

September 8, 2025  
Richard Lamperstorfer

Council,

The MZO (Ministerial Zoning Order) that the town asked for, and used for the Campus of Care project should no longer run with land. The Town asked for and receive the MZO for LTC beds only.

Peel Street South should not be considered as 'one of two' sites selected for a new attainable housing proposal as presented by the Interim CAO Smith on August 25, 2025, and his MOU request passed by this council same date.

Only the town's Tee's Please site should be considered.

The MZO was never meant to continue to run (with the land) and should have expired when People Care LTC (beds) rejected it. (aka the Campus of Care project, rejected it)

The Peel land was purchased for possible a future recreation facility(s), NOT to be 30 plus acres just added to the existing as 'D' (Development) already existing in Thornbury West. And has been considered surplus by the town.

Further, the MZO'd municipal land is NOT in the Thornbury Urban boundary. It should not be housing. It's in Lora Bay, or "somewhere else". Does anyone know?

Further, as the owner of over 12 contiguous acres in Thornbury West, continuing or using town MZO'd land will result in me, removing my acres, permanently. (from future use)

By this is mean that I will build 3 housing units as-of-right, as allowed... not just 1 house as suggested at the August 26 COW meeting by town planner Postma.  
(I will speak more on this in person)

Further, for this council to use Peel lands for HOUSING is NOT a good idea, not planned, not thought out of for neighbouring Thornbury West 'D' lands future use.

I request (suggest) a FULL Secondary Plan exercise for the Thornbury West D lands start now, that should perhaps include 125 Peel St South being Lora Bay lands (being west of Peel)

**\*\*Shoving some attainable housing in the middle of nowhere without considering employment, commercial, retail, or many other uses is, simply RECKLESS.\*\***

I tire of hearing the same old story from councillor so and so that "We have enough housing projects approved to meet our targets" until such and such date. Well, you do. But? ...

But ALL of those approvals are AT THE OTHER END of town, where there are HUNDREDS of acres of "D' land are just being held, in Craighleith.

Just see what happens when I remove my 12 acres from Thornbury West. What percent is that? There'll be no public pipes going through my property. Zig zag of pipes cost down the road to ratepayers? priceless

So, is this a threat by me? No.

I offered my land to the Town for a Public Park and heard ZERO feedback from the 5 members attending the August 25 COW meeting.

The mayor gave it like 25 seconds. (Mayor Matrosovs: 2:16:20 to 2:16:45 -- citing a 1971 talk with dead past councillor Jim Uram about Phase 1, 2, 3 --- hmm? What about my dead planner David Slade? (mayor)

Well, town Peel land is PHASE 4 --- 1 2 3 4,

So, it's not me with a High School diploma who can't do math. Nor my brother without one.(grade 13 diploma)

Summary:

The town should NOT keep the MZO running with 125 Peel Street municipal lands.

The town,

Should consider a Secondary Plan for the complete area of Thornbury West including 125 Peel Street South

Other. (verbal)

Thank you for listening.

Richard Lamperstorfer  
Thornbury

VIDEO August 26 COW link

<https://pub-bluemountains.escribemeetings.com/Players/ISiStandAlonePlayer.aspx?Id=416a2d87-9168-48fd-a5ea-bfc7c36519f1>

[\(Arthur White-Crummey](#) · CBC News · Posted: Aug 28, 2025  
4:08 PM EDT | Last Updated: August 28

## Zoning update would allow 3-storey homes in Ottawa's 'bungalow belt'

### Councillor says blanket 11-metre height limit would be keenly felt in Ottawa's older postwar suburbs

An update to proposed zoning rules in Ottawa could allow three-storey buildings in essentially every neighbourhood — even in suburban areas now dominated by single-family bungalows.

The proposal comes in the latest draft of Ottawa's new comprehensive zoning bylaw. [The first draft was much more restrictive](#), setting an 8.5-metre height limit in N1 and N2 zones, which encompass the lowest-density residential parts of the city. That height adds up to about two storeys.

[A second draft boosted that to 11 metres](#), equivalent to about three storeys, but only in areas outside the Greenbelt. Suburbs inside the Greenbelt would have stayed at 8.5 metres, roughly in line with the current rules.

But the latest draft extends the three-storey permission to essentially all areas. Coun. Jeff Leiper, who chairs council's planning and housing committee, said it will be most keenly felt in the postwar suburbs that ring the central city.

"This is really most impactful in the old suburbs in Nepean and Gloucester, what we call the bungalow belt," Leiper said.

Ottawa is expecting hundreds of thousands more residents over the coming decades, and Leiper said it's not sustainable to send them all into new suburbs, further and further afield.

"These are the sorts of changes and permissions that we have to extend if we want to prevent urban sprawl," he said.

### A 'palatable' path to intensification

There are some exceptions. The higher limits wouldn't apply where they conflict with a secondary plan, or in zones with specific height provisions. But those provisions are

rare in low-density areas, and Leiper said the effect of secondary plans will be "minimal."

The draft is expected to come to council for a vote by the end of the year.

Alta Vista Coun. Marty Carr, who represents an older suburb, said she alerted residents about the change in her newsletter, but hasn't heard much opposition in response.

"I think that we need to see changes in neighbourhoods that allow the different forms of housing that the Official Plan has laid out," she said. "We need to see greater intensification, and it seems like this is mostly, so far, a palatable way to get there."

There is some opposition from the Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association.

Matt Lemay, who chairs the association's history and heritage committee, said it would be one thing if the zoning bylaw set conditions that required developers to add units in exchange for more generous height limits, but the new rules provide no such guarantee.

Without it, he worries developers will simply use the permission to build larger, more expensive single-family homes.

"We agree that intensification is needed, but not applied universally without just consideration for established neighbourhoods," he said. "We were promised gentle intensification, and we're not sure how the continual upzoning from Draft 1 to Draft 2 to Draft 3 is as promised."

## 'We want to build'

But Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association executive director Jason Burggraaf said the changes will mean more density and more affordable homes.

"We want to build, and the city's target to build is about 45,000 homes in existing neighbourhoods from now to 2046, so we've really got to give ourselves the option to build a bit taller," he said.

The extra storey will make it easier to build triplexes or fourplexes on smaller lots, he said, since developers can stack one unit on top of another.

"If you want family-sized units that are still in that low-rise, ground-oriented context in neighbourhoods, you've got to give yourselves a little bit of extra height," he said.

A separate provision in the draft zoning bylaw would allow four units on every lot. That remains unchanged in the latest update.

Leiper said the changes won't come overnight.

"You're not going to wake up two years from now and see that your entire neighborhood is three-storey buildings," he said.

But when the changes do come, he said it will mean more vibrant communities that support more shopping options and better transit. Burggraaf agreed.

## Highrise setbacks reduced

The three-storey update isn't the only change coming in the third draft of the new bylaw. Another tweak would make it easier to build highrise towers by reducing the setback distance separating them from lower-rise areas.

Instead of 30 metres, the setback would be set at 25 metres. The bylaw would also give permission for towers up to 30 storeys in certain high-density zones, up from 27 storeys.

Those zones are concentrated along major corridors and around some transit stations. If developers want to build higher still, they would have to come to Leiper's committee to ask permission.

Burggraaf said lots wide enough to accommodate towers with 30-metre setbacks are few and far between. He said the change will increase the number of lots where it's viable to build highrises.

Leiper doesn't think many residents will notice the difference between a 27- and a 30-storey tower.

"A tower is a tower," he said. "I think if many residents were to look out their backyards at the towers that are in their neighborhood, they'd be hard pressed to say exactly how many stories there are."

Arthur White-Crummey, reporter, CBC Ottawa [cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/zoning-update-would-allow-3-storey-homes-in-ottawa-s-bungalow-belt-1.7620228](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/zoning-update-would-allow-3-storey-homes-in-ottawa-s-bungalow-belt-1.7620228)

(my verbal comments)

\*TBM Council,

I request the blanket zoning for Thornbury West for a detached house be Returned to 10.5 metres(in 2019) from 9.5 metres in the 2025 Official Plan Update currently awaiting Grey County microscope.(approval)

Note that I went to LPAT (OMB, OLT) in 2019 'Lamperstorfer vs. TBM' and won against 'Town' an 11 metre tall, three-storey new build in West Thornbury, and yet TODAY I would need to challenge the one metre reduced height in the updated Thornbury West zoning. It makes no sense to me.

TBM wants density, just "NOT IN THORNBURY"? We NIMBYs certainly love our postcard town, just not young people without moms dads down payments.

Of course, we're not Ottawa, we can't do math here like Meaford or Collingwood. We're special, we having wedding cake architecture requirements.

Richard Lamperstorfer

Thornbury