The new zone structure includes these primary categories:

- **Neighbourhood Zones (N1-N6):** Replace previous residential zones with a graduated density scale from N1 (lowest) to N6 (highest)
- **Hub Zones (H1-H3):** High-intensity mixed-use areas near rapid transit stations
- **Mainstreet Zones (MS1-MS3):** Mid-rise corridors along major streets
- **Minor Corridor Zones (CM1-CM2):** Low-rise mixed-use development along neighbourhood corridors
- **Neighbourhood Mixed-Use Zone (NMU):** Small-scale commercial nodes in neighbourhoods
- **Village Zones (V1-V5, VM):** Rural village residential and mixed-use zones

- **Industrial Zones:** Heavy Industrial (IH), Light Industrial (IL), Mixed Industrial (MI), Rural Industrial and Logistics (RI)
- **Special Purpose Zones:** Institutional (IN), Environmental Protection (EP), Greenspace (GRN), Parks (P)

Subzone Framework

Within each primary zone category, subzones (designated by letter suffixes A, B, C, D, E, F) regulate specific development standards such as lot dimensions, building setbacks, and site coverage requirements. This system allows for fine-tuned regulations that respond to local context while maintaining consistent density and height permissions within each primary zone.

Form-Based vs. Use-Based Zoning

The new by-law shifts significantly toward form-based zoning, emphasizing building envelope, height, and site design rather than strictly regulating land use types. This approach provides greater flexibility for adaptive reuse and mixed-use development while maintaining appropriate transitions between different intensity areas.

Key aspects of the form-based approach include:

- Broader permitted use lists in most zones
- Emphasis on building height, setbacks, and massing controls
- Reduced reliance on site-specific exceptions and permissions

Housing Provisions and Density

Additional Dwelling Units Framework

The by-law implements a comprehensive framework for additional dwelling units (ADUs) that significantly expands housing opportunities across Ottawa. This framework represents one of the most substantial policy changes in the new by-law, permitting up to four dwelling units on serviced residential lots throughout the urban area.

As-of-Right Permissions

On lots with full municipal water and sewer services in the urban area, the following dwelling unit configurations are permitted as-of-right:

- One principal dwelling unit
- Up to two additional dwelling units within the principal building
- One coach house (detached accessory dwelling) in the rear yard

This creates a baseline density of four units per lot across all serviced residential properties, implementing Provincial requirements under Bill 23 while exceeding minimum standards to support housing supply objectives.

Coach House Provisions

Coach houses represent a new housing typology for Ottawa, providing flexible accessory dwelling options. Key regulations include:

- Maximum building height of 3.6 metres (modifications for modular construction)
- Maximum footprint of 95 square metres
- Must be located in rear yard only
- Must have access to public or communal water and wastewater systems

Limitations in Unserviced Areas

In areas without full municipal services, the by-law limits density to protect groundwater and septic system capacity:

- Maximum of two dwelling units per lot in private service enclaves
- Coach houses not permitted on lots without communal or public water/sewer
- Existing lot patterns recognized to prevent oversizing of lots for private services

Neighbourhood Zone Density Matrix

The Neighbourhood zone framework establishes a graduated density scale that permits different maximum unit counts based on zone designation. This table summarizes the permitted densities:

Vertically Attached Dwelling Provisions

The final draft includes staff-recommended changes limiting the maximum number of principal vertically attached dwelling units (semi-detached and townhouses) in certain zones. This addresses provincial requirements while maintaining appropriate density levels:

- **N1 zones:** Vertically attached dwellings not permitted
- **N2 zones:** Maximum two principal vertically attached units
- **N3 zones** in Outer Urban Transect: Maximum four principal vertically attached units

These limitations work in conjunction with the additional dwelling unit provisions, ensuring that each townhouse unit can accommodate two additional dwellings while respecting the overall density framework of each zone.

Housing for Seniors and Special Needs

Following direction from the Housing Acceleration Plan, the by-law includes specific provisions supporting housing for seniors and persons with special needs:

Retirement Homes and Residential Care Facilities

Section 705 permits retirement homes and residential care facilities in any zone where residential uses are permitted. This implements Official Plan Policy 4.2.4, ensuring seniors can access appropriate housing options throughout the city. These uses provide a continuum of care from independent living with minimal services to full supportive care with medical oversight.

Rooming Houses and Cooperative Living

The by-law permits rooming houses with up to 20 rooming units, or a maximum determined by the zone's dwelling unit capacity using a two-rooming-units-per-dwelling-unit equivalency. This supports affordable housing options and cooperative living arrangements for seniors who wish to share common spaces while maintaining private bedrooms.

Oversize Dwelling Units

Section 709 permits dwelling units with up to eight bedrooms, subject to conditions. This supports multi-generational living arrangements where families can accommodate aging parents or adult children within a single dwelling unit while maintaining appropriate occupancy standards.

Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay

The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay (ENO) is an Official Plan policy tool that guides gradual intensification in neighbourhoods with good transit access. The overlay applies to areas within specific walking distances of major destinations:

- 400 metres walking distance (approximately 5 minutes) from Hub boundaries
- 400 metres walking distance from Mainstreet Corridor designations
- 400 metres radius from rapid transit station centers (approximately 10-minute walk)

Implementation Through Zoning

Properties within the ENO receive higher-density zone designations than neighbourhood interiors. The upzoning typically moves properties one zone category higher in the N1-N6 hierarchy. For example:

- R1 zones in ENO areas become N3 (rather than N2 in interiors)
- R2 zones in ENO areas become N3 (rather than N3 in interiors)
- R3/R4 zones in ENO areas become N4 with appropriate height suffixes

Gradual Transition Approach

The ENO implements a gradual transition philosophy where neighbourhoods closest to transit and services evolve toward more urban built forms. This supports:

- Efficient use of transit infrastructure through higher ridership potential
- 15-minute neighbourhood objectives by increasing population near services
- Housing supply targets while respecting neighbourhood character in interiors
- Climate action through transit-supportive development patterns

Parking and Transportation

Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements

One of the most significant policy changes in the new by-law is the complete elimination of minimum parking space requirements throughout urban Ottawa. This represents a fundamental shift from supply-side parking management to demand-responsive, market-based provision.

Rationale and Policy Context

The removal of parking minimums is directed by Official Plan Policy 4.1.4.2 and responds to several planning objectives:

- **Reducing Development Costs:** Parking construction costs \$25,000-\$50,000 per underground space and \$5,000-\$15,000 per surface space. Eliminating mandatory parking reduces development costs that are passed to residents through higher rents or purchase prices.
- **Supporting Transit-Oriented Development:** Areas well-served by transit demonstrate lower car ownership rates. Minimum parking requirements forced developers to provide more parking than market demand warranted in these locations.
- **Enabling Adaptive Reuse:** Strict parking requirements made it difficult to convert commercial buildings to residential use or redevelop sites with limited parking availability.
- **Responding to Changing Transportation Patterns:** Origin-Destination Survey data shows average vehicles per household decreased from 2011 to 2022, while walking trips increased 30% and bicycle trips increased 111%.

Exceptions to the Elimination

While minimum parking is eliminated in urban areas, two specific exceptions apply:

- **Village Residential Zones:** Following Council direction, Section 614 requires one parking space per dwelling unit in V1, V2, and V3 village residential zones. This recognizes limited transit service and higher car dependency in rural villages.

Visitor Parking: Section 603 requires visitor parking at a rate of 0.1 spaces per dwelling unit in most areas (where the Planning Act permits such requirements). This ensures visitors have access without relying entirely on street parking.

Maximum Parking Requirements

While minimums are eliminated, maximum parking rates continue to apply in transit-oriented locations. Properties within 600 metres of existing or planned rapid transit stations shown on Schedule A4 cannot exceed specified parking ratios. This prevents over-parking that would undermine transit investments and urban design objectives.

Maximum rates vary by use type and transect, with stricter limits in the Downtown and Inner Urban transects compared to Outer Urban and Suburban areas. Recent provincial regulations have limited

municipal authority to require parking near certain transit areas, but maximum rates remain an important tool where permitted.

Front Yard Parking Provisions

The by-law introduces new permissions for front yard parking in certain neighbourhood zones to provide flexibility where rear or side yard parking is constrained. Section 604 permits front yard parking in Area B of Schedule A5, which generally includes neighbourhoods outside the Downtown Transect and parts of the Inner Urban Transect.

Front yard parking is subject to conditions:

- Lot must be greater than 6 metres in width
- Parking must be located entirely on the lot
- Maximum driveway width limits apply per Section 606
- Parking exclusion fixtures required in remaining front yard area for buildings with 6+ units

Communal Parking Provisions

The final draft expands permissions for communal or off-site parking lots in Neighbourhood zones. This innovation addresses situations where individual properties may have limited on-site parking capacity, allowing parking to be consolidated on nearby properties within 400 metres.

Communal parking lots are permitted subject to these conditions:

- Must serve another residential use within 400 metres
- Must be on an interior lot (not corner lots)
- Maximum one drive aisle with one row of parking on each side
- Minimum 30% of lot area must be soft landscaping
- Must provide opaque screening at side and rear lot lines
- Not permitted in Downtown Transect or within 600 metres of rapid transit stations

Bicycle Parking Requirements

The by-law significantly enhances bicycle parking requirements to support active transportation mode shift. Section 613 establishes both short-term and long-term bicycle parking requirements that vary by use type and transect location.

Long-Term Bicycle Parking

Long-term bicycle parking serves residents, employees, and others who park for extended periods. Requirements include:

- Downtown and Inner Urban residential: 1.0 space per dwelling unit
- Outer Urban and Suburban residential: 0.75 spaces per dwelling unit
- Must be located inside a building or secure structure
- Must accommodate cargo and electric bicycles where feasible

Short-Term Bicycle Parking

Short-term bicycle parking serves visitors and customers. Staff-recommended changes in the final draft adjust rates based on industry feedback:

- Residential buildings: Minimum 2 spaces plus 1 space per 20 dwelling units above 21 units
- Must be weather-protected for non-residential uses
- Reduced rates in Downtown and Inner Urban transects where on-street bicycle parking is available

On-Street Parking Permit Program

To support the elimination of minimum parking requirements, the Official Plan provides direction for establishing residential on-street parking permit zones in certain areas. Currently available in some Downtown and Inner Urban areas, the program will be expanded following adoption of the new by-law.

Staff will undertake a study to review potential for new on-street parking areas and provide a report to Council in 2027. This initiative will help accommodate parking needs while reducing reliance on private on-site parking provision, particularly in established neighbourhoods where lot sizes may limit parking capacity.

Mixed-Use and Commercial Zones

Hub Zones

Hub zones implement the Official Plan's Hub designation for areas of highest intensity mixed-use development near rapid transit.

H1 - Hub Zone 1

Replaces former MD (Mixed-Use, Downtown) zones in the Downtown core. Permits:

- High-rise towers
- Broad range of commercial, residential, institutional, and cultural uses
- No minimum parking requirements
- Ground floor glazing requirements to activate street frontages

H2 - Hub Zone 2

Applied in Inner Urban and Outer Urban transects near rapid transit stations.

- Mid to high-rise buildings typically 9-30 storeys
- Required transition zones where abutting lower-density neighbourhoods
- Angular plane requirements from abutting residential zones

H3 - Hub Zone 3

Applied in suburban contexts and secondary nodes.

- Lower heights than H1/H2, typically 6-12 storeys
- Greater flexibility for surface parking given suburban context

- Less stringent glazing requirements

Mainstreet Zones

Mainstreet zones implement mid-rise corridor policies along arterial streets.

MS1 - Mainstreet 1

Applied in Downtown and Inner Urban transects.

Permits:

- 6-12 storey mixed-use buildings
- Ground floor commercial or institutional uses required on Mainstreet frontages
- Angular plane transitions to adjacent Neighbourhood zones
- Enhanced pedestrian realm requirements including wider sidewalks

MS2 - Mainstreet 2

Applied in Outer Urban transects.

- 4-6 storey mixed-use buildings typical
- Some flexibility for parking in front yards for non-residential uses
- Less stringent angular plane requirements given lower heights

MS3 - Mainstreet 3

Applied in Suburban transects with modified provisions:

- Height limits vary based on distance from rapid transit: 4-9 storeys near stations, 18-30 storeys at stations
- Greater parking flexibility recognizing suburban auto-orientation
- Reduced transition requirements given lower-density surroundings

Minor Corridor Zones

Minor Corridor zones represent a new zone category implementing 15-minute neighbourhood policies. Over 3,500 locations along designated Minor Corridors have been rezoned to permit mixed-use development, significantly expanding commercial opportunities in neighbourhoods.

CM1 - Minor Corridor 1

Applied in Downtown and Inner Urban transects:

- 4-6 storey mixed-use buildings permitted
- Angular plane requirements apply in Downtown transect only
- Broad commercial use permissions including retail, services, restaurants
- Residential uses permitted above ground floor or throughout building

CM2 - Minor Corridor 2

Applied in Outer Urban and Suburban transects:

- 4 storey buildings in Outer Urban areas
- 6 storey buildings in Suburban transect
- No angular plane requirements
- Same broad commercial permissions as CM1

Neighbourhood Mixed-Use Zone

The NMU zone applies to existing commercial nodes within neighbourhoods, typically at intersections or small commercial plazas. This zone consolidates numerous previous local commercial zones into a single, more flexible framework.

NMU zone characteristics:

- Typically 2-4 storeys depending on transect
- Neighbourhood-serving commercial uses including convenience stores, restaurants, professional offices
- Residential uses permitted above ground floor or throughout building
- Limited surface parking permissions to maintain pedestrian-oriented character

Economic Development Implications

The new commercial zone framework provides significant economic development benefits:

- **Reduced Regulatory Friction:** Elimination of arbitrary use restrictions that limited business types in commercial zones. Previously, outdated pre-amalgamation provisions restricted certain commercial uses without policy justification.
- **Entrepreneurial Opportunities:** Over 3,500 new locations permit commercial uses through Minor Corridor zoning, expanding opportunities for small businesses and service providers. Adaptive Reuse: Broader use permissions facilitate conversion of underutilized commercial or institutional buildings to residential or mixed-use.
- **15-Minute Neighbourhood Support:** Local commercial opportunities reduce travel distances for daily needs, supporting local economic activity.
- **Housing Construction Sector:** Expanded housing permissions create construction jobs and economic activity across residential development sectors.

Home-Based Business Provisions

The by-law expands home-based business provisions to support entrepreneurship within residential areas. Section 302 permits a broad range of home occupations including:

- Professional offices (legal, accounting, consulting, etc.)
- Personal services (hairstyling, esthetics, tutoring)
- Low-risk food establishments with enhanced standards
- Creative and artisan businesses
- Limited retail sales of goods produced on-site

Home businesses are subject to performance standards ensuring compatibility with residential character, including limitations on employees, signage, traffic generation, and external storage.

Environmental and Sustainability Provisions

On-Site Stormwater Management Program

Section 201 of the by-law introduces a comprehensive on-site stormwater management program addressing one of the most critical infrastructure challenges facing intensifying neighbourhoods. This program responds to Council-approved recommendations in the 2024 Infrastructure Master Plan.

Ottawa expects over 400,000 new residents by 2046, with 60% of growth occurring through intensification in existing neighbourhoods. Many of these neighbourhoods have aging stormwater infrastructure not designed for increased runoff from new development. The stormwater management program:

- Prevents flooding in existing neighbourhoods from intensification
- Maintains current service levels for existing residents
- Addresses gap created by Site Plan Control exemptions for smaller developments
- Manages runoff at source before it enters municipal systems

Application and Scope

The program applies to all low-rise residential building permits (four storeys or fewer) that increase hard surface areas. This includes:

- New infill dwelling construction
- Substantial additions to existing dwellings
- New accessory buildings that increase impermeable coverage

Developments proceeding through Site Plan Control continue to address stormwater through that process. The new program specifically targets smaller developments proceeding solely through building permit approvals.

Technical Approaches

Applicants can manage stormwater through various approved methods:

- **Rooftop Control Systems:** Controlled release cisterns that collect and slowly release roof runoff
- **Surface Storage:** Landscape depressions, rain gardens, and bioswales that capture and infiltrate runoff
- **Underground Storage:** Below-grade chambers or tanks with controlled outlet rates
- **Low Impact Development:** Green infrastructure approaches including permeable paving, infiltration trenches, and vegetated systems

QuickSWM Tool

To streamline compliance, the City developed the QuickSWM Tool - a technical checklist allowing applicants to complete stormwater reviews without hiring specialized engineers. Key features:

- Saves 8-12 weeks compared to Site Plan Control timelines
- Many approvals completed within standard 10-day building permit review
- Peer-reviewed technical methodology

- Regularly updated based on user feedback
- Integrated into existing grading and servicing review process

Water and Wastewater Service Adequacy

Section 201 also establishes a risk-based approach to reviewing water and wastewater system capacity:

- **Low Density (1-3 units):** Minimal review, development tracked for future infrastructure planning. Low risk to sanitary capacity and fire protection.
- **Medium Density (4-10 units):** Active review of all applications to assess fire flow capacity and ensure adequate service levels. Higher risk requiring verification.

This approach ensures development does not compromise public safety while minimizing administrative burden for smaller projects. System monitoring will guide prioritization of infrastructure upgrades based on growth patterns and available funding.

Soft Landscaping Requirements

The by-law maintains and in some cases enhances soft landscaping requirements that support urban canopy, climate resilience, and stormwater infiltration. Minimum soft landscaping provisions apply in most zones:

- Neighbourhood zones: Minimum 30% soft landscaping in front yards
- Mixed-use zones: Varies by transect and zone
- Communal parking lots: Minimum 30% soft landscaping of lot area

Soft landscaping supports canopy tree growth, which provides shade, reduces urban heat island effect, improves air quality, manages stormwater, and contributes to mental well-being through exposure to green space.

Environmental Protection Zone

The EP (Environmental Protection) Zone continues to apply to environmentally sensitive areas including wetlands, significant woodlands, and steep slopes. The zone boundaries have been updated in the final draft to align with environmental designations in the Official Plan.

EP zone provisions strictly limit development to protect ecological functions:

- Passive recreational uses only (trails, nature viewing)
- Conservation and restoration activities permitted
- Buildings and structures generally prohibited
- Lot creation not permitted

Mineral Aggregate Separation Overlay

The Mineral Aggregate Separation Overlay protects mineral resources while ensuring public safety near aggregate operations. The final draft adjusts separation distances based on operational experience:

- **Sand and Gravel:** 150 metres separation (reinstating current by-law distance)
- **Bedrock:** 300 metres separation (reduced from 500m in Draft 2, but increased from current 210m)

Rural Area Provisions

Agricultural Zone

The AG (Agricultural) Zone has been modified to implement Provincial Planning Statement 2024 requirements while maintaining agricultural viability. Key changes:

- Two additional dwellings permitted on lots larger than 1 hectare (PPS 2024 requirement)
- Agricultural uses remain primary permitted use
- On-farm diversified uses permitted subject to conditions
- Minimum lot sizes maintained to protect agricultural land base

Village Zones

Village zones implement policies for rural village settlement areas. The zone structure includes:

Village Residential Zones (V1-V5)

Village residential zones provide graduated density similar to urban Neighbourhood zones but adapted for rural context:

- **V1-V3:** Low density village residential, 1-3 storeys
- **V4-V5:** Higher density near village centers, up to 4 storeys
- **Minimum parking requirement:** 1 space per dwelling unit (Section 614)
- Additional dwelling units permitted on serviced lots

Village Mixed-Use Zone (VM)

The VM zone applies to village commercial areas and main streets:

- Mixed residential and commercial uses permitted
- Typically 2-3 storeys, adapted to village scale
- Ground floor commercial encouraged but not required
- Parking standards recognize rural auto-dependency

Rural Countryside Zone

The RU (Rural Countryside) Zone applies to rural residential areas outside villages and agricultural lands. Provisions maintain rural character while providing flexibility:

- Low-density residential development
- Home-based businesses permitted with rural-appropriate scale
- Additional dwellings subject to servicing capacity
- Rural tourism and agri-tourism uses permitted

Rural Industrial and Logistics Zone

The RI zone has been updated to reflect the *Planning Act* definition of 'area of employment' under Provincial regulations:

- Office and institutional uses not permitted (*Planning Act* restriction)
- Commercial uses only if accessory to permitted industrial use
- Focus on warehousing, distribution, manufacturing, resource extraction
- Limited residential permissions ensure employment land protection

Implementation and Transition

Gradual Implementation Through Appeals

Following Council approval, the new Zoning By-law will come into effect gradually as appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) are resolved. This multi-year transition reflects the by-law's comprehensive scope and ensures orderly implementation:

Unappealed Provisions

Provisions not appealed will come into effect once an OLT hearing is held and the Tribunal declares the unappealed sections to be in effect. This could occur relatively quickly for uncontroversial provisions with broad support.

Appealed Provisions

For provisions that are appealed:

- Related provisions in current Zoning By-law 2008-250 continue to apply
- Most restrictive provisions in either by-law prevail until appeals resolved
- Appeals may take several years to fully resolve depending on issues and parties

Special Transition Rules

Section 110 transition provisions concerning interpretation of exceptions and schedules will not come into effect until declared in effect by the OLT. This ensures clarity about how site-specific provisions interact with the new zone framework.

Continuation Provisions

Section 109 establishes continuation provisions for development applications and approvals in process when the new by-law takes effect:

Applications in Progress

Applications deemed complete under Zoning By-law 2008-250:

- Reviewed against the by-law in effect at submission
- Five years to develop following approval
- Cannot 'pick and choose' between old and new by-law provisions

Approved Developments

Developments approved under current by-law:

- Three years to commence development from approval date
- Permissions under approved plans remain valid during this period

- Site Plan Control approvals continue to apply as approved

New Applications

Applications submitted after the new by-law enactment:

- Subject to most restrictive provisions where appeals exist
- Unappealed sections apply fully once declared in effect
- Clarity improves as appeals resolved over time

Exception and Schedule Conversion

The current by-law contains thousands of site-specific exceptions and schedules accumulated over decades. Document 8 establishes a work plan for aligning these provisions with the new by-law:

Retention Approach

Most exceptions will be retained through the transition, ensuring existing permissions and restrictions continue to apply. The by-law includes Document 1B (Exceptions) and Document 1C (Schedules) that translate current provisions into the new framework.

Future Cleanup

Staff will undertake ongoing work to:

- Identify obsolete exceptions that can be removed
- Consolidate similar exceptions into broader zone provisions
- Update schedules to reflect current site conditions
- Bring forward omnibus amendments to streamline exception inventory

Site Plan Control By-law Alignment

On October 8, 2025, Council approved a motion directing amendment of Site Plan Control By-law 2014-256 to increase exemptions to a maximum of 12 residential dwelling units. This aligns with Housing Acceleration Plan objectives.

If N3 zones need to be updated to match the new 12-unit Site Plan threshold, those changes would be brought forward after Council approves the Site Plan Control amendments.

Digital Twin Integration

The City is developing a Digital Twin - an interactive three-dimensional digital replica of Ottawa's buildings and infrastructure - to support by-law implementation and interpretation. Document 13 provides updates on this initiative:

Functionality

The OTwin Viewer will enable:

- 3D visualization of maximum permitted building envelopes
- Sunlight and shadow analysis for proposed developments
- Sightline and view corridor evaluation

- Integration of multiple data layers (zoning, infrastructure, transit)
- Self-service analysis for non-GIS staff

Schedule Modernization

To support Digital Twin integration, GATS (Geospatial, Analytics, Technology Solutions) modernized and recreated 460 site-specific and area-specific zoning schedules included in Part 16 of the by-law. These updated schedules incorporate detailed maps and 3D graphics clarifying how provisions apply across the city.

Minor Zoning By-law Amendment Delegation

Implementing the new by-law will broaden the category of minor zoning by-law amendments delegated to staff, reducing processing timelines for routine adjustments.

The streamlined zone structure and form-based approach means more development can proceed as-of-right, reducing the overall volume of amendment applications while maintaining appropriate public input on significant changes.

Public Consultation Summary

Consultation Themes

The extensive public consultation process revealed several recurring themes in community feedback. Document 15 (As-We-Hear-It Reports) summarizes approximately 190 detailed submissions received during the final draft consultation period (September 8 to October 5, 2025).

Neighbourhood Zones

Support for Intensification: Many respondents supported gentle density increases, particularly where aligned with transit access and infrastructure capacity. Support was strongest for additional dwelling units, coach houses, and missing middle housing.

Infrastructure Concerns: Frequent concerns about whether existing infrastructure (streets, sewers, parks, schools) can accommodate increased density. Requests for phased development tied to infrastructure upgrades.

Character Preservation: Many submissions emphasized maintaining established neighbourhood character, particularly in areas with heritage value or distinctive architectural styles.

Equity Concerns: Questions about whether intensification would be equitably distributed or concentrated in specific areas. Concerns about displacement and gentrification pressures.

Mixed-Use Zones

Height and Scale: Significant debate about appropriate building heights in Hub and Mainstreet zones, particularly in suburban contexts. Some support for increased heights near transit, others concerned about compatibility with adjacent residential areas.

Commercial Permissions: General support for expanded commercial uses to support 15-minute neighbourhoods. Questions about specific uses such as restaurants, bars, and entertainment venues in residential proximity.

Transition Standards: Requests for stronger transition standards where high-rise or mid-rise buildings abut low-density neighbourhoods. Angular plane requirements are seen as important protection.

Parking

Support for Removal: Urban residents, particularly near transit, generally supported parking minimum elimination. Cited reducing development costs, supporting active transportation, and responding to changing mobility patterns.

Concerns about Impacts: Suburban residents and those in areas with limited transit expressed concerns about on-street parking competition, blocked driveways, and impacts on visitors and service vehicles.

Implementation Questions: Many questions about enforcement, on-street permit programs, and how the market will respond. Requests for monitoring and ability to adjust if problems arise.

Environmental Concerns

Tree Protection: Frequent concerns about tree retention and canopy loss from intensification. Requests for stronger tree protection standards and minimum planting requirements.

Climate Action: Support for provisions that support transit use, active transportation, and reduced car dependency. Some requests for stronger green building standards.

Stormwater Management: General support for on-site stormwater requirements. Questions about implementation complexity and whether standards are sufficient to prevent flooding.

Geographic Variations in Feedback

Feedback patterns varied significantly by location and transect:

Downtown and Inner Urban

- Generally supportive of intensification and parking elimination
- Concerns about shadows, building massing, and heritage preservation
- Support for mixed-use development and neighbourhood commercial
- Questions about affordable housing provisions and displacement

Outer Urban and Suburban

- Mixed views on intensification - support near transit, concerns in low-density areas
- Strong opposition to parking minimum removal in many areas
- Infrastructure capacity concerns more pronounced
- Support for neighbourhood commercial and 15-minute neighbourhood concept

Rural Areas

- Support for village parking minimums

- Concerns about agricultural land protection
- Questions about servicing capacity for additional dwelling units
- Support for expanded home-based business permissions

Stakeholder Input

Key stakeholder groups provided specialized input:

Development Industry

- Strong support for streamlined provisions and parking elimination
- Feedback on bicycle parking rates led to staff-recommended adjustments
- Concerns about stormwater implementation complexity and costs
- Requests for additional height flexibility for modular construction

Ottawa Public Health

Document 12 provides OPH's summative statement supporting the by-law. Key health-supportive elements identified:

- Supports walkable 15-minute neighbourhoods promoting physical activity
- Mixed-use permissions improve access to services and amenities
- Bicycle infrastructure requirements support active transportation
- Parking reductions help mitigate climate change and improve air quality
- Housing diversity supports aging in place and social equity
- Protection of childcare play areas from traffic pollution

Community Associations

Community associations provided detailed local context:

- Specific concerns about zoning changes in their neighbourhoods
- Requests for heritage overlays and character area protections
- Infrastructure capacity assessments for high-growth areas
- Implementation monitoring and ongoing engagement requests

Conclusions and Recommendations

Assessment of By-law Objectives

The new Zoning By-law successfully advances multiple strategic objectives established at project inception:

Housing Supply and Affordability

The by-law provides significant new housing capacity:

- Four units permitted on every serviced lot creates baseline gentle density
- Graduated Neighbourhood zone framework enables incremental intensification

- Parking elimination reduces development costs passed to residents
- Streamlined provisions reduce rezoning needs and approval timelines
- Diverse housing types support various household sizes and income levels

Official Plan Implementation

The by-law effectively translates Official Plan policies into regulatory framework:

- Zone structure aligns with Official Plan designations and transect approach
- Density and height permissions achieve intensification targets
- 15-minute neighbourhood policies implemented through Minor Corridors
- Transit-oriented development supported through Hub and Mainstreet zones
- Environmental protection maintained through EP zones and overlays

Economic Development

The by-law removes regulatory barriers and creates opportunities:

- Broad commercial use permissions eliminate outdated restrictions
- Over 3,500 new commercial locations along Minor Corridors
- Expanded home-based business provisions support entrepreneurship
- Housing supply supports labour force attraction and retention
- Streamlined zoning reduces time and costs for business establishment

Implementation Challenges

Several challenges will require ongoing attention during implementation:

Infrastructure Capacity

The most frequently cited concern in public consultation relates to whether existing infrastructure can accommodate increased density. Key considerations:

- **Stormwater:** New on-site management requirements address this directly
- **Water/Wastewater:** Risk-based review ensures adequate capacity verification
- **Transportation:** Intensification near transit reduces auto trips, but local street impacts need monitoring
- **Parks and Recreation:** Population growth requires corresponding amenity expansion
- **Schools:** Enrollment impacts require coordination with school boards

Appeals and Legal Uncertainty

The gradual implementation through OLT appeals creates uncertainty:

- Developers and property owners face complexity determining applicable standards
- Most restrictive provisions may limit housing supply during appeal period

- Resolution timeline depends on appeal volumes and OLT capacity
- Staff resources required to defend by-law provisions at hearings

Monitoring and Adjustment

Several provisions require monitoring to assess effectiveness:

- Parking elimination impacts on street parking and development patterns
- Stormwater management program effectiveness and compliance rates
- Housing production rates relative to targets and demand
- Minor Corridor commercial uptake and economic impacts
- Tree canopy and soft landscaping preservation with intensification

Recommendations for Ongoing Work

Staff recommendations concerning ongoing work include:

Short-Term (Year 1-2)

- **Communication and Education:** Develop comprehensive public education materials explaining new permissions, procedures, and standards. Target materials to different audiences (residents, developers, community groups).
- **Digital Twin Deployment:** Complete Digital Twin development and deploy public-facing tools for visualizing permitted development.
- **Stormwater Program Launch:** Implement full on-site stormwater management program with QuickSWM Tool. Provide extensive technical support during initial months.
Site Plan Control Alignment: Complete amendments to Site Plan Control By-law and align with zoning exemptions.

Medium-Term (Year 2-5)

- **On-Street Parking Study:** Complete comprehensive study of on-street parking permit program expansion as directed by Council. Report to Council in 2027.
- **Exception Rationalization:** Conduct systematic review of site-specific exceptions to identify obsolete provisions. Bring forward omnibus amendments to streamline exception inventory.
- **Secondary Plan Alignment:** Review implementation of secondary plan policies and bring forward omnibus amendments where heights or densities need adjustment.
- **Infrastructure Monitoring:** Establish monitoring frameworks for infrastructure impacts. Coordinate with asset management, transportation, and water services to track capacity.

Long-Term (Year 5+)

- **Comprehensive Review:** Conduct comprehensive review of by-law effectiveness after appeals substantially resolved and sufficient development activity observed.
- **Housing Production Analysis:** Assess whether by-law is delivering expected housing production and diversity. Identify any remaining regulatory barriers.

- **Climate Performance:** Evaluate contribution to climate action goals including mode share shifts, vehicle kilometers traveled reduction, and building energy performance.
- **Economic Impact Assessment:** Assess economic development outcomes including business establishment, employment growth, and commercial vitality in neighbourhoods.

Final Assessment

The City of Ottawa has stated that the new Zoning By-law represents a bold and comprehensive modernization of zoning regulations. After five years of development and three draft iterations, the final draft balances multiple objectives:

- Significantly expanding housing supply and diversity
- Supporting transit-oriented and complete community development
- Creating economic opportunities for businesses and entrepreneurs
- Addressing environmental sustainability through multiple provisions
- Streamlining regulatory complexity for faster, more predictable development

However, the status quo is not sustainable. Ottawa faces acute housing shortages, climate change imperatives, and changing demographics. The new by-law provides a framework to address these challenges while maintaining livability, protecting environmental features, and respecting local context through transect-based regulations.

The extensive public consultation process has shaped a by-law that is better for the input received. While not every concern could be accommodated, staff have demonstrated responsiveness to feedback through adjustments across all three draft iterations.

The new Zoning By-law is designed to position Ottawa to meet its housing, climate, and economic development goals while providing a clear, predictable framework for development. It represents sound planning policy translated into workable regulations. With careful implementation and ongoing refinement, it will serve the city well for decades to come.

Appendix: Staff-Recommended Changes Summary

The final draft includes staff-recommended changes organized into several categories:

A.1 Error Corrections (Document 2)

Document 2 contains changes to correct errors and omissions in the final draft text:

- Wording corrections for clarity and consistency
- Corrections to cross-references and section numbers
- Minor technical adjustments to definitions
- Typographical error corrections

A.2 Zoning Map Changes (Document 3)

Document 3 recommends Zoning Map changes organized by type:

- Blue (Error Corrections): OLT decisions, missing height suffixes, conversion errors, boundary corrections

- Orange (Intent Changes): Policy implementation adjustments, recognition of existing uses
- Green (Technical Changes): Boundary refinements, EP zone alignments, polygon merges

A.3 Intent Changes (Document 4)

Document 4 includes staff-recommended text changes modifying provision intent:

- Vertically attached dwelling limitations in N1, N2, N3 zones
- Modular construction height flexibility provisions
- Bicycle parking rate adjustments based on industry feedback
- Front yard parking provision refinements
- Fenestration requirement removal to reduce permit delays