

## **Revised - Document 3 - Overview of Key Issues and Options**

*At the Joint Agriculture and Rural Affairs and Planning and Housing Committee meeting on March 31, 2025 and the City Council meeting on April 16, 2025, Members of Council brought a variety of motions impacting the options presented in Document 3 of the [report](#) for Draft 2 of the new Zoning By-law. The motions added new options or directions for public consultation purposes for each issue in Document 3. This revised version of Document 3 includes an explanation of the new options added through the motions.*

The following key issues were identified through the public consultation process to-date:

Issue 1: Minimum Parking Rates for Villages

Issue 2: Maximum Building Height in N1 and N2 – Neighbourhood Zones

Issue 3: Conversion of the R4 zone to N4 zone in the draft Zoning By-law

Issue 4: Building Height Transition Framework

Issue 5: Communal Parking Lot Permissions in Neighbourhood (N1-N6) Zones

An analysis of each issue and options for consideration are detailed below.

### **Issue 1: Minimum Parking Rates for Villages**

**Staff propose continuing with the choice-based approach that was proposed in the first draft of the Zoning By-law. Draft 2 of the Zoning By-law does not include minimum parking rates.** This approach gives property owners and businesses flexibility to provide the number of spaces they expect to meet the specific demands of a proposed development or aligns with their business operations. Information about minimum parking space rates and their impact on the cost of development was presented in [Document 9](#) of the April 29, 2024 report that introduced Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law. However, three options are included below regarding parking rates in Villages.

#### **Rationale:**

Feedback from the consultations on the Draft 1, including insights from Council Members, indicates there are concerns in Villages where transportation alternatives to personal vehicles are limited or do not exist. To address these concerns, staff propose the following options for parking space rates in rural Villages:

**Option 1:** Require **one parking space per dwelling unit** in the Village Residential (V1, V2, V3) and Village Mixed-Use (VM) zones.

**Option 2:** Require ***one parking space per dwelling unit in the V1, V2 and V3 zones, but exclude the VM-Village Mixed-Use Zone.*** The rationale for the exclusion is that it would apply to older village centres where existing buildings already face physical constraints in providing parking.

**Option 3:** Require ***one parking space per lot*** containing a dwelling unit or a vertically attached dwelling unit in the V1, V2 and V3 zones. This would require one parking space whenever one dwelling unit is located on a lot but provide a degree of flexibility for multi-unit development.

**Note:** The smallest front yard setback in Villages in the new Zoning By-law is six metres. This means at least two parking spaces would be provided per dwelling (one in a garage or located beyond the required setback, and an additional space in the driveway leading to the required parking space).

#### **COUNCIL DIRECTION ON ISSUE 1**

Following Council direction, **Option 2** will be implemented in Draft 3, the final version of the new Zoning By-law, to be presented in September 2025.

## **Issue 2: Maximum Building Height in N1 and N2 – Neighbourhood Zones**

**Three options are considered for maximum building heights in the N1 and N2 zones.** Option 1 would maintain the 8.5 metre height limit in the Suburban Transect in Draft 1, despite the current Zoning By-law 2008-250 permitting a maximum height of 11 metres in the Suburban Transect. Option 2 would permit a maximum height of 11 metres in the Suburban transect. Option 3 would increase building heights to 11 metres in all N1 and N2 zones.

**Staff prefer Option 2: Increase height permissions for N1 and N2 zones in the Suburban Transect to 11 metres and retain N1 and N2 zone building heights at 8.5 metres in other transects. This option avoids “downzoning” properties in the Suburban Transect and would ensure building heights in the Suburban Transect are in accordance with the Official Plan, particularly as the Suburban Transect policies intend for the Zoning By-law to permit “at least” three storeys as-of-right within the Neighbourhood designation.**

**Option 2 has been implemented in the provisions of Draft 2 in the maximum heights shown in Table 801A of Section 801.**

### **Rationale:**

In Draft 1 of the new Zoning By-law, the N1 and N2 zones propose an 8.5 metre maximum building height. This would generally accommodate a two-storey building but not a full three-storey building, as-of-right.

However, under the current Zoning By-law 2008-250, many current Residential - R1 and R2 subzones located in the Suburban Transect currently allow building heights up to 11 metres. As such, setting an 8.5 metre building height in all N1 and N2 zones in all transects results in a reduction of maximum building heights in many suburban R1 and R2 zones that currently allow for three full storeys (11 metres).

Members of the development industry and the public have proposed increasing the height limit for these zones to 11 metres, regardless of transect. Increasing the maximum permitted height improves the development feasibility of additional dwelling units, especially on narrow lots.

Section 5 and Table 7 of the Official Plan summarize the following with respect to intended building heights in the Neighbourhoods designation in each transect:

*Downtown Core Transect: Low-rise: minimum two storeys, generally permit three storeys, allow a built height of up to four storeys where appropriate (Section 5.1.5(1)).*

*Inner Urban Transect: Low-rise: minimum two storeys, generally permit three storeys, allow built height of up to four storeys where appropriate (Section 5.2.4(1)).*

*Outer Urban Transect: Low-rise: no minimum and generally, zoning will permit at least three storeys but no more than four storeys (Section 5.3.4(1)).*

*Suburban Transect: Low-rise, no minimum: generally, zoning will permit at least three storeys but no more than four storeys (Section 5.4.5(1)).*

Given the directions in these policies, staff are of the opinion it is not appropriate to reduce permitted building heights below three full storeys where such permissions exist in the current Zoning By-law. Details concerning the options are below:

**Option 1:** Retain the same building heights used for N1 and N2 zones as proposed in Draft 1 city-wide. Staff **do not** support this option be implemented, given this would result in a loss of development rights throughout the Suburban transect, The Official Plan contemplates three-storey building heights throughout the Suburban Transect, such that a reduction in building heights to reduce or eliminate the potential for three-storey buildings as-of-right would not be in conformity with the Official Plan.

**Option 2:** Increase height permissions for N1 and N2 zones in the Suburban transect to 11 metres and retain N1 and N2 zone building heights at 8.5 metres in other transects. This option would ensure that building heights in the Suburban Transect are in accordance with the Official Plan, particularly as the Suburban Transect policies intend for the Zoning By-law to permit “at least” three storeys as-of-right within the Neighbourhood designation. This is the staff-preferred option.

**Option 3:** Increase height permissions for N1 and N2 zones to 11 metres in the Inner Urban, Outer Urban, and Suburban transects, but retain existing height suffixes for lower building heights where they presently exist, or where a secondary plan prescribes a height limit.

Examples of secondary plans that may prescribe heights lower than 11 metres would include R1 and R2 zoned lots within the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan, which sets out that the existing low-rise neighbourhoods shall “maintain the general character of these neighbourhoods as expressed by the existing zoning”.

Staff note that in the current Zoning By-law, some height suffixes are not necessarily the result of Secondary Plan policies but may be guided by other policies in the Official Plan. For example, the Rideau Canal Special District policies in Section 6.6.2.2 of the Official Plan include direction for development along the first row of properties facing the Rideau Canal (e.g. along Colonel By Drive) to “respect the existing patterns of building

footprints, height, massing, scale, setback and landscape character within the associated streetscape”, which is currently achieved through area-specific height regulations such as height suffixes. These regulations would be retained in all three options, even where they result in a permitted building height below 11 metres.

#### **ADDITIONAL OPTION VIA COUNCIL MOTION**

**Option 4:** Set height permissions to 11 metres in N1 and N2 zones in all transects and remove height suffixes that limit heights to less than 11 metres, except where specified in a Secondary Plan.

### **Issue 3: Conversion of the R4 zone to N4 zone in the draft Zoning By-law**

There have been many comments received from the public concerning the Neighbourhood zones. Comments and opposition have focused on the maximum densities permitted in the N3 and N4 zones, as well as the locations where the higher density N3 and N4 zones have been applied. To address these concerns, staff are considering modifications to the Neighbourhood zone provisions and to the areas where the N3 and N4 zones have been applied on the Zoning Map.

**Option 1 would carry forward the provisions in Draft 1.** This option increases densities in R4 zones that currently permit four units, eight units or 12 units in a three-storey building, to an unlimited number of units in a four-storey building. This represents a significant change in density and building height from the current zoning and affects properties that were already upzoned in 2020 in the R4 zoning review. Staff do not support this option.

**Option 2 proposes the following:**

- **Where located in an R4 zone that currently has a maximum 11 metre height limit, maintain the maximum building heights as they exist today.**
- **Where located in an R4 zone that currently permits 12 or fewer units in the Inner Urban, Outer Urban, or Suburban Transects, and located outside the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, change the zone from N4 to N3.**
- **Reduce the maximum density in the N3 zone to align with current permissions in the R4 zones (220 units per hectare and a maximum of 10 units in a building).**

**Staff prefer Option 2.** This option provides building heights and densities in the range contemplated in the Official Plan and takes into consideration the previous increase in density permissions achieved through the 2020 R4 Review. **Option 2 has been implemented in the Zoning Map for Draft 2.**

### **Rationale:**

In Draft 1, the location of the proposed N1 to N6 primary zones were mapped as follows based on the transect, current primary zone, and whether the property is inside or outside the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay:

### Downtown Transect

Existing Zone		Evolving Overlay	Interior
	R1	N4	N3
	R2	N4	N3
	R3	N4	N4
	R4	N4	N4
	R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

### Inner Urban Transect

Existing Zone		Evolving Overlay	Interior
	R1	N3	N2
	R2	N3	N3
	R3	N4	N3
	R4	N4	N4
	R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

### Outer Urban Transect

Existing Zone		Evolving Overlay	Interior
	R1	N3	N2
	R2	N3	N2
	R3	N4	N3
	R4	N4	N4
	R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

## Suburban Transect

Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
R1	N2	N1
R2	N3	N2
R3	N3	N3
R4	N4	N3
R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

The R4 zones permit a wider range of built forms and densities than any of the R1 through R3 zones:

- The R4A through R4L subzones only permit a maximum of four dwelling units in a low-rise apartment dwelling.
- The R4UA and UB subzones, established in 2020 in the Downtown Core and Inner Urban Transects as part of the R4 Zoning Review, permit eight and twelve dwelling units respectively. These translate to a per-lot density of roughly 220 units per hectare, which is in line with the maximum density permissions proposed for the N3 zones in Draft 2.
- Other R4 subzones do not limit the maximum number of units. These subzones would be consistent with the N4 zone in the new Zoning By-law.

Despite the range of maximum densities and building heights in the current R4 zones, all R4 zones were converted to N4 zones in Draft 1. The N4 primary zone proposes to allow a full four-storey height and has no maximum limit on permitted density.

Given the above, residents in some neighbourhoods subject to R4 zones have expressed concerns with the proposed N4 zoning in Draft 1, citing that it would represent an inappropriate increase in development permissions in their neighbourhood. Since the densities permitted in the N3 zone are similar to the density and building height in the R4A-L or R4UA/R4UB, staff are considering whether these subzones would be more appropriately zoned N3 in the new Zoning By-law.



The N3 zone allows a maximum per-lot density of 250 units per hectare (UPH) in Draft 1, which would translate to a 12-unit apartment building on a 450 sq m lot.

In Draft 2, this is proposed to be changed to 220 UPH, which would translate to a 10-unit apartment building on the same size of lot.

When compared with the R4UA and UB subzones, the R4UA allows up to eight dwelling units whereas the R4UB subzone allows up to 12 units on a 450 square metre lot. Changing these zones to an N3 zone in the new Zoning By-law would therefore represent a slight increase in density permissions in the R4UA zones and a slight decrease in the R4UB zones. Staff are comfortable with this direction as it will establish a more consistent set of density permissions, and a maximum permission of 10 dwelling units is in alignment with the threshold for exemption from Site Plan Control approval established in the *Planning Act* and the Site Plan Control By-law.

Staff additionally note that the aforementioned subzones permit a maximum building height of three storeys whereas the N4 zone is proposed to permit up to four full storeys (14.5 metres). Additionally, there exist several R4 subzones (namely the R4M, O, Q, R, U, V, X, ZZ, and UC subzones) that also limit buildings to a maximum three storey building height. Option 2 proposes to retain these height limits, such that where a property is located in a zone in the current Zoning By-law that permits no greater than three storeys (11 metres), that height limit will not be increased in the new Zoning By-law. In cases where this zone would be represented through an N4 zone, this would be achieved through the addition of a height suffix (e.g. "N4B H(11)"). This would ensure that the height and built form provisions set out for these areas in the new Zoning By-law remain context-sensitive while permitting a full range of housing forms.

With the above in mind, staff are proposing that where a property is zoned R4A-L or R4UA/R4UB but located within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, it would still be appropriate to assign that property an N4 primary zone, given the policy directions in Section 5.6 of the Official Plan applicable to the overlay. This is accounted for in Option 2:

- Where located in an R4A-L, R4UA, or R4UB subzone within the Inner Urban, Outer Urban, or Suburban Transects, and not located within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, change the primary zone in Draft 2 from N4 to N3, and reduce the maximum density in the N3 zone to align closer to densities that are currently permitted through the R4A-L, UA, and UB subzones (maximum ten units).
- Where located in a R4A-L, R4UA, or R4UB zone within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, or within another R4 zone that currently has a maximum 11 metre height limit, add a height suffix to the zone code to retain the existing 11 metre permitted building height.

The changes proposed in Draft 2 for how the N3 and N4 zones are applied on the Zoning Map are shown below in purple font:

### Downtown Transect

	Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
	R1	N4	N3
	R2	N4	N3
	R3	N4	N4
	R4	N4	N4
	R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

### Inner-Urban Transect

	Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
	R1	N3	N2
	R2	N3	N3
	R3 R4A-L, UA, UB	N4 H(11)	N3
	R4M, O, Q, R, U, V, X, ZZ, UC	N4 H(11)	N4 H(11)
	R4N, P, S, T, Y, Z, UD	N4	N4
	R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

### Outer-Urban Transect

	Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
	R1	N3	N2
	R2	N3	N2
	R3 R4A-L, UA, UB	N4 H(11)	N3
	R4M, O, Q, R, U, V, X, ZZ, UC	N4 H(11)	N4 H(11)

	R4N, P, S, T, Y, Z, UD	N4	N4
	R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

#### Suburban Transect

Existing Zone	Evolving Overlay	Interior
R1	N2	N1
R2	N3	N2
R3	N3	N3
R4A-L	N4 H(11)	N3
R4M, O, Q, R, U, V, X, ZZ	N4 H(11)	N4 H(11)
R4N, P, S, T, Y, Z	N4	N4
R5	N5/N6	N5/N6

Staff propose Option 2 be implemented as it is more reflective of the current densities and maximum permitted building heights contemplated by the current R4 zones. In particular, where an existing R4 zone limits the maximum number of units, a N3 zone is more appropriate where not located within the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay as it would result in a consistent limit on the maximum density as presently in effect. Additionally, retaining the existing three-storey building heights for properties zoned R3 and R4 within the current Zoning By-law would still allow for a full range of housing forms within these neighbourhoods.

**Option 2 is implemented in Draft 2 of the Zoning By-law.**

#### **ADDITIONAL OPTION VIA COUNCIL MOTION**

**Option 3 proposes the same direction as Option 2, except it proposes to maintain the 14.5 m building heights in all N4 zones. Thus, Option 3 proposes only the following:**

- Where located in an R4 zone that currently permits 12 or fewer units in the Inner Urban, Outer Urban, or Suburban Transects, and located outside the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay, change the zone from N4 to N3.
- Reduce the maximum density in the N3 zone to align with current permissions in the R4 zones (220 units per hectare and a maximum of 10 units in a building).

#### **Issue 4: Building Height Transition Framework**

**Staff prefer Option 3 and have integrated it into Draft 2. Option 3 provides a height transition framework calibrated to permit typical high-rise development as-of-right on lots large enough to guarantee adequate transition, while ensuring that mid-rise remains feasible on smaller lots and in areas closest to abutting low-rise areas. Option 3 is implemented in Draft 2 of the Zoning By-law.**

#### **Rationale:**

Staff have developed three approaches to regulating building height transition in mixed-use zones abutting low-rise residential areas. These were developed in series, and each option represents an iteration on the previous one.

All approaches rely on a straightforward interpretation of the Official Plan's policies concerning maximum heights in Hubs and Mainstreet corridors, which do not provide strong justification for varying heights contextually or by transect. While the Official Plan does make repeated allusions to the "transect-specific" nature of its policies, this is not borne out in Section 5 – Transects with regard to the maximum building heights contemplated in the Hub and Mainstreet designations. With the exception of the Downtown Core transect, where heights in the Hub and Mainstreet designations are mostly subject to secondary plans, schedules or exceptions, the height policies for each transect are more alike than different. As a result, staff expect that a zoning strategy based on implied or inferred differences between transect policies would be challenging to defend from appeals and amendments.

The Official Plan generally correlates adequate built form transition with lot size, for example limiting high-rise to instances "where the parcel is of sufficient size to allow for a transition." The Official Plan also directs that height transition should be guided generally by the application of an angular plane, which is also based on the premise that height is more impactful the closer it is. By that logic, more distance should equate to more acceptable height, and it is for these reasons that the zoning strategy makes lot depth the primary determinant of building height.

Staff are mindful that drawing an angular plane too strictly can compromise built form, reducing unit count and adding complexity and cost to building design. The angular plane does, however, make it possible to scale building height gradually according to lot depth. Drawing a 45-degree plane from the rear lot line at a height equivalent to the planned (four-storey) context in abutting Neighbourhoods is consistent with industry and reviewer practice in development applications, and allows mid-rise heights (22.5 metres, or approximately six storeys, at the depth of the rear yard setback) even on modestly sized lots.


It was necessary to make certain assumptions about building floorplates to gauge likely outcomes of these frameworks. Here staff are more interested in being *predictive*, rather than *prescriptive*. Generally, 20 metres is held to be the approximate minimum depth for the floorplate of a building with a double-loaded residential corridor, meaning residential units on both sides of a central corridor. Point towers are assumed to have floorplates deeper than 20 metres, but not exceeding the 750m<sup>2</sup> floorplate maximum described in the Official Plan and urban design guidelines.

Recognizing that built form transition is a qualitative and context-specific question, a citywide zoning by-law cannot predict the specific circumstances of every future project. Attempting to do so results mostly in over-specific zoning that is difficult to administer and frequently ends in frustration for its users.

For the purpose of determining as-of-right permissions, staff sought to identify the threshold for what development might be considered typical in the Ottawa context – which tower heights are commonplace, and which setbacks are large enough that staff can have a degree of confidence that transition factors can be managed in most circumstances – and to accommodate those cases as-of-right in the new Zoning By-law. Amendments should be reserved for especially tall buildings and/or for projects providing less than the “standard” depth of transition, which may indeed meet the intent of the Official Plan but represent a deviation from the norm.

The successive iterations on this height strategy are as follows:

**Option 1** was the height transition framework proposed in Draft 1, which consisted of a stepped arrangement of maximum building heights (6, 9, 18, and 25 storeys) increasing with distance from the rear lot line, to a maximum of 25 storeys.




*Option 1 consisted of a stepped series of maximum heights.*

**Option 2** was developed after the release of Draft 1, and consists of a pair of angular planes with an inflection point 30 metres from the rear lot line, such that the first angular plane regulates height in close proximity to abutting residential areas and is generally meant to deliver mid-rise building heights, and the second angular plane – intended to deliver gradually increasing high-rise heights – “steps up” to 60 metres (approximately 18 storeys) height and continues toward the front of the lot.

On most lots, Option 2 delivers substantially the same heights as Option 1, except that it scales continuously through application of the angular plane; for example, Option 1 would not permit a 7-storey building at an intermediate point between the 6-storey and 9-storey steps, whereas Option 2 would accommodate this.

On exceptionally large lots, the second angular plane would result in Option 2 scaling all the way up to the high-rise maximum of 40 storeys described in the Official Plan.



*Option 2 consisted of two angular planes, meant to scale maximum height to lot depth.*


**Option 3** was developed in consultation with representatives of community associations and industry over the latter half of 2024. It is the staff-preferred option.

Like the previous option, Option 3 begins with a 30-metre-deep transition area next to any abutting low-rise residential areas. As implied earlier, 30 metres was selected as the threshold where staff can be reasonably confident that qualitative considerations can be managed by any proposal.

Adequate transition may be possible with less than 30 metres separation, but confirming this would require review of the specific proposal and context. Staff find it would be appropriate that such projects would be subject to the additional staff review and consideration associated with the zoning by-law amendments needed to exceed as-of-right permissions.

For Option 3, staff argue that once adequate transition to surrounding low-rise areas is provided, as described above, modulating tower heights (e.g. scaling gradually from 18 storeys as in Option 2) is unnecessary. At these scales, the material impacts of high-rise development have more to do with massing and building design than with outright height. As such, Option 3 proposes a maximum height of 90 metres – approximately 27 storeys – starting after the 30-metre transition area.

The proposed 90-metre maximum is the product of a review of all high-rise building permits issued since 2018; 80 per cent of high-rise projects over this period had heights below 90 metres. It follows that if these heights are regularly proposed and approved in Ottawa, they represent the kind of ordinary high-rise development that zoning should be considering for as-of-right permission. Projects exceeding 90-metre heights may thus be considered outliers relative to the proposals ordinarily seen in Ottawa, and for that reason case-by-case review may be desirable.



*Option 3 permits 90-metre heights, buffered by a 30-metre transition area.*



Compared to Option 2, the 90-metre maximum permits more height on lots ranging from approximately 50 to 80 metres deep. Only the very largest Mainstreet corridor lots would result in the Option 2 angular plane exceeding the 90-metre height permissions proposed in Option 3.

Staff note that if there is an appetite to accommodate a greater range of future proposals as-of-right, a maximum height of 100 metres (approximately 30 storeys) would accommodate over 95 per cent of proposals seen over the same 2018-2024 period.

Moreover, the Official Plan definition of high-rise includes heights up to 40 storeys. While the Official Plan does not direct that 40 storeys *shall* be permitted as-of-right, it also does not direct that it *shall not* be permitted. The underlying philosophy of Option 3 is that a 40-storey building remains exceptionally tall by Ottawa standards and that it is appropriate for such projects to fall outside the “ordinary” range targeted for as-of-right permissions, but if there is interest in developing a pathway to as-of-right 40-storey heights, a framework can be devised to identify the appropriate circumstances for it.

Staff prefer Option 3 on the grounds that it presents a predictable framework for as-of-right high-rise permission: provided that adequate transition can be provided via the 30-metre transition area, high-rise development of “typical” heights should be generally permissible. Within this framework, Option 3 is more permissive than Option 2 on more common lot sizes (i.e. lot depths below approximately 80 metres) by limiting the use of the angular plane to managing transition in the podium and mid-rise range.

**Option 3 is implemented in Draft 2 of the Zoning By-law.**

#### **ADDITIONAL OPTIONS VIA COUNCIL MOTIONS**

**Option 4:** Limits the maximum ‘as-of-right’ height for high-rise buildings along Mainstreet Corridors in the Suburban Transect based on distance from a rapid transit station.

**Option 5:** Builds on Option 3 to increase the permitted as-of-right maximum heights to 30 storeys, and consult on a potential height transition area that would allow a high-rise building to be closer than 30 metres from a lot line abutting a low-rise Neighbourhood Zone.

## **Issue 5: Communal Parking Lot Permissions in Neighbourhood (N1-N6) Zones**

The staff-preferred option is to maintain the current provisions in Draft 1 which permit a communal parking lot as part of a planned unit development. A planned unit development is a development that has more than one residential building on a lot. Staff also propose that the provision, “no parking spaces are permitted in any other location on the lot containing the planned unit development” be deleted from the provisions.

The staff-preferred option, including the deletion of the above provision, has been implemented in Section 801 in Draft 2.

If directed to be more permissive with respect to where communal parking lots are permitted, staff present the following options for consideration. Staff note these options could be implemented in combination with each other:

- Permit a communal parking lot in association with other residential uses (not just a planned unit development). Staff recommend that a communal parking lot should be tied to a residential use being on the same lot.
- Limit the number of parking spaces available in a parking lot for “community use”.
- Limit the maximum percentage of a lot that may be used for a communal parking lot.

Staff remain open to discussing how communal neighbourhood parking could work in new and existing communities. This could include in-depth discussion on what a “neighbourhood parking lot or garage” development would look like in terms of its size and scale, given that to-date the proposed “communal parking” model has been hypothetical in nature.

### **Rationale:**

As part of consultations, multiple stakeholder groups including the Federation of Citizens’ Associations and the Greater Ottawa Home Builders’ Association, supported “neighbourhood parking lots” or “neighbourhood parking garages” in the Neighbourhood Zones (N1-N6 zones). The purpose of these parking lots or garages would be to allow excess parking in a planned unit development to be used by residents of the surrounding neighbourhood.

In Draft 1, staff proposed regulations in the N1-N6 zones to permit parking lots and parking garages as a conditional use to allow the development of these lots while ensuring the primary use of the land continues to be for residential uses. Staff agree

with the idea of neighbourhood communal parking lots or garages for nearby residents given their potential to support parking supply management in neighbourhoods. However, in developing the regulations set out in Draft 1, staff note the following concerns:

- It is difficult to limit the use of a parking lot to a specific set of users in a manner that is enforceable.
- Where permitted, the parking lot should be regulated to ensure it does not become the dominant use on a residential lot as that would not achieve the intent of the Neighbourhood policies in the Official Plan.

### **Proposed Changes for Draft 2:**

In Draft 1, the Neighbourhood zones permit a “parking lot” and “parking garage” as conditional permitted uses. These uses were proposed to be subject to the following conditions:

- the parking lot or parking garage must be located on the same lot as a residential use, more specifically a planned unit development (PUD);
- the parking lot or parking garage is serving only residential uses within 400 metres of the subject property;
- no parking spaces are permitted in any other location on the lot containing the planned unit development; and
- the parking lot or garage is not permitted to cover more than 30 per cent of the area of the lot.

As part of Draft 2, staff removed the condition that “no parking spaces are permitted in any other location on the lot containing the planned unit development”. Staff recognize there may be a need for flexibility with respect to the location of on-site parking throughout the development (for example, for visitor parking to be provided in a separate location on the lot, or for private garages to be provided for ground-oriented units within the PUD), and the restriction of the “neighbourhood parking” to 30 per cent of the lot is satisfactory to achieve the intent of ensuring that parking does not become the dominant use of the development.

**In Draft 2**, staff carried forward the provisions in Draft 1 which permit communal parking where it is associated with a planned unit development, **with the deletion of the provision that “no parking spaces are permitted in any other location on the lot containing the planned unit development”**.

**ADDITIONAL OPTION FOR ISSUE 5 VIA COUNCIL MOTION**

Direct staff to consult on a transect-based approach for communal parking permissions, and additionally consider car-sharing options as part of this approach.