



**Green Lands – Village of Richmond  
6295, 6363, 6409, 6335 Perth Street**

Planning Rationale Addendum  
Zoning By-law Amendment + Draft Plan of Subdivision  
August 25, 2021



Prepared for Caivan Communities

Prepared by Fotenn Planning + Design  
396 Cooper Street, Suite 300  
Ottawa, ON K2P 2H7

August 2021

© Fotenn

The information contained in this document produced by Fotenn is solely for the use of the Client identified above for the purpose for which it has been prepared and Fotenn undertakes no duty to or accepts any responsibility to any third party who may rely upon this document.

# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose

Fotenn Consultants has been retained by Caivan (Richmond North) Limited, a division of Caivan Communities (“Caivan”) to prepare an Addendum to the Planning Rationale in support of Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications for the lands known municipally as 6295, 6363, 6409, 6335 Perth Street (the “subject lands”). The subject lands are collectively referred to as the “Green Lands,” referencing the surname of the previous owner. The applications are combined with Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision applications for lands south of Perth Street, known as the “Laffin Lands,” with a Fotenn Planning Rationale submitted under separate cover.

As part of the application process, City of Ottawa staff have reviewed the plans, reports, and documents submitted in support of the Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision applications. Staff have provided comments on the submission as part of the first round of review on December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020. A subsequent response to these comments and revised plans were submitted to City of Ottawa staff on February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

Upon a second review of the submitted responses and revised plans, Staff have provided a second round of comments dated May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021. This Planning Addendum is intended to provide responses to these comments, as requested by staff. The Addendum should be read in conjunction with the originally submitted Planning Rationale.

## 1.2 Revised Concept Plan

Caivan has prepared a revised Concept Plan for the Green Lands, including West and East components. Both portions of the development are designed to integrate within the surrounding context, including with Fox Run North and Cedarstone Street / Mira Court. Pedestrian integration includes pathway blocks to connect the Green East lands with Fox Run North, which also enhances access to the park block for existing residents to the east.

Through ongoing land assembly activities, Caivan is acquiring other land holdings to supplement the Green West and East lands. The addition of these lands will create more functional road and lot patterns, avoid fragmentation of the subdivision, and create more efficient development of land and infrastructure. Specifically, the projected land holdings include:

- / The parcel at the northwest corner of the Green Lands, currently under an Agreement of Purchase and Sale from Flowing Creek Farms Inc. and recently approved for severance by the Committee of Adjustment (application D08-01-21/B-00150);
- / The northern portion of the parcel currently owned by Richmond BMR, recently approved for severance by the Committee of Adjustment (application D08-01-21/B-00200); and
- / The hydro corridor bisecting the Green Lands and Fox Run North.

The revised Concept Plan includes these additional parcels, reflecting a more complete development north of Perth Street. The addition of these lands also helps to achieve the objectives of the Village of Richmond Secondary Plan, as Schedule A (Land Use) identifies these parcels for development. Figure 1 below shows the revised Concept Plan.

The block along the northern edge of the Green West Lands is reserved for a Natural Heritage Systems Buffer. This block, previously referred to as Block 46 on the original Plan of Subdivision and, subsequently changed to Block 58 will not be used for housing.




Figure 1: Revised Concept Plan for Green Lands and Fox Run North.

The subject lands are generally designated Residential – One and Two Unit on Schedule A (Land Use) of the Village of Richmond Secondary Plan. Uses permitted within this designation include detached and semi-detached dwellings, duplexes, bed and breakfast, home-based business, and converted retirement homes.

Development proposals in the Residential – One and Two-Unit designation will be evaluated against its ability to meet City Design Guidelines and the Community Design Plan. New plans of subdivision will use the historical grid pattern for streets and will ensure equitable access to parks and other open spaces, as required by the Official Plan. Aligning with this policy, the proposed street network in the Green Lands development is a modified grid, with three connection points to Perth Street. Additional connectivity for pedestrians is provided by means of pedestrian pathways directed towards the park block.

The southwestern portion of the Green West Lands is designated Residential – Ground-Oriented Attached. Uses permitted in the designation include triplexes and ground-oriented attached dwellings containing six units or less. A limited number of detached, duplex, and semi-detached dwellings may be permitted as long as 50% of the area of the designation remains for attached dwellings. The maximum building height shall be three-and-a-half storeys. On the Green West lands, the location of the townhouses is consistent with the Residential – Ground-Oriented Attached designation.

A Park designation is also indicated on the Green West lands on Schedule A. The designation permits park uses, as well as recreational and athletic facilities, environmental preserves and educational areas. Policy 2 of Section 3.7 states that parks will be developed in consultation with local residents and parks planning staff and should be based on the following:

- Pedestrian connections should be provided to sidewalks and pathways;
- The park should be exposed to local streets with a minimum of two street frontages;
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) should be considered in the design of the park;
- The park should not be located immediately adjacent to school properties, but may be associated with other community facilities or infrastructure;
- The park will not be used as part of, or associated with, the function of the stormwater management system.

The proposed park block in the Green West lands generally aligns with the location indicated on Schedule A. The park has been sited to be centrally located, and is accessible from two abutting streets, including Oldenberg Avenue. Pedestrian pathways are proposed to enable access for pedestrians from the east.

Policy 3 of Section 3.3.4 states that the City will evaluate a development proposal in the Western Development Lands against its ability to meet the Demonstration Plan, as displayed in the Community Design Plan. The proposed development is consistent with the Demonstration Plan, including the general location of land uses.

Policy 4 requires that setbacks for the Van Gaal Drain shall be in accordance with watercourse setback policy in the Official Plan. The proposed development achieves the required 30-metre setback. Policy 6 states that the interim floodplain area north of Perth Street shown on Schedule A dictates that prior to development being permitted behind the 30-metre berm from the Van Gaal Drain, the proponent will have to undertake sufficient works to demonstrate that:

- / Existing flood elevations are matched;
- / There will be no increases in flood levels on adjacent properties; and
- / A 30-metre setback is maintained due to the watercourse remaining a direct fishery.

Through the realignment of the Van Gaal Drain and related works, the floodplain overlay will be removed from the development lands. Policy 3 of Section 3.3.6 notes that when the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority changes their floodplain mapping, development may proceed based on underlying land use designations and in accordance with the

Demonstration Plans, without amending the floodplains shown on Schedule A. Caivan and its consultant partners have undertaken discussions with the RVCA as part of the proposed development applications.

Policy 1 of Section 2.0 of the Secondary Plan states that all development in the Western Development Lands shall be based on public communal well services. Development in the remainder of the village shall be based on private or communal wells. A communal well system is proposed to service the lands.

Policy 2 states that all new development in Richmond shall be connected to the central wastewater collection system. No new development shall be permitted until the wastewater system can provide the capacity in accordance with the Master Servicing Study. Policy 3 adds that existing wastewater infrastructure services shall be upgraded over time to provide the required capacity for the full development of the Village of Richmond. Upon submission of a development proposal, the proponent shall be required to demonstrate that capacity exists to service the development. Achievement of the intent of this policy is addressed in the Functional Servicing Report and associated documentation submitted as part of the applications.

### 1.3.1 Density and Unit Mix

To evaluate conformity with Secondary Plan policies for density and unit mix, Fotenn prepared a calculation table to summarize statistics for all development within the Western Development Lands. Unit statistics for various developments by Caivan, Mattamy, and Metric are included in the table.

#### 1.3.1.1 Unit Mix

Table 1 below summarizes the total unit mix in the Western Development Lands. The analysis indicates that the percentages of single detached and attached dwellings fall within the minimum required ranges established in the Secondary Plan.

Table 1: Unit Mix in the Western Development Lands

Unit Mix Totals			Combined	Combined Mix %	Required Range
Large Lot	Mattamy	224	305	13%	2-7%
	Caivan	39			
	Metric	42			
Singles	Mattamy	553	1392	61%	58-78%
	Caivan	839			
Towns	Mattamy	193	600	26%	20-35%
	Caivan	220			
Rear Towns & B2B	Mattamy	84			
	Caivan	103			
TOTAL	<b>Mattamy</b>	<b>1054</b>			
	<b>Caivan</b>	<b>1201</b>			
	<b>Metric</b>	<b>42</b>			
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>2297</b>			

In the “One and Two Units – Large Lots” category (labeled as “Large Lot” in the table), the combined percentage of Metric, Caivan and Mattamy development totals 13 percent, whereas a range of 2 to 7 percent is required. The slight deviation is justified on the following grounds:

- / The amount of non large lot single detached dwellings proposed has increased to 1392 units as Caivan has aimed to meet the required range of 58-78% of the unit mix and now is providing 61% of this unit type, in conformity with the policies of the Secondary Plan.

- / The total number of townhouses, rear lane townhouses, and back to back (B2B) townhouses has been reduced to 600 units, representing a unit mix of 26% which is in conformity with the policies of the Secondary Plan.
- / Large-lot single-detached dwellings are over-represented at 13 percent even though Caivan has reduced the proposed number of large lot dwelling units to 39 total as part of their revised development plan. Of the total 305 large lot single detached dwellings proposed for the entire Western Development Lands, only 12.8% are being developed by Caivan while the remaining 87.2% of these unit types have previously been approved as part of Mattamy and Metric's plans of subdivisions in the Western Development Lands.

Without adding in the 39 units proposed by Caivan as part of this application, the number of large lot singles already approved is approximately 11.8% of the total unit mix, which already exceeds the required range of 2-7%. This demonstrates a non-conformance of previous development applications with the policies of the Secondary Plan and places an unequal burden on Caivan as the final developer to submit applications in the Western Development Lands to meet the required range of unit mixes.

- / There remains a discrepancy between the requirements in the Secondary Plan and the requirements in the Community Design Plan (CDP). Whereas in the Secondary Plan, all required ranges are indicated as "Minimums," the One and Two Units – Small Lots requirement in the CDP is indicated as a "Maximum." While the Secondary Plan is a Statutory document, in contrast with the CDP, the intention to apply a "Maximum" to this category is presumed to be the correct interpretation, for two reasons:
  - The Community Design Plan was created first, with the Secondary Plan composed of its key elements; and
  - Applying a "Maximum" allows the various ranges to sum to 100 percent, whereas if all ranges are "Minimums," the ranges exceed 100 percent.

#### 1.3.1.2 Density

Table 2 below summarizes total densities in the Western Development Lands. Critically, the analysis concludes that all of the dwelling types exceed the overall density maximums, with the exception of the Townhouses. Exceedances are modest in all cases.

The rationale for the proposed densities on the Green Lands development is premised on the following:

- / The proposed densities are consistent with all other development in the Western Development Lands, which have been draft-approved by the City of Ottawa. In the case of the Green East lands, the proposed 50-foot lots are among the lowest-density lots proposed in the Western Development Lands, but nevertheless exceed the maximum permitted density in some cases.
- / Some increases in overall density are generated from the proposed development of areas that were not originally contemplated in the policy documents. In particular, the hydro corridor across the Green Lands and Fox Run North development, as well as the portion of the Laffin Lands previously envisioned for a second stormwater management pond, are now proposed for development.
- / The exceedances of density maximums are modest in all cases and continue to meet the overall intent of the policy.
- / A principal purpose of density controls in planning policies is to ensure that servicing capacity is available or planned to service the development. As demonstrated through the submitted studies, the proposed development can be effectively serviced at the densities proposed.
- / The proposed dwelling types are consistent with products across the development industry in the City of Ottawa, accounting for affordability, market demand for units and product types, and overall built form.

- / The Zoning By-law Amendment application proposes reasonable setbacks for the proposed units that create adequate amenity areas and open spaces. Proposed zoning details are included in Appendix A.
- / The Implementation section of the Secondary Plan permits minor, non-substantive changes to the policies of the CDP, design guidelines, and demonstration plans, at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Infrastructure Approvals. Policy 4 further stipulates that subdivision, site plan and zoning approval by the City constitute approval of the change or interpretation of the provisions of the CDP. As draft subdivision approval has been issued for the balance of the Western Development Lands at similar densities to those proposed in the Green Lands, the City of Ottawa has already recognized general conformity with the density policies of the Plans.

Table 2: Densities in the Western Development Lands

Density Totals			Combined Area	Overall Density	Maximum Permitted Density
Large Lot	Mattamy	224	11.782458	25.88594	17
	Caivan	39			
	Metric	42			
Singles	Mattamy	553	40.452269	34.410925	30
	Caivan	839			
Towns	Mattamy	193	9.929301	41.594066	45
	Caivan	220			
Rear Towns & B2B	Mattamy	84	2.1153845	88.400005	80
	Caivan	103			
TOTAL	Mattamy	1054			
	Caivan	1201			
	Metric	42			
GRAND TOTAL		2297			

The following four tables demonstrate the densities for the Green East and Green West Lands (figures rounded):

Richmond North East  
- GREEN EAST

Type	Units	Area per unit type	Total Area (net hectare)	Density	Maximum Permitted Density	Mix Percentage	Required Range
50' Reg	20	0.0381	0.762	26.24672	17	61%	2-7%
50' Long	13	0.06477	0.84201	15.43925	17	39%	2-7%

Total 33

Fox Run Ph. 4 -  
GREEN WEST

Type	Units	Area per unit type	Total Area (net hectare)	Density	Maximum Permitted Density	Mix Percentage	Required Range
30' Reg	44	0.024705	1.08702	40.47764	30	18%	58-78%
36' Reg	68	0.0297	2.0196	33.67003	30	27%	58-78%
42' Mid	51	0.03375	1.72125	29.62963	30	20%	2-7%
Rear Towns	10	0.0134915	0.134915	74.12074	99	4%	20-35%
Towns	77	0.0169926	1.30843	58.84915	45	31%	20-35%

Total 250

Richmond North  
1A - GREEN WEST

Type	Units	Area per unit type	Total Area (net hectare)	Density	Maximum Permitted Density	Mix Percentage	Required Range
30' Reg	19	0.024705	0.469395	40.47764	30	13%	58-78%
36' Reg	90	0.0297	2.673	33.67003	30	62%	58-78%
42' Reg	36	0.03375	1.215	29.62963	30	25%	2-7%

Total 145

Richmond North  
1B - GREEN WEST

Type	Units	Area per unit type	Total Area (net hectare)	Density	Maximum Permitted Density	Mix Percentage	Required Range
30' Reg	4	0.024705	0.09882	40.47764	30	2%	58-78%
36' Reg	11	0.0297	0.3267	33.67003	30	6%	58-78%
Rear Towns	10	0.0134915	0.134915	74.12074	99	5%	20-35%
Towns	165	0.0169926	2.803779	58.84915	45	87%	20-35%

Total 190

In addition, the proposed development meets the applicable community design guidelines, including:

- / Avoids suburban-style road patterns such as curvilinear streets, P-loops, and dead ends.
- / Incorporates an appropriate transition in built form between areas where heights and / or use are different.
- / Proposes a variety of detached building types that include a range of design features along each street or block.
- / The proposed plan of subdivision features an efficient road pattern that relies on a modified grid to connect to Perth Street and lands south of Perth Street via Oldenburg Avenue. A variety of detached and attached dwelling types are proposed throughout the development with a greater concentration of attached dwellings such as townhouses located closer to Perth Street.

## 1.4 Zoning By-law Amendment

Figure 3 below illustrates the proposed zoning for the Green Lands. The proposed zones include:

- / Village Residential Second Density Subzone E, Rural Exception Zone XXXr, Holding Zone (V2E[XXXr]-h) for the area of the Green West Lands proposed for detached dwellings;
- / Village Residential Third Density Subzone B, Rural Exception Zone XXXr, Holding Zone (V3B[XXXr]-h) for the area of the Green West Lands proposed for traditional townhouses and rear lane townhouses;
- / Village Residential Second Density Subzone E, Rural Exception Zone XXXr, Holding Zone (V2E[XXXr]-h) for the Green East Lands;
- / Parks and Open Space Zone for the park block and the realigned Van Gaal drain.

The proposed zones generally align with existing zoning in the surrounding Caivan development, particularly the V2E[XXXr] and V3B[XXXr] zones in the Green West lands. Each of these subzones are tailored to the unique requirements of the Caivan dwelling models. The consistent zoning will permit a continuation of the existing dwelling models from previous phases into the Green West Lands.

The Holding Zone that currently applies to the lands will continue to apply to the Green Lands.

The proposed zoning in the Green East Lands is intended to feature a new site-specific exception zone to distinguish the larger lot sizes from those proposed in the Green West Lands.

The proposed zoning is included as Appendix A.




Figure 2: Proposed Zoning for Green Lands

## 1.5 Conclusion

The proposed development conforms to the applicable planning policies, including the policies of the Village of Richmond Secondary Plan and the Village of Richmond CDP. The proposed subdivision and zoning are reasonable and appropriate and represent good planning.

Sincerely,



Nick Sutherland, MCIP RPP  
Planner



Jaime Posen, MCIP RPP  
Associate

## Appendix A: Proposed Zoning Details

Areas planned for detached dwellings in the Green East Lands Village Residential Second Density Subzone E, Exception XXXr, Holding Zone (V2E[XXXr]-h)				
Exception Number	Applicable Zone	Exception Provisions – Additional Land Uses Permitted	Exception Provisions – Land Uses Prohibited	Exception Provisions - Provisions
XXXr	V2E[XXXr]-h		Duplex dwelling Linked detached dwelling Semi-detached dwelling	<p>Despite Table 65 – Permitted Projections into Required Yards Features (5) and (6), the maximum size and extent of projections for fire escapes, open stairways, stoop, landing, steps and ramps is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wheelchair ramps – no limit</li> <li>2. Other features: at or below the floor level of the first floor – no limit; Other cases – 1.5 m, but not closer than 1.0 m to a lot line; and the maximum size and extent of projections for covered or uncovered balcony, porch, deck, platform and verandah, with a maximum of two enclosed sides, excluding those covered by canopies and awnings is as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Uncovered, unenclosed features such as decks or platforms where the walking surface is not higher than 0.6 m above adjacent grade – no minimum</li> <li>b. All other cases – 2 metres, but no closer than 1 metre from any lot line</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Minimum front yard setback: 4.0 m</p> <p>Minimum rear yard setback: 6.0</p> <p>Minimum corner side yard setback: 4.0 m</p> <p>Despite Section 57, the required corner sight triangle will be determined through a plan of subdivision process</p> <p>Despite Section 107(3)(ii) the area of the driveway cannot exceed 65 percent of the area of the yard in which it is located</p>

				<p>Provisions specific to detached dwellings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum lot width: 15 m</li> <li>2. Minimum lot area: 400 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>3. Total interior side yard setback: 1.8 m with one minimum yard no less than 0.6 m</li> <li>4. Maximum lot coverage: 60%</li> </ol> <p>A holding symbol can only be removed when servicing capacity is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Areas planned for detached dwellings in the Green West Lands Village Residential Second Density Subzone E, Exception XXXr, Holding Zone (V2E[XXXr]-h)				
Exception Number	Applicable Zone	Exception Provisions – Additional Land Uses Permitted	Exception Provisions – Land Uses Prohibited	Exception Provisions - Provisions
XXXr	V2E[XXXr]-h	Townhouse		<p>Despite Table 65 – Permitted Projections into Required Yards Features (5) and (6), the maximum size and extent of projections for fire escapes, open stairways, stoop, landing, steps and ramps is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wheelchair ramps – no limit</li> <li>2. Other features: at or below the floor level of the first floor – no limit; Other cases – 1.5 m, but not closer than 1.0 m to a lot line; and the maximum size and extent of projections for covered or uncovered balcony, porch, deck, platform and verandah, with a maximum of two enclosed sides, excluding those covered by canopies and awnings is as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Uncovered, unenclosed features such as decks or platforms where the walking surface is not higher than 0.6 m above adjacent grade – no minimum</li> <li>b. All other cases – 2 metres, but no closer than 1 metre from any lot line</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Minimum front yard setback: 4.0 m</p>

				<p>Minimum rear yard setback: 6.0</p> <p>Minimum corner side yard setback: 4.0 m</p> <p>Despite Section 57, the required corner sight triangle will be determined through a plan of subdivision process</p> <p>Despite Section 107(3)(ii) the area of the driveway cannot exceed 65 percent of the area of the yard in which it is located</p> <p>Provisions specific to detached dwellings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum lot width: 9 m</li> <li>2. Minimum lot area: 243 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>3. Total interior side yard setback: 1.8 m with one minimum yard no less than 0.6 m</li> <li>4. Maximum lot coverage: 60%</li> </ol> <p>Provisions specific to townhouse dwellings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum lot width: 6.0 m</li> <li>2. Minimum lot area: 150 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>3. Minimum interior side yard setback: 1.5 m</li> <li>4. Maximum lot coverage: 65%</li> </ol> <p>A holding symbol can only be removed when servicing capacity is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Areas planned for townhouse and rear lane townhouse dwellings in the Green West Lands Village Residential Third Density Subzone B, Exception XXXr, Holding Zone (V3B[XXXr]-h)				
Exception Number	Applicable Zone	Exception Provisions – Additional Land Uses Permitted	Exception Provisions – Land Uses Prohibited	Exception Provisions - Provisions
XXXr	V3B[XXXr]-h			<p>Despite Table 65 – Permitted Projections into Required Yards Features (5) and (6), the maximum size and extent of projections for fire escapes, open stairways, stoop, landing, steps and ramps is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wheelchair ramps – no limit</li> </ol>

			<p>2. Other features: at or below the floor level of the first floor – no limit; Other cases – 1.5 m, but not closer than 1.0 m to a lot line; and the maximum size and extent of projections for covered or uncovered balcony, porch, deck, platform and verandah, with a maximum of two enclosed sides, excluding those covered by canopies and awnings is as follows:</p> <p>a. Uncovered, unenclosed features such as decks or platforms where the walking surface is not higher than 0.6 m above adjacent grade – no minimum</p> <p>b. All other cases – 2 metres, but no closer than 1 metre from any lot line</p> <p>Minimum front yard setback: 4.0 m</p> <p>Minimum rear yard setback: 6.0 m</p> <p>Minimum corner side yard setback: 4.0 m</p> <p>Despite Section 57, the required corner sight triangle will be determined through a plan of subdivision process</p> <p>Despite Section 107(3)(ii) the area of the driveway cannot exceed 65 percent of the area of the yard in which it is located</p> <p>Provisions specific to detached dwellings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum lot width: 9.0 m</li> <li>2. Minimum lot area: 225 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>3. Total interior side yard setback: 1.8 m with one minimum yard no less than 0.6 m</li> <li>4. Maximum lot coverage: 60%</li> <li>5. Despite Table 236, column VIII, the minimum landscaped area is 25%</li> </ol> <p>Provisions specific to townhouses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum lot area: 132 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>2. Minimum front yard setback: 4 m</li> <li>3. Minimum corner side yard setback: 4 m</li> <li>4. Minimum rear yard setback: 6 m</li> <li>5. Maximum building height: 14 m</li> <li>6. Minimum interior side yard setback: 1.5 m</li> <li>7. Maximum lot coverage: 65%</li> </ol> <p>Provisions specific to a townhouse dwelling that fronts on a public street and also has rear lane access:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum lot area: 120 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>2. Minimum lot width: 5.5 m</li> </ol>
--	--	--	---

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. Minimum front yard setback: 4 m</li><li>4. Minimum interior side yard setback: 1.5 m</li><li>5. Minimum corner side yard setback: 4 m</li><li>6. Maximum building height: 14 m</li><li>7. Maximum lot coverage: 100%</li><li>8. Minimum landscaped area: 10 m<sup>2</sup></li></ol> <p>Despite Section 107(3)(ii), the area of the driveway cannot exceed 65% of the area of the yard in which it is located, except in the case of a townhouse, including townhouses with rear lane access, whereby the area of the driveway can cover 100% of the yard in which it is located.</p> <p>Despite Table 160B, endnote 11, where access is via the rear lane, the minimum rear yard setback may be reduced to 0 m, and the width of the garage, carport or driveway may be the width of the entire rear yard.</p> <p>Despite Table 137 – Amenity Area, townhouses in any form are exempt from the requirement to provide outdoor amenity area.</p> <p>A holding symbol can only be removed when servicing capacity is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City.</p>
--	--	--	---