

# Planning Rationale Addendum No. 2

## 384 Arlington Avenue, Ottawa

1

June 1, 2023

**Mr. Andrew McCreight and Mr. Eric Forhan**  
Development Review, Central Services  
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department  
City of Ottawa  
110 Laurier Avenue West  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Via Email: [eric.forhan@ottawa.ca](mailto:eric.forhan@ottawa.ca)

**RE: 384 Arlington Avenue, Ottawa**  
**Planning Rationale Addendum No. 2**  
**Zoning By-Law Amendment (D02-02-22-0082)**

Dear Mr. McCreight and Mr. Forhan,

Fotenn Planning + Design ('Fotenn') previously prepared a Planning Rationale dated August 24, 2022, to support a Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBLA) application, and a Planning Rationale Addendum dated May 9, 2023 to support an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) application for the lands known as 384 Arlington Avenue in the City of Ottawa (the "subject site").

This Addendum should be read in conjunction with the original August 2022 Planning Rationale and May 2023 Planning Rationale Addendum No. 1. All opinions and findings of the original report remain valid, except as otherwise described below.

This report is intended to address key outstanding comments from the review of the application.

### 1.1 Summary of the Application

In August 2022, Fotenn, on behalf of Windmill Developments, submitted a Zoning By-law Amendment application (File no. D02-02-22-0082) to redevelop the subject site with one (1) 24-storey high-rise residential apartment building. The Zoning By-law Amendment application sought to rezone the entirety of the subject site to "Residential Fifth Density, Subzone XXX, Schedule YYY (AM10[XXX] S(YYY))" to permit the proposed development.

Per the request of city staff, an OPA was submitted dated March 30, 2023, and was deemed complete on April 25, 2023. The OPA Planning Rationale Addendum was submitted on May 9, 2023. The OPA proposes that a site-specific policy amendment be made to Section 6.3.1 of Official Plan (2022), which states: "A building with a maximum height of 78-metres is permitted on the site municipally known as 384 Arlington Avenue."

### 1.2 Changes to the Proposed Development

In response to the first round of comments received through technical circulation as well as in follow-up meetings and correspondence with city staff, the proposed development has been revised. Multiple changes were made to re-orient the tower footprint, improve the prominence of the church, reduce the podium height along Arlington Avenue from four (4) to three (3) storeys, reduce the eight (8) storey middle mass to six (6) storeys, improve tower setbacks from multiple angles, and reorganized the landscaped area along Bell Street North from a courtyard into a long linear area.

One of the reasons the City requested that the development team study a re-orientation of the tower was to provide tower separation to the east, improve the stepback of the tower on Bell Street, and improve the pedestrian experience. A hypothetical 20-metre tower setback was envisioned, which guided the redesign of the tower from its previous design. In

Submission 1, the tower was pushed as far south as possible to locate the density close to Raymond Street and the highway. The design was revised to rotate the tower footprint 90° and provide setbacks on Bell Street North and Raymond Street.

As is shown in the Block Plan in the Architectural Brochure, a Site Plan Control Application (SPC) for 370 Cambridge Street has been submitted, which will redevelop a row of two (2) storey townhouses to a four (4) storey low-rise apartment building. As this application was received by the city on March 29, 2023, it is unlikely that the entire block would be re-assembled and consolidated for a tower application in the near future. Nonetheless, the revised tower footprint will provide increased separation between the proposed high-rise and low-rise apartment building.

Changes to the building design has resulted in greater compliance with certain provisions in the zoning by-law. For example, relief is no longer required from the minimum corner side yard setback (Bell Street North frontage) and interior yard setback (Arthur Lane frontage). However, relief is still required from the minimum rear yard setback (Raymond Street frontage) performance standard because the building setback is 0 metres when 7.5 metres is required. A setback of 1.5 metres is provided to improve the pedestrian experience.



Figure 1: Summary of changes, original design (left) and revised design (right)

Table 1, below, provides a summary of the changes proposed between the original and revised design.

Table 1: Comparative table summarizing changes between the original and revised design

|                              | Original Design  | Revised Design   |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Units</b>                 | 274 units  | 294 units  |
| <b>Amenity Space</b>         | 2,680.8 m <sup>2</sup>   | 2,910.8 m <sup>2</sup>   |
| <b>Parking Count</b>         | 91 parking spaces<br>(not split into resident vs visitor parking spaces) | 79 parking spaces<br>/ 65 resident parking spaces<br>/ 14 visitor parking spaces |
| <b>Bicycle Parking Count</b> | 280 bicycle parking spaces   | 294 bicycle parking spaces   |

|  |   | Original Design             | Revised Design              |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Tower height</b>                        |   | 24 storeys<br>71 metres     | 24 storeys<br>78 metres     |
| <b>Podium height</b>                       |   | 8 storeys                   | 6 storeys                   |
| <b>Height along Arlington Ave</b>          |   | 4 storeys                   | 3 storeys                   |
| <b>Min. front yard setback</b>             |   | 0 m<br>Legal non-conforming | 0 m<br>Legal non-conforming |
| <b>Min. corner side yard setback</b>       |   | 1.5 m                       | 3.16 m                      |
| <b>Min. rear yard setback</b>              |   | 0 m                         | 0 m                         |
| <b>Min. interior side yard setback</b>     | Within the first 21 m from the front yard | 1.5 m                       | 4.78 m                      |
|  | 21 m from the front lot line              | 1.5 m                       | 4.78 m                      |
| <b>Min. interior side yard for a tower</b> |   | 1.8 m                       | 8.36 m                      |
| <b>Min. rear yard setback for a tower</b>  |   | 0 m                         | 1.5 m                       |

### 1.3 Zone Analysis

Since the original Planning Rationale submitted in August 2022, the appeal to the High-Rise Zoning Provisions has been settled and they are now in effect and are located in section 77 of the Zoning By-law. Whereas these had been contemplated previously in the Planning Rationale, they were not included in the proposed zoning by-law amendment; as they are now in effect, they have been included in the proposed amendment.

Table 2, below, provides a summary of the Residential Fifth Density, Subzone B (R5B) as detailed in Zoning By-law 2008-250. The table demonstrates how the development meets the provisions. Areas of compliance are noted with a green checkmark (✓) and areas of non-compliance are noted with a red 'x' (X).

Table 2: Proposed R5B Subzone performance standards and analysis

| R5B   | Requirement   | Provided                    | Compliance? |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Minimum Lot Width (m)</b><br>Table 164A            | 22.5 m  | 37.99 m                     | ✓           |
| <b>Minimum Lot Area (m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br>Table 164A | 675 m <sup>2</sup>  | 2,187 m <sup>2</sup>        | ✓           |
| <b>Maximum Building Height (m)</b><br>Table 164A      | Maximum building height is either shown with an H(#) on the Zoning Map, on a Schedule or in the exception zone. | 78 m                        | ✓           |
| <b>Minimum Front Yard Setback (m)</b><br>Table 164A   | 3 m   | 0 m<br>Legal non-conforming | ✓           |
| <b>Minimum Corner Yard Setback (m)</b><br>Table 164A  | 3 m   | 3.16 m                      | ✓           |
| <b>Minimum Rear Yard Setback (m)</b><br>Table 164A    | 7.5 m   | 0 m                         | X           |

| R5B   |   | Requirement   | Provided   | Compliance? |
|---|---|---|--|-------------|
| <b>Minimum Interior Side Yard Setback (m)</b><br>Table 164A |   | Within the first 21 m from the front yard: 1.5 m  | Within the first 21 m from the front yard: 4.78 m  | ✓           |
|   |   | 21 m from the front lot line: 6 m   | 21 m from the front lot line: 4.78 m   | ✗           |
| <b>Corner Sight Triangle</b><br>s. 57                       |   | A triangular corner site triangle measuring 6 m x 6 m extending from the corner of two streets shall be observed. No buildings are permitted within 3 m of the triangle formed.                                     | Arlington Ave and Bell St N: existing legal non-conforming   | ✓           |
|   |   |   | Bell St N and Raymond St: 6 m x 6 m  | ✓           |
| <b>Landscaped Area</b><br>s. 163(9)                         |   | 30% of the lot area must be provided as landscaped area   | 24%  | ✗           |
| <b>Amenity Area</b><br>Table 137<br>s. 137(4)               | Total Amenity Area                      | 6m <sup>2</sup> per dwelling unit:<br>1,764 m <sup>2</sup>  | Communal amenity: 1,329 m <sup>2</sup><br>Private balconies/ terraces: 1,580.4 m <sup>2</sup><br><br>Total: 2,910.8 m <sup>2</sup>   | ✓           |
|   | Communal Amenity Area                   | A minimum of 50% of the required total amenity area: 882 m <sup>2</sup>   | 1,329 m <sup>2</sup><br><br>Includes communal amenity areas and terraces   | ✓           |
|   | Layout of Amenity Area                  | Aggregated into areas up to 54 m <sup>2</sup> , and where more than one aggregated area is provided, at least one must be a minimum of 54 m <sup>2</sup>  | Ground floor greenspace: 153.1 m <sup>2</sup><br>4 <sup>th</sup> floor terrace: 354.8 m <sup>2</sup><br>7 <sup>th</sup> floor terrace: 312.6 m <sup>2</sup><br><br>Multiple areas of more than 54 m <sup>2</sup> | ✓           |
|   | Amenity area as part of landscaped area | Where amenity area is located outside at grade, it may be included in the calculation of landscaped area requirements   | Included   | ✓           |
| <b>Parking Requirements</b>                                 |   |   |  |             |
| <b>Parking Requirements</b><br>Area X on Schedule 1A        |   | 0.5 spaces/unit, less the first 12 units, less 10% (resident):<br>$((294-12)*0.5)-10\%$<br><b>127 resident parking spaces</b><br><br>0.1 spaces/unit, less the first 12 units (visitor): <b>28.2 parking spaces</b> | 65 resident parking spaces<br><br>14 visitor parking spaces  | ✗<br><br>✗  |

| R5B  | Requirement   | Provided   | Compliance? |
|--|---|--|-------------|
|  | Total: <b>155 parking spaces</b>  |  |             |
| <b>All parking provided below-grade</b><br>s. 101(6)(c)                            | where all parking spaces provided or required for a permitted land use are located below grade in the same building as that land use, the parking required by Table 101 for that land use may be reduced by the lesser of:<br><br>/ 10 per cent of the required parking spaces;<br>or<br>/ 20 parking spaces. | Resident parking reduced by 10%                        | ✓           |
| <b>Vehicle Parking Space Dimensions</b><br>s. 106                                  | Must be 2.6 m x 5.2 m   | 2.6 m x 5.2 m  | ✓           |
| <b>Aisle and Driveway Provisions</b><br>s. 107                                     | Width of double-lane driveway providing access to a parking garage: 6m<br><br>Width of aisles in a parking garage for parking oriented at 90°: 6 m  | Driveway width: 6 m<br><br>Aisle width: 6 m            | ✓<br><br>✓  |
| <b>Bicycle Parking</b><br>s. 111   | 0.5 per dwelling unit:<br>294 dwelling units * 0.5<br>= 147 bicycle parking spaces  | 294 bicycle parking spaces (1:1)                       | ✓           |
| <b>Bicycle Parking Space Dimensions</b><br>s. 111                                  | Horizontal: 0.6 m by 1.8 m<br>Vertical: 0.5 m by 1.5 m<br>(Max 50% of required spaces)  | Horizontal: 0.6 m by 1.8 m<br>Vertical: 0.5 m by 1.5 m | ✓           |
| <b>Bicycle Parking Access Aisle Width</b><br>s. 111                                | 1.5 m   | 1.5 m  | ✓           |
| <b>Minimum Lot Area for a Corner Lot</b><br>s. 77(3)(a)                            | 1,150 m <sup>2</sup>  | 2,187 m  | ✓           |
| <b>Minimum Interior Side Yard and Rear Yard Setback for a Tower</b><br>s. 77(3)(c) | 10 m  | Interior Side Yard: 8.36                               | X           |
|  |   | Rear yard: 1.5 m                                       | X           |

## 1.4 Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

To facilitate the proposed development, a Zoning By-law Amendment is being submitted to rezone the lands to “Residential Fifth Density, Subzone B, Special Exception XXXX, Schedule YYY (R5B[XXXX] SYYY)”. The special exception would address specific performance standards, while the proposed site-specific schedule would establish building heights, setbacks, and stepbacks. The new zoning schedule and exception would provide relief from specific provisions of the proposed zoning as detailed throughout this report to address non-compliance in the following areas:

### **Increase Permitted Maximum Building Height and Application of the R5 Zone**

The proposed maximum height is 78 metres. Please see the Planning Rationale dated August 2022 for more information. This has increased from 71 metres in Submission 1 to 78 metres in this submission.

### **Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

Relief is required for the rear yard setback where 0 metres are provided when 7.5 metres are required. Since the rear yard is adjacent to a road and beyond, a highway, there are no buildings or open space that might require transition or buffer thus mitigating potential adverse impacts on the community.

The requested relief remains the same as in Submission 1.

### **Landscaped Area**

24% of landscaped area is provided when 30% is required. This relief remains unchanged from the original Planning Rationale dated August 2022. The requested relief remains the same as in Submission 1.

### **Minimum Resident Parking Space Rate**

65 resident vehicle parking spaces provided when 127 resident parking spaces are required. Please see the Planning Rationale dated August 2022 for more information. The requested relief has changed since Submission 1, when 91 parking spaces were proposed (not broken down into resident vs visitor) when 140 vehicle parking spaces were indicated as being required. Per section 101(6)(c), the required minimum number of resident parking spaces can be reduced by 10% as all spaces are being provided underground.

### **Minimum Visitor Parking Space Rate**

In the original submission, parking allocation between resident and visitor had not yet been contemplated. Parking allocation has been explored as part of this submission and rates have been further refined. Given the site's proximity to public transit and cycling routes and high walkability and given the development team's commitment to providing alternative transportation options, vehicle parking is expected to be lower than the required minimums. Therefore, 14 visitor parking spaces are provided when 28 are required.

### **Minimum Required Rear Yard and Interior Side Yard Setback for a Tower**

- / Reduced Required Rear Yard Setback for a Tower of 1.5 m when 10 m is required
- / Reduced Interior Side Yard Setback for a Tower of 8.36 m when 10 m is required

Relief is required from the Provisions for High-Rise Buildings (Zoning By-law 2008-250, Section 77), which came into effect after the Planning Rationale was submitted. A stepback of 1.5 metres is provided for the rear yard so that the tower is not directly adjacent to the rear yard property line to provide a tower break on Raymond Street. While 10 metres is required, as described in the relief for the Minimum Rear Yard Setback, the site context adjacent to a road and highway do not require transition or buffer space. The location of the height in this context is therefore appropriate for relief.

The reduced interior side yard setback for the tower is provided at 8.36 metres when 10 metres is required, however, Arthur Lane provides additional buffer for the proposed development. 10 metres are provided from the tower to the centreline of Arthur Lane, which demonstrates that sufficient buffer space can be provided when taking the laneway into account.

## **1.5 Conclusion**

It remains Fotenn's professional opinion that these applications represent good land use planning and are in the public interest. The proposed development is consistent with the direction and policies of the 2003 and 2022 City of Ottawa Official Plans.

Having reviewed the resubmission package against the applicable planning framework, what is being proposed remains appropriate for the site, and is in the public interest for the following reasons:

- / The proposed development generally conforms to the 2003 and 2022 City of Ottawa Official Plan policies by proposing an intensification and building height in an area identified to accommodate growth, and by providing suitable transition within the corridor to the neighbourhood to the north. Nevertheless, we have submitted an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) at the request of city staff, but continue to assert that the proposed development conforms to the Official Plans;
- / The proposed development will add to the diversity of housing types, housing tenures, and built form; and
- / The proposed development generally complies with the proposed R5B subzone and relief requested aligns with the intent of the zone.

Should you have additional questions or require clarification on any of the information provided herein, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Tamara Nahal, M.Pl.  
Planner



Tim Beed, MCIP RPP  
Senior Planner