RESIDENTIAL INTENSIFICATION IN ESTABLISHED NEIGHBOURHOODS STUDY (RIENS):

What We Heard

A consolidation of feedback received throughout the Study (March 2016 to February 2017)

We received incredible feedback throughout the Study over a variety of engagement opportunities and also tested some new formats for engagement. Here are some of our numbers:

3 public engagement sessions
40-50 approx. # of people signed in per session

3 stakeholder sessions made up of
12 residents & 2 planning consultants

28 people attended the bus tour
including staff, members of council, residents, a member of the development industry, and print media representatives

11 pieces of written feedback
including a memorandum of support from Region of Waterloo’s Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC)

3 updates at Waterloo Region Home Builders’ Association Kitchener Liaison Committee meetings

380 survey views & 112 responses to the Engage Kitchener Survey

Estimated total of over 300 hours of feedback!
This document consolidates all feedback received from these various engagement opportunities that took place throughout the Study. We are very appreciative of the time spent by so many individuals in our community providing extremely thoughtful feedback with their opinions on what would work best for their neighbourhood.

This document walks through feedback as follows:

1. Engagement Session #1
2. Stakeholder Session #1
3. Engagement Session #2
4. Stakeholder Session #2
5. Bus Tour
6. Engagement Session #3
7. Stakeholder Session #3
8. Engage Kitchener Survey Results
9. Direct correspondence

1. ENGAGEMENT SESSION #1

Number of people who signed in: 49

The first engagement session was held on March 8, 2016 at the Rockway Golf Course. The purpose of the first engagement session was to provide an introduction to the Study, describe the study process, identify the goals and objectives of the study, provide an explanation of what intensification is and how the City’s current approach to residential intensification can be improved. Following the presentation, the public asked questions about the Study and highlighted areas that they felt should be considered as part of the Study.

In addition, at the end of this meeting those interested in joining the stakeholder team were invited to sign up. It was explained that stakeholders are interested members of the public that were to be involved in focused discussions about the Study.

Below are the questions and comments that were heard from those in attendance.

Questions (with project team answers in italics):

- **Are there Regional roads in the Study Area and will the Region be involved?** Yes, there are Regional roads in the Study Area and the Region will be consulted during the Study process.
- **Will setbacks be reviewed as part of the process?** Yes, setbacks will be reviewed along with other zoning standards.
- **What is the timeline for the Study?** The timeline is approximately one year.
- **Will any consideration be given to trees in this Study?** Yes, trees will be a factor in evaluating neighbourhood character.
• **Are other uses being considered?** The Study focus is on residential land uses, but may consider processes for lands that may convert from another use to residential use.

• **How are lands in Heritage Conservation Districts being treated?** Lands in Heritage Conservation Districts are included in the RIENS study, but only those that are zoned for lower-density residential (e.g. R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5 or R-6).

• **What if there are other areas where landowners are interested in being part of the process?** The Study will include several opportunities for consultation, however the Study Area is the Central Neighbourhoods and Vanier Community. It will be up to Council to study areas beyond the defined Study area.

• **How will the City manage applications in the next year as this Study progresses?** Applications submitted during the Study will be subject to, and evaluated in accordance with the current land use framework.

• **How do the PARTS study and RIENS study differ?** The PARTS study focuses on land use in the vicinity of the transit stations and the RIENS focuses on the rules and processes that should apply for permitted low-density residential development.

General Comments made by the public:

• Real life example provided of construction of a semi-detached dwelling that was permitted as of right adjacent to an existing single detached dwelling.

• Consideration should be given to coach housing being permitted in laneways.

• Renters also have a stake in the future of the City - not just property owners and developers.

• Consideration should be given to better understanding the relationship between zoning and taxation.

• Protection of tree canopy should be a factor to consider.

• The rules regarding the relationship between new development on corridors and low-density housing should be reviewed.

• Concern about Kitchener becoming like Waterloo.

• Suggest that Heritage Conservation District Plans be reviewed.

• Considerable interest expressed in finding out what the intensification rules are in different parts of the City.

### 2. STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1

The first stakeholder meeting was held on April 6, 2016 at the Rockway Community Centre. Interested members of the public were invited to sign up for the stakeholder team and it was explained that their role was to participate in focused discussions about the Study. The group was comprised of twelve residents within the Study Area and two local planning consultants.

The meeting began with introductions and a brief description of why stakeholders chose to join the stakeholder team. The Project Team then provided a brief description of what the Zoning By-law does, how it controls development and described how each zone standard impacts how
a lot is developed. The meeting was opened up to a general discussion that included real life examples of what stakeholders see as working and what could be improved. Also discussed were the types of uses that are permitted in each residential zone and the approaches that have been implemented in other municipalities to manage residential intensification.

At this meeting, stakeholders listed the reasons below for becoming involved:

- Concern for the community and how development may impact the overall look and feel of the area;
- Supportive of intensification that occurs in the ‘right way’;
- Being involved in this process means taking action in developing an appropriate process;
- Desire to be proactive and engaged in a study that may have impacts on how development in older neighbourhoods is approved in the future;
- An interest in the preservation of community heritage features; and,
- Intensification should enhance the area where it happening and have a positive impact.

In addition to the above, below are the questions and comments raised at the stakeholder meeting by those in attendance.

Questions (with project team answers in italics):

- **In some areas, there are live/work units that are pretty close to the sidewalk. How does this happen?**

  In some areas, such as mixed-use corridors, there is a reduced or no requirement for setback. This type of corridor is zoned differently than low-rise residential areas and is not included in the Study, however the study would provide recommendations on how to deal with the interface behind such areas and low density residential areas.

- **Will demographics and building activity information be reviewed during this process?**

  City staff has provided the Project Team with information on building activity in the area. This will be a consideration in the Study and will be discussed at future meetings.

- **How do Cultural Heritage Landscapes fit in to the Study?**

  Cultural Heritage Landscapes have not yet been covered in our research, but the Project Team will look further into this and the impact that this may have.

General comments:

- Notification process for Committee of Adjustment applications should be improved. Notices are not clear and the content can be confusing.
- Desire to have more rules that govern the building height, type of materials, style (specific emphasis on heritage), and landscaping to be reflective of what exists on the street where development is proposed.
- Suggestion that more rules for development to blend with existing streetscape is important, particularly as a way to ensure that development resembles surrounding character and is appropriate.
• Suggestion that more rules may deter poor development.
• Real life example was provided where standards such as depth of dwelling and garage rules in the Zoning By-law could have made a residential development more appropriate in terms of streetscape and the experience of local neighbours.
• Real life examples were provided of a positive experience that some stakeholders had in working with a developer of a residential property to request changes to the development to reflect their neighbourhood character.
• Experience where the ratio of building mass to lot size (floor space ratio) was manipulated for a development that created a negative impact on community.
• Real life examples of newer development that fits in with surrounding character were provided.
• Interest in building line and front yard setbacks to ensure located of houses is uniform along street.
• The public process for development applications is very important to stakeholders.
• Consideration for standards in relation to the hierarchy of roads in the City, specifically with parking requirements for developers.
• Interest in seeing better cohesion between departments in the approvals process.
• There are a wide variety of uses that are permitted and many of the zones seem open.
• Suggestion that semis may not need driveways or could have a shared driveway to look more like single-detached dwellings.
• Concern for types of houses (reference to rooming/boarding houses) that are permitted and public safety.
• Interest in adding lanes (and lane-based housing) to the Study discussion.
• Interest in learning more about the City of Ottawa’s approach to regulating character.

3. ENGAGEMENT SESSION #2

The second engagement session was held on June 14, 2016 at the Victoria Park Pavilion. The first part of the meeting included a presentation on the overall intent of the Study, some of its background, its current status and the product of the work to date. The presentation also included a review of compatibility and compatibility tests, neighbourhood character and character elements as well as possible options for the Study Area.

The second part of the engagement session was an interactive session that involved using ‘clickers’ to identify public preferences on elements that contribute to compatibility and character. In order to gauge the public’s preferences, participants were asked to identify their preference using ‘clicker’ software. This allowed the Project Team to better understand and discern the public’s preferences on the relative importance of the specific character elements that were presented. The elements evaluated included height, setback from the front lot line, location of garage, width of interior side yard and architectural character. Participants were shown a number of images which showed infill housing examples with varying building elements (including building setbacks, design, garage projection, and height) that varied from the existing dwellings on either side, and were asked to provide their opinion on whether they thought the new dwelling in the middle was compatible with the homes on either side.
Participants’ assessments of the images were made by selecting a number from a 5-point scale, with 1 being most desirable and 5 being least desirable.

In addition to the above, the following questions and comments were raised at the meeting by those in attendance.

Questions (with answers from the project team in italics):

- **Can a control be implemented for the rear wall or depth of dwelling?** Yes, but this is not a control that is currently used by the City. The City does, however, implement a minimum rear yard setback that is measured from the rear property line.
- **Who comprises the stakeholder group?** At the first meeting, an announcement was made to those in attendance to sign up to be on the stakeholder group.
- **What are the Ottawa and Edmonton methods mentioned in the presentation?** Ottawa uses a streetscape character analysis and Edmonton uses a development permit system. These are explained at length in the report that is available online ([www.kitchener.ca/RIENS](http://www.kitchener.ca/RIENS)), however these options deal with process and the focus on today’s meeting is on compatibility and character.
- **Does this Study consider compatibility in terms of zoning?** Yes, the report that is available online ([www.kitchener.ca/RIENS](http://www.kitchener.ca/RIENS)) identifies a list of potential options, others of which include amendments to Official Plan policies, updates to site plan control, updates to the urban design manual, potential change in process and notification for planning applications.

Comments:

- Concern that this Study is focused on implementing more preventative measures rather than encouraging infill.
- Concern that the Study process does not explore the personal connections and neighbour-to-neighbour interactions that occur in neighbourhoods and that make each area unique.
- Indicated that, in some cases, neighbourhoods are diverse and that is the distinct character.
- Suggest that other elements, such as porches, should be included in the Study because it contributes to place making.
- Suggest that the Study consider the relationship between neighbourhoods in terms of permanent residents and renters and how changes to current standards may impact the viability of the renting market.

**4. STAKEHOLDER MEETING #2**

The intent of the second stakeholder meeting was to provide each participant with an
opportunity to provide their comments on the value of the approach that was used at Engagement Session #2 and to provide their opinions on which of the options that were presented at Engagement Session #2 had merit.

A number of stakeholders who had attended Engagement Session #2 were supportive of the approach taken and felt that the questions posed and the comments made by the public assisted them in understanding what some of the issues and challenges are. The stakeholders also indicated that they felt that zoning rule changes that deal with front yard setbacks, building height and garage width and projection should be explored. The stakeholders were also very supportive of requiring the posting of a sign on a property when an application for minor variance and consent has been submitted.

Some stakeholders also identified front porches and trees as important character elements in some neighbourhoods. It was also noted that should the site plan or other similar process be considered, expectations should be set up front so that the process is clear and not too onerous.

5. BUS TOUR

Number of people who attended: 28

On October 4, 2016, the Project Team took members of Council, City staff, members of the public and media representatives on a bus tour through the Study Area. The bus tour was for informational and educational purposes. An information package that was prepared for the bus tour can be found here or accessed on the City’s website here: https://www.kitchener.ca/en/livinginkitchener/resources/Planning/RIENS/PLAN_-_IENS-Bus-Tour-Oct-4-2016.pdf.

The purpose of the bus tour was to discuss how development can occur as-of-right in accordance with the City’s current Planning framework. To accomplish this, the bus tour visited various parts of the Study area and discussed of how the draft recommendations could impact future development and the existing residential neighbourhoods. The following streets were visited as part of this tour: Simeon Street, Sydney Street, Fourth Avenue, Vanier Drive, Kehl Street and Homewood Avenue.

6. ENGAGEMENT SESSION #3

Number of people who signed in: 40

The third engagement session was held on October 27, 2016 at the Rockway Golf Course. The purpose of this engagement session was to present and receive feedback on the draft recommendations for the Study Area. This meeting was structured as a workshop and the recommendations were discussed at each table, with a member of City staff facilitating the discussion.
The participants were asked to choose some or all of the seven recommendations for discussion within their group. The participants were generally supportive of the recommendations that were being made. The roundtable discussions generated a number of suggestions including: controlling the extent of development within the rear yard; establishing measures to save trees; requiring that only detached garages be permitted in certain areas, considering laneway development where appropriate; expanding site plan control beyond just the pilot areas; retaining some R-6 zoning areas to maintain choice and flexibility; reviewing areas that are zoned R-7; and preference for an online version of the Citizen’s Guide to Infill Development.

7. STAKEHOLDER MEETING #3

The third Stakeholder meeting was held on November 3, 2016 at the Rockway Community Centre. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity to further discuss and receive feedback on the draft recommendations.

This was an open forum discussion. The following are some of the comments provided:

- General overall support for the report recommendations;
- Consideration could be given for larger backyard setbacks on deeper lots;
- Concern about the practicality of measuring building heights and who provides those measurements;
- Consideration could be given to providing for varying roof pitches as it relates to height;
- Consideration should be given to establishing different rules in areas where detached garages in the rear yard are the norm;
- Confirmation that there is a need to evaluate those areas that have zoning to allow multiple dwellings in stable areas (but not in all areas);
- General support for site plan control but prefer to include other areas than just the pilot project areas;
- There is a need to ensure that the site plan approval process for homes is not too prohibitive;
- Acknowledge that there are benefits to a Citizen’s Guide to inform the planning process and support the maintenance of character of neighbourhoods; and,
- Supportive of the use of a notice on a property for minor variance and consent applications.
8. ENGAGE KITCHENER

From November 1 to December 13, 2016, an online survey on the draft recommendations was available through Engage Kitchener. This platform is an online forum that allows citizens to offer their feedback, share opinions and exchange ideas about City programs, services and decisions. Below is a brief summary of the general comments that were provided on the draft recommendations.

The majority of participants agreed that front yard setbacks help to ensure that new development respects the existing neighbourhood and streetscape. However, some participants also raised a number of concerns with the front yard setback recommendation and its impact on building design, the potential to stifle unique home designs and the options available for intensification.

For the building height recommendation, a number of participants agreed that an averaging approach would promote a more visually appealing streetscape while respecting existing development in the area. Some suggested that the roof type and the angle of roofline could have some impact on building height and identified this as a factor for consideration in the recommendations. There were also a number of participants that disagreed with the building height recommendation and commented that it may restrict intensification efforts and potentially limit innovation in building design.

There were many responses in favour of controlling the construction of garages and driveways in the Study area. Others indicated that the recommendations should consider the context and recognize that there is the potential for increased street parking by limiting garage size based on lot width.

A number of participants indicated that they are supportive of the site plan approval pilot project as a means to conserve existing streetscape, heritage housing stock and landscaping. However, others expressed concern that this process could discourage redevelopment because of the additional required planning approvals.

The majority of participants responded in favour of the recommendations for notification of consent and minor variance applications. Similar support was also provided for the recommendations to develop a Citizen’s guide for infill development. In addition, a number of participants identified content that could be included in the guide.

Here are the actual survey results:

- Survey active: November 1 to December 13, 2016
- Attendees: 380
- All Responses: 112
- Hours of Public Comment: 5.6
Front Yard Setbacks

**Agree/Strongly Agree Comments:**

- Helps to ensure that new development respects the existing context and design of the streetscape.
- I think it is an amazing idea. This way the city can plan utilities better. Also if the road needs expansion then the city does not have to buy and demo a family’s house because it’s too close to the road compared to the rest of the street.
- A unified streetline is important. That said, if neighbours are poorly built / redevelopment projects this should not apply. This should not be in the zoning by-law rather an urban design guideline.
- I support anything that helps new construction fit in with the neighbourhood. I would like to see maintaining front yard trees and having a reasonable rear setback addressed as well. We bought our property specifically because of the back yard which helps provide a buffer in a neighbourhood with larger multi-residential buildings which overlook single family homes reducing privacy, sunlight and general enjoyment of the property.
- Makes for beautiful streetscapes, creates pleasing relationships between homes, consistent
- This is a great way to make sure a new development doesn't 'cut up' the neighbourhood. It maintains visibility of the street for the houses, and would help encourage connections between neighbours. Visibility also creates safe neighbourhoods.
- Streetscapes are important and uniformity should be maintained regarding front yard setbacks.
- When you talk about setbacks from the street, you should be very clear in explaining whether "street" means the physical roadway (curb to curb) or the property line, which could be in the middle of the front lawn.
- Allowing new dwellings to not conform to the average setback of the neighborhood would result in negative changes to aesthetic of the streetscape as well as possible negative shadow impacts.
- While there might be slight variation from one house to the next in terms of setback the overall look would be a more thoughtful planned look
- Especially when older houses are replaced in established neighbourhoods this will help with a uniform look.
- As an example and comparison to another similar municipality, the City of Guelph's Zoning Bylaw has this front yard setback provision for older built up neighbourhoods (on what is known in their Zoning By-law as 'Map 66'). Guelph has had this zoning provision for some time and it appears to work well and achieve the same intent.
- It really impacts the esthetic of the neighbourhood when front yard setbacks do not conform to the adjacent properties. It impacts sight lines for owners.
- This will protect pedestrian throughways, provide more accessibility, be more visually appealing and decrease blind spots or potential problematic alley like areas. It would also allow for more art installations and community activities on the street. It promotes neighbourhood communication as well. Streetscapes that are welcoming encourage citizens to take ownership and get involved!!
- There have been duplexes in the Kingsway (between Wilson and Kingsway) put up fronting much closer to the road and it looks out of character.
- Like the uniformity of the proposed setback recommendation.
- House are too close to the street in new development areas. People that have chosen to buy homes in existing areas may have done so because of the set back and so this should be respected with any new development in existing areas.
- There is something to be said for all houses in general to be closer to the street and sidewalk.
- By allowing new buildings to have a smaller setback, it would greatly diminish the street appeal of the adjacent dwellings.
- Close to the road has been allowed on streets in Oakville and to walk down them one feels suffocated.
- Basing the setback with context, and a minimum is probably a good idea, however, I would use more than the two adjacent homes, it should fit the neighbourhood. Also, averages are not good, that limits developments to less than existing structures, that's the opposite of intensification.
**Undecided comments:**

- All the same looks too rigid but various setbacks can cause visibility issues
- Great idea for transitioning between buildings and consistency on a street. My hesitation is that it would prevent the gradual movement of the streetwall closer to the street, which is a natural way for places to intensify. These neighbourhoods are generally not burdened with excessive front yards, so I can see how this may work in practice and still lead to a sense of street enclosure. Not sure what to think yet.
- Require more information because how will this be enforced and what is the burden of proof and by who? So the owner needs to measure adjacent properties? How will legal access to measure the properties be granted? Who from the City will validate and what is the validation (a new site inspection before permit is issued)? Will more resources be required.

**Strongly disagree/disagree comments:**

- This worries me regarding road expansions. I'd rather see smaller paved roads and unaligned fronts of homes than I would a picture-perfect line. This also doesn't seem to allow angled fronts if someone wants to optimize their solar capture.
- Being a bit unique and different can allow for some unique urban design. Perhaps every other one can be set a bit closer to the front line
- Front yards in many parts of the city are built to maximize driveway length. The front yard serves little to no purpose. This policy would discourage gentle intensification, encourage car dependence and does in no way factor in that household car ownership is likely to diminish in an increasing share economy and vehicle autonomy (with a Google/Times study citing average household car ownership expected to diminish to 1.2 per household).
- Closer street fronting homes look better. Allows for sidewalks to be better lit and the home seems more inviting. Flexibility is good.
- Conformity isn't necessarily a good thing. Existing neighbourhoods were designed on an outdated neighbourhood strategy. Flexibility on setback allows for creative design.
- Ensure a greater level of flexibility is encouraged. A line of best fit should be considered vs. immediate setbacks to address the overall character. Old neighbourhoods have a range of setbacks and a broader context is important on the block, across the street and larger neighbourhood.
- I think new dwellings should be able to be built all the way to the 4.5 m front yard setback. Perhaps limit the second floor to the average existing dwelling set back of the two adjacent dwellings on both sides of the lot. Does this recommendation apply to corner lots? if so, will the average only account for the 2 houses on one side? This would skew the average, and allow the new dwelling to be built much closer to the 4.5 m front yard setback.
- I think the city should promote building new dwellings closer to the street by either being in-line with average front yard setback or closer to the street.
• This disagree because why can't each property have its unique shape and own design, why do each need to be same....each person is different...why can’t property be the same way....making everything the same is not only stupid but senseless and ugly, and makes area dull...
• Within reason, if a person buys a house, he or she should be free to renovate freely. I do not see the need to keep all structures parallel.
• I think having all houses in-line with one another take curb appeal away. It looks cookie cutter and boring
• We don't need neighbourhoods to look like cookie cutter streets. People want uniqueness in their homes that they can pride themselves in. Property owners should be free to build on their land.
• Lot sizes vary substantially across the neighbourhood. Some homes on bends and corner lots etc.. This cannot be across the board requirement because a 100 foot frontage estate lot could look totally different than a 36 foot frontage lot.
• What if they aren't close to consistent now?
• I think having the same setback for all houses leaves the area looking like a cookie cutter made the area. It doesn't hurt anyone to have varying setbacks. Not a lot of people use their front yards for anything these days so it seems silly to have huge grass fields in the front, especially if pushing the house toward the street makes for a larger back yard that people are more likely to use.
• People should not have any expectations on the developments of their neighbours.
• I can, because I have an imagination, imagine something other than "averages" that would justify having a front yard setback that is inconsistent with surrounding dwellings but nonetheless harmonious and appropriate. I think designing with averages is a recipe for no one ending up happy, and no innovation ever being imagined.
• The minimum setback should (1) take into account more than just the two adjacent homes and (2) be at most equal to the smallest setback of the adjacent homes, rather than the average. I would prefer a rule along the lines of 0.75~0.9 times the smallest setback, so that neighbourhoods that intensify are given the opportunity to reduce setbacks over time. An absolute minimum could still be in place.
• This setup guarantees that development will always move backwards, to the lowest common denominator. It reduces options for intensification, by forcing intensification to occur towards the back only, or upwards only, when different situations might call for different directions of new dwelling massing to be employed.
**Building Height**

Please tell us if you agree or disagree with this recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agree/ Strongly agree comments:**

- Helps to ensure that new development respects the existing context and design of the streetscape
- I believe Margaret Avenue between Victoria and Queen is zoned for buildings higher than 10.5 metres. It appears to be within the study area. Would this recommendation apply to the 6-7 storey building that has previously been proposed for this location?
- Visually appealing to have a similar overall height. Allows for sensitivity to surrounding homes.
- These seem like reasonable, logical guidelines. The only concern that I would have with them is how a roof would relate. I think that in neighbourhoods that have pitched roofs, it would be important to incorporate that into the bylaws for a new build. A square, flat-roofed building at 8.5 metres has a much different affect than one with a pitched roof. This might not be the point that should address that issue, but I thought I’d mention it.
- The uniformity in height of buildings along the street frontage is important. However, if the site to be developed extends back from the street front into a larger area, then I feel there is room for flexibility in the height of new buildings if their scale blends in with the surrounding neighborhood.
- Strongly agree with Scenario 1. Similar to previous question; shadow effects of larger houses on single-story street would be substantial. Three story houses should not be incorporated into lower density neighborhoods. Disagree with Scenario 2. If both houses
on either side are already above the 8.5m height, then maximum height should be the height of the larger building.

- Some consideration might be given to new home with a higher pitch of roof than the 2 adjacent dwellings.
- What is not indicated by this recommendation clearly is where on the property this elevation is taken. This should be associated with the grade relative to the street elevation, not the elevation at the corner of the house as shown. A row of homes with underground parking spaces does not blend with any existing streetscape in the study area, but under this recommendation would be permitted doubtless to any new construction regardless of building height.
- In regards to multi-storey additions, they should be allowed to match the maximum neighbouring height but no higher.
- I am in favour of Scenario 2
- This may allow for families to better grow with their home.
- I have concerns as to how things will change for the surrounding two homes. Will it create noise reverberation, or a wind tunnel? How will that be measured before construction.
- Again visually more appealing. See above
- Again Kingsway area multiple multilevel, multi-unit properties in amongst bungalows and they are unsightly and out of place
- Allows for sensible intensification without losing character of neighbourhood.
- Houses should be similar in size in an area for an overall pleasant look.
- I think that it is fair to say that the building in Scenario B has a right to have as much, or slightly less height than the tallest neighbour. A+B/2 is numerically easy, but I would almost put in a caveat like: A+B / 2 will be enforced for buildings where the height difference is greater than 1 meter. If the height difference is less than one meter, the taller building's height will be the maximum allowed.
- Please do not allow 2 or 3 story buildings in the existing residential areas. Allowing this would, I assume, lead to the ugly situation that now exists in certain areas of Oakville where mansions are stealing the sun from yards with bungalows on them.

Undecided comments:

- In some cases, property owners are now adding third floors to traditional two-storey homes. This will change the "average" height on both sides. I think the angle of the roofline is actually more important than the height, especially in the central area. A third storey can fit in surprisingly well if the roof design resembles those of the neighbouring homes. Also, it might be possible to allow/encourage higher building heights for dwellings constructed farther back from the "street" than existing neighbouring dwellings.
- Available space on the lot should also be a consideration.
- I would tend to think that if you've already allowed build heights of x, then x should be the max, not the difference between both.
Disagree/ Strongly disagree comments:

- I seriously think we have enough high rise condo buildings in this region of Kitchener-Waterloo!!
- Neighbourhoods with a variety of home sizes can meet more needs, and prompt more mingling across demographics. Aiming to keep a neighbourhood too similar leaves a lot of people out. One thing I’d love to see in Kitchener, though, is what Burlington Vermont has done: No building above the height of the trees. They have just as dense downtown neighbourhoods as we do, but everything is much more pleasant for walking without the towering, wind-tunnel causing high rises.
- I hit strongly disagree because of the (a+b) / 2= max height idea. Why does it matter that one house is 10.5m and the other one is 10m? So the builder has to take a loss of building height because the house next door is .5 meters less. That could make less money per square foot due to ceiling heights. The rule should be set on number of floors not on height. I love the idea that you can’t put a 3 story house next to one story home and a max of 2 storys is going to be the new max.
- Intensification should allow for higher buildings rather than lower. I have been to a few neighbourhoods and taller buildings allow for larger families/higher economic status for those wanting to live in the core. Why is this even under review?
- The city should be encouraging gentle intensification and not vice-versa. A three story dwelling is completely acceptable in a two level neighbourhood with many modern, steel and/or concrete building techniques becoming economically viable at only three fully usable level.
- We need more diverse housing stock that allow for multi-generations to cohabitate. Help to provide affordable secondary units.
- This should not be "bible" in the zoning bylaw rather used as a good design principle. There are plenty of examples of well-designed taller structures adjacent to low rise. The concept of building up (not out) is a fundamental of our Places to Grow legislation. This could be construed as down-zoning. Fundamentally, the building code allows for typical home construction techniques for buildings up to 3 stories.
- The recommended option expresses a regressive allowance and limits.
- The proposed height limit will have an impact on infill choices...flat roofs will become the norm...Maintain the 10.5m to allow for housing choice (pitched rooflines and flat rooflines). Use guidelines to promote transition in heights as shown by other leading examples. Some variation is encouraged.
- 10.5 meters should remain as the maximum height. Owners should be able to design and build an acceptable 3 storey home that suits the neighborhood. Limiting height is an aesthetic limitation. If the City is going to start limiting aesthetics, they would also have to comment on the architecture of the home. I’d be upset if a neighbor built a 2 story home with horrible architecture.
- The height should be contextual and could limit architectural roof lines. For example, if in a neighbourhood with 1.75 storey homes that feature a 12/12 (steep) roof pitch, when I go to build a 2 storey (as it doesn’t make sense to build a 1.75 storey home today
as it did 75 years ago) it will limit my roof pitch due to the height restriction and it won't fit into the neighbourhood.

- Agree with Scenario 2, but in Scenario 1 why is there a need for streets dedicated to 1 storey buildings. It seems this would discourage densification. These houses will need to get destroyed when new dwellings will need to be built, no?
- If new buildings are accommodating 2 family units they should get an exemption to the height restriction... we need to infill existing areas with new low-med density homes rather than creating ghettos of condos/apartments and vast areas on only single family homes.
- Does not seem particularly practical from a building perspective, as you may end up with extra stories looking squished into non-standard building heights. Would be more in favour of a storey limit and minimum ceiling height than a height limit. You end up with much more beautiful, flexible buildings that are in proportion to their heritage neighbours with high ceilings. I love the proposed idea to create a floating limit that depends on the building's neighbours. If using stories instead, maybe: "You are entitled to build one storey higher than the adjacent building with the fewest stories, to a maximum of x stories."
- Again I think you are trying to regulate too much and taking away for the uniqueness of each property....this is the problem with city way to much regulations on size, etc, etc...stop already
- I think the max building height of 10.5 meters is fine.
- We don't need neighbourhoods to look like cookie cutter streets. Allow variance in height and bring in uniqueness in buildings.
- This seems so arbitrary!
- Restricting height in this way reduces intensification efforts and can actually make the area less dense if restricted too much.
- We should not limit the ability for intensifications of existing areas.
- For similar reasons noted above, please keep this straight forward for customers and staff to understand and enforce. Also, current house designs have steeper roof pitch, it's the trend right now. If height is such an issue, leave the height alone, straight forward of max 10.5 and increase min. side setback like it was 22 years ago to reduce the effect.
- Again, there could be a case made for being slightly above an average and still being harmonious and appropriate. I'm not in favour of averaging much, and certainly not housing. We need new solutions to sustainable intensification, and average = vanilla pudding. No innovation. I’m on board with harmonious and appropriate, but not necessarily "consistency" or averages as a solution, although I do understand the rationale.
- Scenario 1: the draft recommendation might work in some areas, but on larger streets 3-storey buildings should be permitted. Scenario 2: Maximum building height should remain 10.5 metres to permit more dense redevelopment.
- The maximum height should (1) take into account more than just the two adjacent homes and (2) be at least equal to the highest of the adjacent homes, rather than the
average. I would prefer a rule along the lines of 1.1~1.25 times the highest, so that
neighbourhoods that intensify are given the opportunity to increase in height.

- Averaging heights makes for difficult dwelling creation, as they must always be tailored
to bizarre combinations of neighbours. It also makes no sense for a study about
intensification to propose that we cannot even build to the current density of a site.
That makes zero sense. Regarding bungalow areas, this is also problematic to subdivide
single-family homes into those with different numbers of floors or heights, which will
create disproportionate pressures because any development must be created in strict
adherence to every individual lot within the city. It greatly increases the planning and
unique-build costs for a development to move forward, causing stratification of
property values and even greater upwards pressure on existing and new home prices.

- Making moves that go the opposite of intensification at this juncture seems counter-
productive and like giving into nimbyism.

- Three storey buildings are not onerous on any street. Being able to build up to three or
four storeys is important to satisfying the "missing middle" housing. Further, making it
the average of the two adjacent buildings makes absolutely no sense, that restricts the
size of a building to possibly LESS than some of the surrounding buildings, that's again,
the opposite of intensification.

- Housing up to 4 storeys can be integrated into an existing neighbourhood without
changing its character. I'd rather see more density in existing neighbourhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garage Width / Projection and Driveway Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.kitchener.ca/RIENS">www.kitchener.ca/RIENS</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garage Width, Garage
Projection and Driveway Width

- There are currently no rules for garage width and projection in the
  RIENS study area.
- This means that this is possible.

- Draft Recommendations:
  - Lot width <15 metres, limit to single car garage and
    driveway.
  - Lot width >15 metres, permit double car garage
    and driveway.
  - No projection permitted, but can be in line with a front
    porch.
Agree/Strongly Agree comments:

- Support the reduction in garage projections so that they don't dominate the facade of a house and the overall streetscape.
- Love the idea
- Requirements for front porches should have been made a part of the RIENS study area to encourage community feel within neighbourhoods. Front yards should be limited to a single car length to encourage porch interaction with sidewalks.
- Protects street view of surrounding homes, encourages similar setbacks, provides for sensitivity to existing homes, uses a sensible mathematical rule in terms of single or double garage so easily understood.
- This will improve the streetscape sightlines, keep front lawns and front porches front and centre, and encourage neighbours to interact by providing natural opportunities to meet each other while coming and going about their daily routines. It will improve neighbourhood safety through passive surveillance and familiarity of neighbours' habits and movements. It will also greatly contribute to building a sense of community and maintaining healthy neighbourhoods as the city grows and urban intensification increases.
- I'd even go further and require garages to be set back from the front of the house by 1 meter to take the focus off the garage and place it back on the residence itself.
- It would be nice also to discourage construction of driveways and garages. This would help build more dense neighbourhoods and encourage people to use public transit.
- Feel it does not look good when the garage dominates the front of a house or dwelling
- More clarity is required on this proposed provision. Perhaps consider adding a requirement that the off-street parking area in a garage or carport be behind the front wall of the main dwelling, in addition to the above.
- Garage projection creates an anonymous feel to a neighbourhood and encourages owners to drive in their closed off area and enter house with no interaction or visibility to street. Front porch communities help address isolation and crime by simply having neighbours interact incidentally and/or intentionally. This creates community; large
storage spaces at the front of houses do not. It also does not allow for trees, gardens or an outdoor seating area that add to the overall health and vibrant nature of a street.

- How can we build strong neighborhoods if we only see the cars/garages and not the people?
- I think this is completely reasonable and allows an unobstructed streetscape.
- To avoid flush front wall faces and to encourage aesthetics allow garage to project max. 2' in front. This breaks up mass wall, supports options and flexibility and does not draw eyes directly to the garage door(s).
- Do not allow garages to be farther out than porches.
- Front porches should be the focal point for a house, not a garage. Front porches allow for interactions with neighbours whereas garages do not.
- I would love to see garages moved to the sides or backs of houses again. I live in a new old established neighborhood and one of the things I love about it is the front porch neighborhood feeling. This simply cannot happen in a neighborhood where cars drive into a garage and residents walk not their house from the garage. It makes it difficult to see, let alone have conversations with their neighbors.
- This seems fair and balanced. Garages in the study area should never become like suburban garages.
- This seems like a reasonable rule for these neighbourhoods. There are lots of suburban areas where people have the choice to have large garages. Agree with previous comments on removing parking minimums.
- Limiting the width of garages isn't a good idea and should be adopted. But it would be better simply to remove the parking minimums. Some people don't want a car, especially in developed areas, and builders should be allowed to satisfy that demand. If the demand doesn't exist, then builders won't build it, parking shouldn't be mandated, the market should control for it.

Undecided Comments:

- The current process seems to be sufficient as done in neighbouring municipalities.
- Would the garage still have to align to the front yard setback? If so then I don't see the concern with projection.
- Many homeowners are taking lawn space and paving extra-large driveways, this make for an awkward look. On the other hand, it helps to resolve on-street parking.
- I would recommend looking at this from the perspective of ratio of the front of the house with the garage, visibility to the street, like a front porch and windows benefits neighbourhoods and reduces instances of vandalism and theft.

Disagree/Strongly Disagree Comments:

- Plan for multiple needs, rather than uniformity. People just don't come in cookie-cutter sizes and interests... some people spend a lot of time in their garages. Certainly, as a child, I got to know most of the fellows who worked in their home garages along my
street, and I felt safer because of it. One person's "ugly" is another person's "functional".

- Front yards that are dominated by garages are poor design. That said, we should not limit a homeowner's desire for a double car garage on narrower lot. If the garages are well designed (mason detailing, high design doors) and are integrated into the base of the home (not projecting) should be permitted. 50' lots are very rare infill situations. Consider 40' as the threshold.

- Agree on single car garages in neighbourhoods however, 15m is too high of a standard. A single car garage should be for lots less than 10m (30 ft wide home). This is a more fair standard that promotes infill and in keeping with infill housing. Very hard to create a 15m wide lot in existing neighbourhood. Proposed homes are suburban and do not reflect urban infill houses. A two car garage can be tastefully designed on a 10m lot and wider.

- I don't have any issues with "no projections permitted, but can be in line with a front porch", however, limiting a 2 car garage to a lot wider than 49 feet (15 m) is not acceptable. There are many designs of homes with double car garages on smaller lots that are still aesthetically pleasing, and would fit in with the surrounding neighborhood architecture.

- I feel that 36 and 40 foot product should be allowed to have double car driveways and garages in these areas.

- This should also be neighbourhood contextual. At a minimum, the expectation for a homeowner today is a single garage. In certain neighbourhoods where the homes are older, a lot width greater than 15m still doesn't make sense for a double car garage as many of the homes won't have a single. However, there are neighbourhoods from more recent decades where a double garage was a norm on a 15m lot and would fit in fine.

- The ability of a car to park in front of the door of the house as in the example on the right should not be permitted, as this too is not found in any great way through the study area. For new home building this type of arrangement might be acceptable, but if the intent is to preserve the character of the streetscape as it is, then these types of solutions detract. It is the homes themselves that predominate the streetscape in the study area; not the cars parked in front, nor the garages proposed. The example to the right does not accommodate sufficient greenspace to the lot (with stormwater percolation benefits) and the city determined curb cut that would permit this type of walkway/parking arrangement should not be permitted. Additionally, much of the problem with both the aesthetics of these types of developments would be mitigated with stronger wording as to garage sizing relative to both building size relative to property size. It would mean the houses designed for the lot width could not be 'maxed' to the setbacks. If the majority of the streetscape where the proposed infill is to be done is 1300 to 1750 sq. ft homes, then this consideration should ALSO be used to determine appropriate building and garage sizes to the homes proposed.

- Especially in these areas, cars belong behind the buildings. You are the protectors of the streetscape - it's ok to say no garages out front.
• Again I think you are try to regulate too much and taking away for the unique of each property....this the problem with city way to much regulations on size, etc, etc...stop already
• What is the harm in a projected porch?
• I agree with the first two bullet points but disagree with the third bullet point. Garage projections as long as they are in line with the properties adjacent and follow the terms set out in the first two bullet points are acceptable to me.
• This is stupid actually. Many houses have the garage design out front, or to the side still projecting out front. Garages build into the home with living space above, are more susceptible to fumes etc from the garage into the home. There is no practical reason houses need to be flat faced. If people do not find this style of home visually appealing, they won't buy it. This type of stuff should not be a concern of local governments.
• Same answer as previous.
• Increasing garage widths and number of parking bays not only looks poor but it also encourages car use. This is something that should be left in the suburbs and not in city centre and established areas.
• Only allowing a single car garage on a lot that is less than 15m will encourage on street parking. Homeowners appreciate larger garages even if they do not park in them.
• We should not limit the types of homes people choose to accommodate.
• Two car garages in existing central neighbourhoods are not conducive to pedestrian friendly streets. Are developers allowed to build housing without ANY driveway or garage? Many people are choosing to live downtown so they don't have to own a vehicle. Driveways also make it difficult to install protected bike lanes.

Committee of Adjustment Notification

How would you prefer to be notified of applications for consent or minor variance in your neighbourhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification Method</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper ad and direct mailing to adjacent neighbours</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign on property and direct mailing to adjacent neighbours</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clarification on “Other” category:

• Can be the cause from vandalism.
• Ad, mailing and sign on property
• Email
I don't feel I need to be notified. It's none of my business.
To reach as many as possible, you need many ways to notify neighbours, not just one of the above methods.
Sign on property, direct mailing, online map
Both, newspaper provides notification to those interested in the neighbour while a sign would provide notice to pedestrians in the neighbourhood.
Signs, direct mailing, and email fan out through neighborhood associations.
Leave as is

**Site Plan Control Pilot Project**

*Currently, Site Plan Control in the City does not apply to single detached, semi-detached or duplex dwellings.*

*Applying Site Plan Control in designated neighbourhoods (such as one or more of the neighbourhoods identified in the City’s Cultural Heritage Study (CHL Study) would ensure that development is complementary of the overall character of the community’s existing housing stock and vegetation (e.g. street trees) and contribute to the unique qualities of the neighbourhood in which it is being developed.*

*Draft Recommendation:*

*That the City consider requiring Site Plan Approval in the Cedar Hill and Central Frederick neighbourhoods/ cultural heritage landscapes as a pilot project for new single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings.*
Support efforts taken to conserve the streetscapes, housing stock, hard landscaping and vegetation unique to these established communities.

Generally I agree with a pilot project my concern would be adding cost and time delays for development. I am in favour of better design and better looking projects.

Feel this is crucial to understand what might be involved in developing tools to guide potential development that is sensitive and appropriate for established neighbourhoods, number of staff hours required to implement etc.

Excellent idea. Individuals or developers interested in building in an area would have a clear understanding of the need to plan a project that blends with the streetscape of existing neighbourhood buildings, rather than proposing a concept then having to revise plans several times to reduce the neighbours’ complaints.

I think it should be applied to all older residential areas, not just the two listed. Agree for new housing developments only. Site Plan Control should not be applied to projects that would not affect the streetscape of the neighborhood.

I think this proposal is a good one, it means new development would have to comply with more homogeneous requirements providing some comfort to exiting residents.

I’m excited that the city is looking into this to help keep a unified look in established neighbourhoods.

The City should also consider and include a Section 41 (site plan control) agreement with the pilot site plan approval process in heritage neighbourhoods for singles and semis.

If people are buying in those neighbourhoods, I would argue that they are buying a home for that historical look and feel and that new developments in the area should be cognizant of that.

Let each property be unique of each property….this the problem with city way to much regulations on size, etc, etc…stop already

Keeping with the character of a neighborhood is important. Permits may take longer but the benefits outweigh.
• Pilot should encompass the entire study area, not just the two neighbourhoods mentioned, as I see developers avoiding the two areas mentioned and carrying on in an area where less work/planning is involved on their part.
• Time to look at all implications for neighbourhoods is important and should not be rushed.
• I think that delays in approval for this sort of thing should be acceptable if they ensure the character of established neighbourhoods is considered and weighed in the decision making process.
• The current character of many study neighborhoods is a big part of their appeal, so while I feel including these areas in draft recommendations no matter how small the new dwelling, I would not want to see it become a large additional expense to the City's budget. A longer waiting period to build in these areas would be acceptable, numerous new staff to process applications would be less so.
• I think all in-fills should be required to be nice, and not a cheap in-fill that create an eye sore.
• I think these recommendations will go a long way in protecting the feel of the neighbourhoods.
• Great idea of pilot project as the first step!
• Please expand this to my neighbourhood (Queen's Blvd-Highland Road) and apply to single detached, semi-detached or duplex dwellings.
• Great pilot.

Undecided comments:

• I'm torn on this one. I would love to maintain the old characteristics, but would also be concerned about how this could affect the development of affordable housing. Obviously the more hoops to jump through, the longer it takes, the more money it costs. This would risk making housing less affordable in these areas, and these are areas that are close to services that lower income individuals rely on. I would also be concerned about how much it would interfere with renovations done to existing homes. i.e. Would this affect if I wanted to tear down my ancient uninsulated back porch and replace it with an insulated one? Does that mean that there is now an additional 6 months of process that must be expected? Does it now make it a completely unaffordable home improvement? That being said, if an appropriate balance is struck, this could be a great way to maintain the beauty of some neighbourhoods. I love my old neighbourhood, it's why I'm here, and would be sad to see it lose its charm to some tasteless design choices. A pilot project would be a good way to test some of these concerns, but maybe a smaller area than is currently indicated (particularly not the entirety of Central Frederick).

• Sounds like red tape that will add costs and make it more likely that intensification only takes place when done by corporations and not by you and me. One part of me wonders how long are traditional homes, which I love, will remain viable given the home energy
changes that some people anticipate as we begin to rely less and less on fossil fuels. So . . . I'm undecided on this one for now.

- Appreciate the intent, but not in favour of more administrative burden for either city staff or developers of small buildings. If the approval process is too onerous, only large developers with the staff to shepherd a project through will have the ability to build in these areas.
- I think the zoning by-laws do catch a lot of "unwanted" characteristics.

Disagree/Strongly disagree comments:

- A neighbourhoods character is always evolving and what would meet the needs of residents yesterday does not often match against the needs of modern residents. The city should be striving to encourage quality of design that is above that of the new dwellings neighbourhood and not try to preserve an old timey feel for nostalgia's sake.
- We should be much more progressive in our planning and encourage good design and not create more restrictive rules.
- Site plan approval is far too expensive, complicated and length for individuals, small builders. This will promote more suburban development (which we don't want). Suggest another form of simplified design critique process only
- Extreme caution here. A balance is needed to support good infill housing. A very simple and scoped site plan process that is efficient (cost and time) could be supported with a focus on promoting good quality infill housing. This type of process is not intended for single detached/semi-detached homes and an onerous process would have a negative impact and impact housing costs. Simple guidelines that promote innovative infill houses could be supported provided modern infill homes can be supported through a simple and cost effective process. Ensure a simple and low fee is considered for this review process and avoid long review times. Strike a balance and avoid costly processes for small projects (e.g. expensive engineering review fees, securities and other studies). Review other cities to find a good fit.
- If the policies are put in place to deal with the suggested changes re setbacks, heights, etc. as per above, then I do not feel that site plan approval for single detached, semi-detached for duplex dwellings would be necessary.
- This proposal would add cumbersome red tape to the process and discourage redevelopment. This issue can largely be addressed as it has been up to this point with the consent conditions.
- I'm not opposed to the trial use of the site plan approval process in the study area, but this should be considered only for semi-detached or duplex construction. As these types of construction almost inevitably involve major changes in parking and drainage, setbacks, screening, external garbage, etc. with multiple inhabitants - it makes sense to have those type of developments done with SPA. For an individual single family resident, I don't believe the generally excessively long process of SPA is in the resident's interest, nor would the added expense of municipal manpower required for this be necessary. Finally I believe that the pilot program, if approved, should have clearly
delineated review dates with all parties who have gone through the process during the pilot program contacted directly for their input as to whether it should be continued (rather than just stakeholders in the study area who may have not).

- I grew up in the St Mary's area and lived in micro management firm the heritage committee and all it did was cost the homeowners extra grief, time, and way more money on small repairs and renovations.
- While it is important to hold onto the heritage of an area, forcing it for new developments is just faking it. As noted in the audio clip, this would also require more admin and personnel which at a time when the City is hiking taxes at level far disproportionate to inflation, small cosmetic things like this are a waste of money.
- New buildings should not be restrained to a particular period or style of architecture. Diverse building styles, including more modern styles, are desirable. Having said this, I agree with trying this approach for maintaining vegetation, as well as typical building heights and setbacks.
- Intensification of low density areas by reasonable means should not be further slowed, made more difficult, and made more costly by forcing development to be within the exact context of what has already been done. To do what has been done before in a neighbourhood cannot achieve any intensification, and this kind of fine tooth comb approach to the most modest of developments not only makes it extremely discomforting for any newcomer to attempt to create an intensified home, but puts even more pressure on intensification and development completely outside this study, which should be pertinent to consider. If we are attaching so many rules and hoops for a home which may only have one extra bedroom or be a slightly larger duplex, the residents of the city will feel that mid- and high-rise should be exponentially more challenged and restricted. To put everything through an approval process is to say that there is no acceptable intensification, or else there would be acceptable intensification that did not require standing in front of an entire community which has no reason to want to see anything change. There must be direct paths to RIENS, even if exorbitant versions must pass some extra hurdles. If any intensification starts with such hurdles, it will impact all possible development in debilitating fashion. Neighbourhoods cannot evolve and grow if the voices of those who are currently living there always trump and have every reason to stop any potential new residents or changing residents from growing and evolving within our community. The hearts of our cities are the areas which should see the most change, relative to outlying suburban areas, and we must start to communicate this.

Citizens’ guide

The City would like to put together a Citizens’ Guide to help residents understand the process involved with building on a property. What information would you find most helpful in this guide?

- The process, what is permitted, what is not, anticipated timelines and expenses.
• The city's building codes. The process to building within Canadian and city laws. A link with local and national building codes. A what to expect section
• Permits
• Fees, required information to submit to the City.
• Basic flow charts in plain english or even videos would be helpful
• Outline what is allowable / not allowable, under zoning regulations, what the zoning means in simple terms, steps needed to proceed with a build, emails etc to access resources in terms of understanding the details, perhaps a step by step guide
• Yes. Good idea. Talk about benefits of living in existing neighbourhoods and promoting urban living options. This will help with a more complete housing model and talk about promoting transit supportive development. New infill homes add value and can add interest in neighbourhoods when well designed and can support schools. A range of housing is important particularly to support LRT, support intensification targets and provide alternative housing options.
• Building process and steps to obtain approval: Restrictions re. height, distance from property line, other factors (as suggested amendments above) that are specific to the neighbourhood and zoning area.
• Contact list for information re. approvals application & troubleshooting, clarification of bylaws.
• The basic bylaws (including fence bylaws) presented in a very visual way (much easier to decipher than a lot of text)
• Photography of different neighbourhood styles and of successfully completed builds (new buildings that fit well in an old neighbourhood, extensions that blend, creative use of space - ideas that have worked in the past to get new ideas flowing)
• Who you will need to contact to get all the permits set, inspectors
• An FAQ section or link to go to for online FAQs
• The policy if revised and the process that the City puts in place to deal with building on a property.
• Required permits, timeline for permitting and review, cost of permits, maps identifying if location is included in historical area/Site Plan Control, general rules/requirements.
• Approval process and timelines.
• At what point in doing renovations does one need a building permit?
• The guide should be prepared in plain language, outlining applicable regulations and appeal processes. It should include images, such as those used in this survey, as they are helpful in assisting readers to understand the options available and the implications of regulations.
• I'd like to see information on- Size- height & side yard clearance & setback
• Intended use- multiple or single family dwelling, etc.
• Car & pedestrian egress
• Material finish& style
• Explanation about densification and the reasons why it is important.
The guide should appeal to both property owners completing an infill project as well as surrounding property owners and residents to an infill project. Recognize there are 2 distinct audiences.

If there are clear design guidelines as per those relating to site plan approval that would be pertinent, then these should be distilled to what they should be. Additionally, a chart of costs for the permits themselves throughout the process should be produced.

List of the necessary permits and the estimated costs for typical buildings

How to access your land blueprint for proper zoning and fencing

Reference guide to services that the City will perform and what tasks need to be completed by the builder

What a great idea. A step-by-step process would be helpful, and visual guide to what is permitted in each zone. It would be hugely helpful to have contact information for city staff who are willing and able to guide citizens through the process of building something that improves the neighbourhood.

Newspaper, internet and websites

The information the city should be providing should discuss safety concerns only.

Contact info at city hall

Cost of permits and potential penalties of a permit isn't acquired

Step by step guide style.

As much as possible regarding building types, sizes, location from boundaries. A number to call when uncertainties arise.

Safety i.e. hydro lines etc, size and dimension guidelines, design ideas or suggestions for age of neighbourhood etc.

Who to contact with concerns about the properties in their area, where to find information about developments in the area

What permits are needed for what types of projects
  - costs of permits
  - how to disagree with proposed plan i.e. who to contact at city hall

diagrams and visuals

Setbacks, height requirements, permits required, fees

The by-laws or where to easily find the by-laws. When you do or do not have to contact the City.

Two scenarios come into mind:
  - Renovations and the requirements/considerations a property must have when altering the physical structure of an existing dwelling.
  - New buildings/tear downs should have clear guidelines to set expectations before a resident has a chance to get worked up about their design and then blame the city when it doesn't conform.

Where to find the min. max building regulations, who to call for information, visual aids. costs/permit information

Setback information, minimum lot sizes. Guide on getting building permits and what permits are needed.
• The citizens guide must list when and what applies. Also what projects are not subject to this approval process, and include FAQ's too.
• Use pictures with diagrammatic details like the ones used on this survey.
• Easily understood distinction between zones, explicit direction on exceptions to any rules, visual examples of concepts and rules.
• What are rules for redevelopment, what are limitations, expectations of the community
• What types of construction or changes require applications, e.g., sheds, fences, garages, additions.

Other questions:

Do you have any other general feedback, suggestions or questions?

• The recommendation coming out of this study gives a one-sided prospective that seems to be against encouraging and supporting intensification.
• Intensification is not at a critical inflection point where additional controls are needed yet. I appreciate we’re getting ahead of potential problems in the future. Please consider that individuals have a right to a home by their design, comfort level etc as a human need.
• In one of the public meetings there was a question whether this study would address maintaining the tree canopy and the moderator responded that it would. I don’t see a recommendation that addresses this issue. Could this be clarified.
• Keep reaching out to communities for feedback! Many thanks and much appreciation for your efforts to engage and inform!
• Good to have effective rules to promote infill housing. A balanced approach is needed to promote this housing that is lacking (happening in other cities). Please ensure new rules do not impede creative and modern infill housing. Talk about positive examples and show modern infill homes too (suburban ones are misleading). This will help with attracting talent near transit and jobs. Consider a pilot implementation for one year and have feedback on process. Infill housing is expensive and Kitchener has potential to support a new type of urban housing model. Support good examples and reflect on these.
• I strongly support your recommendations. These proposed amendments will help to protect and ensure the health of established neighbourhoods as growth and residential intensification occur. It is encouraging to see recognition of the need to sustain and stabilize established neighbourhoods while embracing the advantages of intensification and the LRT. I hope that Kitchener will continue to follow these tenets in order to recognize and support healthy and balanced growth.
• I would suggest that you keep the process simple and straight forward with the revised policies guiding the way.
• No mention of trees. The city plants traditional varieties in the central area, helping to retain the traditional look of the neighbourhoods. Will the city itself anticipate opportunities for intensifying by not planting trees in areas near the "street" if they
might stand in the way of new dwellings. Also, I'm disappointed that my ward council member has not notified us in person about this study. Not upset, just a little disappointed. I suspect most of my neighbours are totally unaware of the study, but would be very interested in the proposals.

- With the exception of the 1st item above (front yard setback), the other proposals try to paint all neighbourhoods with the same broad stroke which doesn't apply. The process should be contextual to the immediate neighbours and the proposals can have unforeseen consequences as indicated in the comments above.
- Great work on the recommendations. Implementing them will go a long way to intensification that is respectful of neighbourhood characteristics and neighbouring properties.
- Some good planning rules now will lay ground work for a great city in 2050!
- If the city is to plan for future population growth and densification, possibly slightly stricter regulation on construction of new dwellings may be important.
- Strongly agree that height of new builds be limited and should be in line with surrounding properties.
- Love the direction this is headed and the intention behind it. Not sure if the draft recommendations will have the intended long term effect at this point, but they are a great starting point and have made me think!
- Unnecessary restrictions in a growing city. What started this silly process?
- Long overdue in addressing these issues. City needs to act quickly before unique pockets of the inner city have lost their character.
- We've seen a large number of multi-unit properties built in our area in the last 3 years and see signs of more. There's no consultation with the people whose services are affected every time a water main breaks, the road is dug up to provide services to the new property and by construction noise / traffic. You don't live in an established neighbourhood to have construction around you. The demand onto the schools in the area is increasing as well as more young families move into the single dwelling homes, and these small rental properties appear appealing to them.
- There are a significant number of basement apartments around from what we see increasing demand on the services around here.
- I'm a resident of this area and this is the first I've heard of anything of this since the meeting in March we were unable to attend. Social media notices are more helpful as few people we know still receive the record.
- It is very important to keep the character of existing, well-maintained neighbourhoods, while at the same time allowing for some changes and development.
- This work seems very thought out. It is respectful of the character of existing neighbourhoods while still allowing new development that will be a positive addition to the neighbourhood.
- I greatly appreciate this study and the questionnaire. The major reason for moving into the area that I now live is the character of not just my home, but those on my street and the greater neighbourhood. Studies like this give me faith that any intensification that occurs will be completed in a considerate manner for not just the immediate
neighbours, but those who genuinely care about their neighbourhood. Change is bound to come, so let's at least make it well informed and forward thinking.

- I am conflicted with the building height restrictions. I do not want to see 3 storey single dwelling units in our established neighbourhoods but single family dwellings that are only occupied by renters are a HUGE problem in my central neighbourhood as landlords do not take care and probably have a difficult time getting in quality tenants. Typically, landlords pay firms to take care of the many of these homes they own but these hired firms have very low standards and hardly respond as they have to be in charge of MANY properties to make any profit. At the same time these are the people responsible for selecting new tenants which is a hamster wheel with the properties by the universities. So, if a 3 storey, 6-unit building goes in beside my 1929 home it may look a bit odd if one traces the roof lines but my experience is the property will be kept neater and there will be fewer daily interruptions to existing neighbours by emergency services and strangers coming and going for drug sales if it's an apartment type unit than the rental of the upstairs and the separate rental of the basement of a formerly singe-dwelling unit. Furthermore, these larger dwellings can be made to visually fit in the older neighbourhoods.

- Many neighbourhoods in the study area have well established neighbourhood associations. Perhaps there is a way to partner with NAs to help inform residents of upcoming proposals within their area.

- Thanks for asking!

- The proposed recommendations would restrict the intensification in favour of appeasing current residents who are against change. If we want Kitchener to be a walkable, liveable city we need to be more open to increased density in these areas.

- This current RIENS proposal seems intended to make intensification only appear plausible, while in fact making no real intensification possible, and stacking the deck disproportionately in favour of no development or change happening, putting the centuries of Kitchener's future on hold for the whims of current landowners. For a city attempting to combat climate change and usher in both newcomers and the future, this is a disgracefully backwards stand to take.

- There is a difference between maintaining the character of a neighbourhood, and opposing all changes or intensification in a neighbourhood. The Benton St. development of Barra Castle is a good example of an intensification project where developers seem to actually care about and develop a building which maintains the character of a neighbourhood. And yet, many still oppose it. It is important not to let NIMBY interests prevent intensification in developed neighbourhoods. There is of course, the possibility of letting developers run rampant through areas, putting up cheap poorly designed buildings as happened in Waterloo Northdale for a while, so balance is important, but in developed mature neighbourhoods with an established population with political power, (as opposed to a neighbourhood where most homes are rented to Students already) I far more fear NIMBYs obstructing all development.

- I welcome denser housing to my neighbourhood. More people brings more vibrancy and services.
To help us better understand where feedback is coming from, please tell us a bit about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live in the study area</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to move the study area</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been or will be involved with developing a property in the study area</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live outside of the study area but have an interest in the topic</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the first 3 letters of your postal code?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N2A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2G</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2H</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elmira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. CORRESPONDENCE

The following pages include all correspondence that provided feedback on the Study.
Good Morning Janine,

As part of your RIENT process, please note that we submitted Committee of Adjustment applications to create two infill properties on Bismark Avenue to accommodate two modern semi-detached homes (minor variance applications A2011-073 and A2011-074). We are also in the process to repeat this for 154 and 156 Waterloo Street. In both instances, we have submitted a conceptual site plan, landscape plan and conceptual renderings for staff and committee of adjustment approval. We also submitted an urban design study for 8 and 10 bismark avenue. We hope that this process can be maintained for this low-rise form of residential intensification to facilitate compatible infill based on a streamlined process given this is a small scale project and not a site plan project. We are working with Rick Merrill from The Planning Partnership and happy to provide additional comments on guidelines if needed. We would note that the city has urban design guidelines and many of these can be used through the CofA process for review and comment. We look forward to discussing this further.

Thanks for your consideration,

Ben Eby
Intown Inc.
May 16 2016

Janine Oosterveld
Janine.Oosterveld@kitchener.ca
City Manager of Site Development, Customer Service and RIEN project
City of Kitchener

Dear Ms. Oosterveld and city team representatives,

RE: Residential Intensification Comments (CSD16-031)
INTOWN INC.

Please accept this letter as a follow up to our meeting with Mr. Alain Pinard on April 22, 2016 and my email to you today to discuss residential intensification opportunities in the City of Kitchener. On April 22 we discussed opportunities and the need to support low-rise intensification within the city’s central neighbourhoods similar to other large cities such as Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto and Ottawa that have LRT service. This letter also builds on a presentation that we made (including Rick Merrill from The Planning Partnership and Tim Ingold from Coldwell Banker Peter Benninger Realty) to your August 12, 2013 Planning and Strategic Services Committee and previous follow up letters.

By copy of this letter we request that we work with you on future report updates and how our innovative infill model can be supported through the RIEN Study. This type of housing is important as it provides greater housing choice and enhances the urban living experience. More specifically, this type of housing supports the growing “Reurb Market” introduced in your 2005 and 2010 Reurbanization Market Studies1. A broad range of housing is needed to support a broad demographic, as well as, to support transit ridership, to implement your growth target objectives, and most recently, to attract and retain talent reflected in your Made It Kitchener economic development strategy that promotes urban housing across the city.

INTOWN INC. (INTOWN) is a boutique developer that specializes in modern low rise intensification projects located near valued amenities. During the last several years we have gained extensive experience in developing low rise modern housing including a creative project in your Innovation District. Based on our experience, current projects, and our project team, we would ask that our model be incorporated into:

(1) The Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIEN) study, as well as;
(2) The Planning Around Rapid Station Areas Study (PARTS); and,
(3) Your Comprehensive Review of Zoning Bylaw (CROSBY) project.

There is growing demand for low rise infill housing experienced in larger cities, and more recently, our community. We believe that this type of housing adds to the urban experience, as well as, will be an important form to density to support transit service which is a major priority locally, regionally and provincially following recent announcements to increase density as part of the 2016 Places To Grow amendments.

In 2011, INTOWN purchased its first property and moving ahead with modern infill homes that relate to the expanding "reurb" market. The city is evolving and INTOWN believes that a broad range of housing options are needed to address evolving market conditions reflected in the 2010 reurbanization market study. The Reurb Study should be considered as part of your residential intensification efforts particularly as the city evaluates transit supportive development opportunities around the ION LRT Stations underway and is focused on attracting talent driven by a new demographic and market working in the emerging tech sector. Key findings from this study are provided in Appendix 1 for review and consideration.

In 2013, INTOWN participated in the City of Kitchener Official Plan review process and was able to provide comments into this process that is shaping how intensification occurs across the city. INTOWN supports these policies that encourages low-rise intensification across the city with criteria to evaluate minor variance applications (4.C.1.8). Copy of relevant policies are highlighted in Appendix 2 to frame the discussion on residential intensification within established neighbourhoods. We believe that new singles, semis (with secondary suites), townhouses and stacked townhouses forms an important part of compatible low rise housing like many other cities and can enhance neighbourhood character with effective design guidelines and review processes administered through the Committee of Adjustment process for low-rise housing projects.

This year, INTOWN was surprised to learn that the city introduced interim zoning controls to guide residential intensification through CSD 13-11 Report (ZBA 2013-124) with new regulations impacting semi-detached homes with secondary suites (called semi detached duplex dwelling). Based on evolving housing trends, employment trends, market trends and rising land costs, INTOWN has redesigned our homes with secondary suite options to facilitate greater housing choice which is needed based on strong employment growth in the downtown and new LRT service. This type of housing should be considered and supported based on the following rationale for The RIEN study:


- The 2014 Official Plan. The propose housing by INTOWN conforms to many official plan policies, including secondary suites and criteria for new residential intensification. The proposed low-rise infill by INTOWN is compatible in existing neighbourhoods demonstrated in our recent projects and other select examples.

- Complete community. A broad range of housing is needed, and in fact, required across the City of Kitchener. All types of residential intensification should be supported provided they respect the surrounding neighbourhood character. New low rise housing provides opportunities for a broader target market including families and young professionals. Duplex Dwellings should be permitted to facilitate a complete community model, particularly in areas close to employment, transit, parks, schools and services. This type of housing helps supports the growing workforce and to attract talent.

- Transit ridership. A full range of Intensification opportunities should be supported within LRT station nodes and their surrounding (walkable) neighbourhoods. Low-rise intensification should
form part of the city’s planning “toolkit” to support growth over the long term, with emphasis on LRT Stations and central neighbourhoods. This type of housing, including semi-detached duplex dwellings, can provide gentle density (2-4x density increase) in support of LRT ridership.

- Affordability. A broad range of housing is necessary to manage rising land costs and offer alternative housing options. A more complete review of housing options is required prior to down zoning any properties. Zoning analysis has been included in Appendix 3 for review and consideration. The R4 and R5 zones make over 1/3 of all zone categories in the city. Semi detached units with secondary suites should remain in LRT Station Nodes and their surrounding neighbourhoods subject to specific performance standards. In terms of rental/lease options, this type of housing is more affordable than options today.

- Design quality. As it relates to the RIEN, a high standard of urban design should be required for all new infill projects recognizing that modern design can respect, and in fact, enhance neighbourhood character. A range of submission requirements can be required through different approval processes to address criteria established in the official plan including through the Committee of Adjustment process to evaluate new residential intensification projects. INTOWN’s projects provide a model for this which includes conceptual building plans, elevations, landscape plans as part of the approvals. INTOWN supports semi-detached duplex dwellings subject to specific performance standards that respect neighbourhood character (eg. single driveways).

A growing number of cities are supporting low rise intensification. The City of Kitchener has the opportunity to learn from these cities and develop a Made in Kitchener approach, recently unveiled in March 2016 as part of the City’s economic development strategy. Low rise housing will assist the city grow over time and provide opportunity to support transit, talent attraction and promoting a healthy Kitchener where people can live, work and thrive in a more sustainable way. Positive examples of low-rise infill housing are provided in Appendix 4 recognizing that new homes can be designed in a modern or traditional aesthetic. INTOWN has visited many cities to experience this type of housing, and has developed our own designs that have been presented to the city and under construction this year. We would ask that you review our project in the INNOVATION DISTRICT and use this model for gentle density within The PARTS study based on the following specific comments:

- Land Use. A broad range of housing is recommended in the PARTS which covers a 800metre radius around the ION Transit stop. In addition to promoting high density projects along the corridor, a full range of low-rise housing options should be permitted within the LRT Station node and surrounding neighbourhoods to support the city’s goal of intensification and LRT ridership. The 2011 Planning Act reforms supports secondary suites, and this type of housing should be permitted within areas with high transit service reinforced through the proposed 2016 Places To Grow amendments.

- Process. The Official Plan establishes criteria for new low-rise intensification through the Committee of Adjustment (variance) process and already has design guidelines for the city. The city can request a range of studies and plans to evaluate residential intensification - INTOWN recommends that all infill projects include building elevation drawings, conceptual site plan, and landscape plan for staff review and approval. This is similar to a scoped site plan review process however, administered through the Committee of adjustment review process recognizing that low density housing is the smallest form of intensification and most price sensitive.
• Design Principles. The City has design guidelines that these set a strong mandate for compatible intensification projects. In addition to these, and new official plan policies, the following design principles can be incorporated in the PARTS and RIEN studies subject to more discussion with our project team (specifically Mr. Rick Merrill from The Planning Partnership):

- all infill projects to be landscaped to enhance streetscape character and privacy;
- new building design shall respect existing neighbourhood character;
- innovative and modern designs can be supported provided it enhances neighbourhood character;
- building massing and design elements shall respect and be compatible with existing built form (surrounding houses);
- single car driveways are encouraged for new low rise housing to complement existing character.

• Zoning regulations. New station area zoning should continue to promote a full range of housing within the station nodes recognizing lots sizes and setbacks are more restrictive in existing neighbourhoods. Driveway width regulations may strike a balance in promoting gentle density.

INTOWN is building a modern semi-detached home (with secondary suite) in your INNOVATION DISTRICT. This type of housing is responding to evolving market conditions and includes a range of units that are compatible in the neighbourhoods. We believe that the modern design enhances the neighbourhood character and parking can be managed with a single car driveway. Examples of the evolving elevations are included in Appendix 5 for reference and consideration. We hope that this type of housing continues to be supported in the RIEN, PARTS, and CROSBY studies.

We look forward to working with you through this process and request that we be notified on any future meeting or report for consultation. We would also extend this invitation to the WRHBA, our project team, and how this can be carefully integrated with other city projects. Thank you and sincerely,

Ben Eby
President, INTOWN INC.

cc. Marc Kemerer, Debra Smith Frank LLP
Rick Merrill, The Planning Partnership
Tim Ingold, Coldwell Banker Peter Benninger Realty
Marie Schroeder, Waterloo Region Home Builders Association
Alain Pinard, City of Kitchener
Della Ross, City of Kitchener
Brandon Sloan, City of Kitchener
Janine Oosterveld (RIEN study)
Aaron McCrimmon-Jones (PARTS study)
Natalie Goss (CROSBY study)
Julian vonWesterholt, City of Kitchener
Garret Stevenson, City of Kitchener
Rod Regier, City of Kitchener
APPENDIX 1 – REURB STUDY FINDINGS AND EXCERPTS

The Region of Waterloo along with its partners commissioned two Market Research Reports (2005\(^2\) and 2010\(^3\)) evaluating market preferences for the “reurbanization market”. Select key findings from the 2010 Report are highlighted below:

- In 2010, single detached housing accounted for 35% of all units built compared to 78% in 1998.
- In 2010, reurbanization units accounted for 50% of all housing units compared to 15% in 2003.
- Housing preferences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young Single and Couples</th>
<th>Empty Nesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000-1500 sf</td>
<td>1000-1500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Downtown neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small yard</td>
<td>Small yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two parking spaces</td>
<td>Two parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bedrooms</td>
<td>Two bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1.5 bathrooms</td>
<td>2.5 bathrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>Ease of maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of residence</td>
<td>Distance to shops/services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to employment</td>
<td>30% of potential reurbanization residents reports somewhat or very likely to move within the next two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of the potential reurbanization residents report somewhat or very likely to move.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180,000 population by 2031, an increase of 45,000 from 2006 (31%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170,000 by 2031, an increase of 75,000 from 2006 (75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8.1. Complete Community excerpt: “A complete community creates and provides access to a mix of land uses including, a full range and mix of housing, including affordable housing, recreation, commerce and cultural facilities, health care facilities, employment, parks and open spaces distributed and connected in a coherent and efficient manner. A complete community also supports the use of public transit and active transportation, enabling residents to meet most of their daily needs within a short distance of their homes. Kitchener will be planned as a complete community that create opportunities for all people to live, work and interact within close proximity…” (pg. 2-1)

3.2.1. City Urban Area and Countryside excerpt: “Directing growth to the Built-Up Area will make efficient use of land, existing physical infrastructure, transit, and community infrastructure… Much of the Built-Up Area consists of established residential neighbourhoods where significant development is not expected during the planning horizon of this Plan. While such residential areas are regarded as stable, that does not mean they are static. These residential areas may see some physical change over time. Development within or adjacent to these neighbourhoods will be compatible with and respectful of existing built form and character of the area.” Pg. 3-2.

3.2.1.11. “Smaller scale, site-specific intensification opportunities and second dwelling units may be permitted throughout the Built-Up Area in accordance with the land use policies in Section 15.” Pg. 3-4.

3.2.2.52. Community Areas. “Limited intensification may be permitted within Community Areas in accordance with the applicable land use designation on Map 3 and the Urban Design Policies in Section 11. The proposed development must be sensitive to and compatible with the character, form and planned function of the surrounding context.” Pg. 3-15.

Section 4 Housing. 4.1.3 Objective. “To ensure that new residential areas and the redevelopment of lands for residential uses and residential infill projects reflect a high standard of urban design”. Pg. 4-1.

4.1.6. Supply-Development, Redevelopment and Intensification. “The City will identify and encourage residential intensification and/or redevelopment, including adaptive re-use and infill opportunities, including second dwelling units, in order to respond to changing housing needs and as a cost-effective means to reduce infrastructure and servicing costs by minimizing land consumption and making better use of existing community infrastructure.” Pg. 4-2.

4.1.8. Section establishes criteria for minor variances to facilitate residential intensification or a redevelopment of lands noted below:

“Where a special zoning regulation(s) or minor variance(s) is/are requested, proposed or required to facilitate residential intensification or a redevelopment of lands, the overall impact of the special zoning regulation(s) or minor variance(s) will be reviewed, but not limited to the following to ensure, that:

a) Any new building and any additions and/or modifications to existing buildings are appropriate in massing and scale and are compatible with the built form and the community character of the established neighbourhood.
b) Where front yard setback reductions are proposed for new buildings in established
neighbourhoods, the requested front yard setback should be similar to adjacent properties
and supports and maintain the character of the streetscape and the neighbourhood.

c) New additions and modifications to existing buildings are to be directed to the rear yard and
are to be discouraged in the front yard and side yard abutting a street, except where it can
be demonstrated that the addition and/or modification is compatible in scale, massing,
design and character of adjacent properties and is in keeping with the character of the
streetscape.

d) New buildings, additions, modification and conversions are sensitive to the exterior areas of
adjacent properties and that the appropriate screening and/or buffering is provided to
mitigate any adverse impacts, particularly with respect to privacy.

e) The lands can function appropriately and not create unacceptable adverse impacts for
adjacent properties by providing both an appropriate number of parking spaces and an
appropriate landscaped/amenity area on the site.

f) The impact of each special zoning regulation or variance will be reviewed prior to
formulating a recommendation to ensure that a deficiency in the one zoning requirement
does not compromise the site in achieving objectives of compatible and appropriate site and
neighbourhood design and does not create further zoning deficiencies.”

4.C.1.9. “Residential intensification and/or redevelopment within existing neighbourhoods will be
designed to respect existing character. A high degree of sensitivity to surrounding context is important
in considering compatibility.” Pg. 4-2.

4.C.1.12. Variety and Integration. “The City favours a land use pattern which mixes and disperses a full
range of housing types and styles both across the city as a whole and within neighbourhoods.” Pg. 4-3.

4.C.1.23. Second Dwelling Units, Garden Suites and Coach House Dwelling Units. “The City will support
the addition of a second dwelling unit within a residential unit, where desirable and appropriate unless
otherwise limited by the policies of this Plan, and in accordance with the City’s Zoning By-law, in order
to provide another housing option to Kitchener homeowners and residents.” Pg. 4-5.

Section 5 Economy. 5.1.4 Objective. “To support a diverse range and mix of housing, employment,
amenity and arts and culture opportunities to attract and retain talent.” Pg. 5-1.

will accommodate a full range of low density housing types including single detached dwellings, duplex
dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, street townhouse dwellings, townhouse dwellings in a cluster
development, low-rise multiple dwellings and special needs housing.” Pg. 15-21.

15.D.3.9. “The City will encourage and support the mixing and integrating of innovative and different
forms of housing to achieve and maintain a low-rise built form.” Pg. 15-21.
### APPENDIX 3 – ZONING ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total zoned land in City</td>
<td>13,834.3</td>
<td>34,185.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Residential Zoning</td>
<td>5,369.28</td>
<td>13,267.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>67.38 ha</td>
<td>166.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>228.22</td>
<td>563.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>2061.29</td>
<td>5093.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>1487.87</td>
<td>3676.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>353.83</td>
<td>874.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>847.27</td>
<td>2093.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>124.36</td>
<td>307.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>98.94</td>
<td>244.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>100.12</td>
<td>247.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Residential zoning as % of entire City: 38.8%
- R1-R5 zoning as % of residential zones (R1-R9): 78.2%
- R4-R5 zoning as % of residential zones (R4-R5): 34.3%
- R6-R9 zoning as % of residential zones (R1-R9): 21.8%.
Kitchener Triplex on Waterloo Street in Innovation District

Infill Home in Uptown Waterloo
APPENDIX 5 – INTOWN HOUSING EXAMPLES

Original three storey infill model:

Two storey attached semi model:

Updated semi-detached duplex model (with landscaped yards):
Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

Comment Form

Discovery Session (Engagement Session #2)
Tuesday, June 14, 2016

Victoria Park Pavilion
80 Schneider Avenue, Kitchener ON

Please provide your comments below, including any specific issues or observations regarding the compatibility of new or renovated/expanded dwellings in the RIENS area:

Victoria Commons works great. Even though student houses are okay, although they destroy a neighborhood, I strongly endorse intensification, especially on empty lots. I strongly endorse additions to homes, increasing density of houses (eg. granny flats). I oppose densification. I rent and don't want to be priced out of this area. At the same time, I prefer renting room in detached houses.

Prominent visual patterns can prevent people from hanging up laundry or putting up gardens on their front yards! Diversity makes for better neighbourhoods.

WHERE DO PEOPLE PARK? How busy are the streets? These are things that people care about more than everything looks the same.

I don't even understand what you are trying to defend against here. What is the threat?

I want less red tape in developments. Empty lots are a terrible idea.

Planner Planning Kitchener
A depth bylaw sounds like a TERRIBLE idea.
I think it is SUCCESSFUL when there are roaming horses in the area and you don’t know it.

This meeting was REALLY poorly publicized.

I like front porches & front gardens!

Once again you have constrained your study questions on the wrong things that don’t matter to people. Do you do this on purpose? So frustrating.

"Don’t think about it too much"? Wow. That is a terrible way to set up policy.

Height is fine so long as it doesn’t shade out the neighbors.

Man. I feel manipulated. You are going to twist my responses. I don’t trust you.

The townhouses near King & Cannon are also really nice.

Different style we have if big block is in other ways. (size of the houses are the same size & setback)

How do we express our consternation in a way that will influence the report?
Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

Comment Form

Discovery Session (Engagement Session #2)
Tuesday, June 14, 2016

Victoria Park Pavilion
80 Schneider Avenue, Kitchener ON

Please provide your comments below, including any specific issues or observations regarding the compatibility of new or renovated/expanded dwellings in the RIENS area:

1. I feel the scope of the study is too narrow. It focuses on dwellings only. It does not relate to relation to pathways, walkable to stores, schools, parks. These common elements help define what a neighbourhood is. Common elements are important to any study on intensification.

2. In addition to this, and this probably cannot be regulated: Is it a bedroom community? Do people want to live in the geographical area? To get to know each other in the neighbourhood association, I tend to agree this is beyond the scope of the study.

But I think it needs to be a part of the scope of a study on intensification.

That is relationship to public space.
Councillors

I was sorry to see you leave prior to the end of the public meeting session at Vic Pk Pavilion last evening.

I can’t help but feel the process is a ways down the track now, given the assumptions presented by the consultant, and that there are some problems with the approach.

Had you stayed, I think you would have heard concerns voiced about the evening’s process and the assumptions that may underlie the focus on compatibility (and its tendency to reward similarity rather than diversity), so I would want you to get a full picture of the meeting, while it’s fresh with you.

One participant was quite eloquent in her views that what attracts us to our neighbourhoods, and creates the neighbourhoods’ character, are the quirky juxtapositions, the diversity, the wide variety, etc. This isn’t being discussed in the approach, to my view.

So, I would caution please that you not take away from the meeting that participants were satisfied with the process and the approach to turning discussion, engagement, and input into knee-jerk voting that is forced to accept the premise presented.

I would ask that the City consider the following:

- why is RIENS being undertaken? Is it because the City acknowledges that changes are coming, and likely for higher densities and different forms of small infill development, in accordance with some good principles about how we move our community forward?
  - if so, why are these rules and the study being applied to “established” neighbourhoods. Why is this not an examination of as-of-right practices regardless of the geography of the City and age of the streetscape?
  - why are suburban areas insulated from this sort of change, and why do we need to continue to subsidize suburban areas with our taxes and the cost of our utilities and services, to preserve their low density and their “exclusive” rather than inclusive approach to being part of our community?
- if the idea is to manage change in a manner that helps increase density and sustainable use of our resources and tax dollars, then isn’t it a given that infill will not look like the existing? This discussion of “compatibility” is just a way to stifle what you are looking for, in the name of keeping complaints down from residents looking to insulate themselves from change. Why not address the very real issue of how new development makes a positive contribution to the streetscape and neighbourhood, even where existing development may not.
  - another participant made the point that where new infill lacks porches and other features that actually promote interaction in the streetscape and among neighbours, that development isn’t compatible with what we are trying to achieve (whether or not it matches what’s existing).
Would a proposal for infill in a suburban neighbourhood be rejected because it has front porches and no garage doors, simply because it doesn’t match the “character” (read sameness) of the rest of the street?

- the presenters seem trapped in the idea of compatibility of private to private, rather than compatibility of private to public space, which is much more important. Not once were we asked: “How compatible is this new infill with the streetscape and social spaces and public values that it interacts with?” That’s the real issue of compatibility, and hopefully the Neighbourhood Strategy will outline some principles of good neighbourhood streets that all development needs to support and reinforce.
- Character is being misdiagnosed here. People become “characters”, lovable and otherwise but usually accepted for who they are, NOT because of their similar traits, but because of their individual quirks, the lines of experience etched into their faces, their graces and flaws. So too with buildings and streets. Where a streetscape consists of sameness, it can be said to LACK CHARACTER, not to have it.
- please do not visit uniformity and conformity on our streetscapes, just because the planners only have tools (setback, density, minimum lot size, height, etc) that were developed in the last 50 years to ensure that uniformity. Uniformity is not what is needed. What is needed is respect for diversity, tolerance, acceptance of variety, and indeed a promotion of it. Downtown neighbourhoods thrive based on this diversity, and so should all citizens and neighbourhoods.

If this exercise is meant to head off complaints to the city about how change is affecting people who don’t want change, that is a misspent effort. Let’s figure out how to ensure that neighbours understand and can see change as a positive, while helping those who build understand their responsibilities to improve (rather than denigrate) the neighbourhood and public realm. Where the proponent can address and commit to public values that we’ve identified, we can make that the criterium. Where individual homeowners object to those values, they can do so during the debate and discussion of the values. Their later objection to the results of acting on those values is not appropriate.

Please call if you wish to discuss.

Cheers,

John MacDonald, OAA, MRAIC
Principal
John MacDonald Architect Inc.
1519 579 1700
f 519 579 2046
www.johnmacdonaldarchitect.ca

The Courtyard @ Bonnie Stuart
141 Whitney Place, Suite 101
Kitchener, ON N2H 2X8

“All of us, if we are reasonably comfortable, healthy and safe, owe immense debt to the past. There is no way, of course, to repay the past. We can only pay those debts by making gifts to the future.” – Jane Jacobs Canadian Cities and Sovereignty-Association

Consider the environment before printing.
This e-mail may contain information that is confidential and is intended for the named recipient.
If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system.
Hi Janine – I wanted to provide some quick points of feedback on last night’s session:

- I found the “clicker” format extremely limiting — I would not classify that as true engagement at all. Rather, it was a way for the consultant to quickly and easily poll the audience of attendees. This might have been a useful tool if the material we were being pored on was the result of community feedback, but the material was extremely generic and the answers were often obvious (meaning you could have asked any group of Canadian urban residents the same questions and gotten the same/similar answers. Some additional problems with this format:
  a) The sample size was too small: With approximately 45 “voters” on the clicker questions, and a large portion of them students, this results far too small a sample to be statistically representative of anything — and it is not a random sample (rather — for better or worse - a very biased sample based on residents who had a strong enough interest in the subject to attend.) I am sure the consultant is going to represent the results as statistics that somehow represent Kitchener residents in their report, which – if you are at all familiar with proper statistical analysis – is not an honest representation of anything.
  b) The character elements were limited to 5 dimensions (height, side yard setbacks, front yard setbacks, driveway/garage, and architectural style) and there was no opportunity for input or discussion about other possible elements, or any notion of getting feedback from residents that could be used by the consultant and/or Kitchener planning to define character elements specific to Kitchener. This would have gone a long way to making residents feel that their voices had been heard (and taken seriously.)
- I was disappointed that we did not get to talk about higher density intensification in residential neighborhoods — such as the Mansion Street lofts, the Walter Street development, or whatever will inevitably happen with the old Electrohome factory. Perhaps that is another session, but I am actually supportive of these types of developments and think they really bring interesting flavor and diversity to residential neighborhoods, especially when they utilize historical assets — and especially if they are designed properly, i.e. perhaps with ‘front porches’ (aka patios) that encourage residents of the higher density dwellings to come outside and connect with their neighborhood.

Overall, the consultant said there was a ‘method to their madness’ — but after speaking to other attendees we all were left with the common perception that our voices were not heard — so if nothing else, their method failed to make residents feel that their voices were heard so I hope that adjustments are made in the future — perhaps to mix qualitative and quantitative approaches together so that residents (who were motivated enough to come out and attend) get a chance to have their voices heard.
Hi [Name],

Thanks so much for taking the time to provide feedback and attend the meeting.

In terms of the stakeholder session, I will add your name to the list - my apologies that we inadvertently missed adding your name to that circulation list. I didn’t see your name on the separate sign-up sheet from the meeting but I did find your email request. We have a session scheduled for Thursday, June 23rd at the Rockway Community Centre (Heritage Room) from 6:30 – 8:30. Would you be available to attend?

Thanks for also pointing out your concern about the meeting start time. The Kitchener Post ad and the "save the date" email included more information about the presentation start time at 7:00 but I did see that the website and the reminder email didn’t include those details. We will strive to communicate that consistently for the next session as well as potentially bumping up the start time of the formal part as you suggest.

The "clicker" format was new to the City and I appreciate your feedback on it. It will be considered if integrating the format into any other engagement sessions. It really did spark a lot of conversation about the importance of diversity in neighbourhood character. That point was definitely heard. I will also be working on an engageKitchener survey - and will keep your points in mind when compiling it.

Thank you for forwarding examples of infill as well.

Let me know if you are able to join the stakeholder group on June 23rd.

Regards,

Janine Oosterveld
Manager of Site Development & Customer Service | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7076 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | janine.oosterveld@kitchener.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: [Name]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Janine Oosterveld
Subject: Stakeholder group for RIENS consultations

Hi Janine,

I’m not sure if I missed an email somewhere along the line, but I had requested on paper and by email to be on the stakeholder consultation group after that first meeting. Is it too late? I would also love to help lead a walking tour in Mt. Hope neighbourhood. There are clear examples of compatibility and character that are innovative and mixed density, as well as some that are a bit more questionable.
I hope the consultants look at 65 Waterloo as a positive example. There’s also Union and Moore where a series of townhomes just went in that span a couple of former lots. Plus the condo at Louisa and King. Not sure how those will turn out.

Here is some detailed (and, I'm sad to say, not very rounded) feedback about the consulting firm's session, from the point of view of both a resident of KW since 2000, and a workshop designer for the past couple of decades:

-in a session scheduled from 6:30-8:30, we should start promptly at 6:30 and end promptly at 8:30. We began at 7 pm and then near the end felt pressed for time. We would not have felt pressed for time had we begun at 6:30 or even 6:40 for stragglers. But basically it’s more professional to start when it is advertised to start, as you and I and everyone else all have busy lives.

-the refresher slides for the first 30 minutes were helpful if dwelled on too long, but “leading” comments detracted from the neutrality of the input session. In particular the notion that difference is positive when it is harmonious (rather than compatibility equalling sameness or even likeness) was promoted, but undercut by some comments about odd or weird styles later.

-the notion that 50 minutes of repetitive isolated clicker questions constitutes an “interactive” engagement session is preposterous. This was not a good use of personal response systems (clickers) and will net poor data for analysis due to the facilitator’s non-facilitative approach (contradictory messages about our role, plenty of unexamined assumptions, an apparent inability to reason quantitatively or understand a Likert scale, and the dreaded editorializing about likes and dislikes that a facilitator should never, ever do).

-given 2 hours, some clicker-type polling around tolerances for various design elements within the audience should be a discussion-starter rather than the whole of interaction. Round tables for 6-8 people as a followup would get us all knowing each other better and sharing views about what promotes the kind of “character” we love in our various neighbourhoods and that could be achieved by zoning, permitting, etc. I think a planning student from UW would’ve done a better job designing an interactive 2 hour session! It would likely be something like 20 mins of reorientation / updates, 10-20 mins of polling to help get the concepts down around compatibility, some question time, then a good hour of roundtable focus prompts and take-up. So much could be accomplished in 2 hours and instead we got a remarkably bad use of clickers that produced unhelpful (to my mind) data.

As you can see — and probably heard from some of us last night — the facilitation skills of the hired firm were a disappointment. I know that isn’t your fault, but I sincerely hope they get this feedback somehow in order to design better sessions in future. That was very amateurish for people who are being paid as professionals.

Thanks for listening, and for working to engage the community.
Janine Oosterveld

From: Perry Grobe <grobenursery@kw.igs.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 24, 2016 4:02 PM
To: Janine Oosterveld
Cc: Berry Vranovnic
Subject: Re: Feedback to C of K online surveys.

Janine:
Thank you very much for your consideration, and for your timely response to my query.
While I will use 'I' in my statements, I wish to let you know that my father, Peter Grobe (a retired landscape architect who also lives in the study area), and I have worked together on this submission.
I can distill what I have to say to several points relative to the survey.

1) The front yard setback requirement I agree with for new homes.
2) The building height restriction I would agree with, but with a few conditions. In the example posed, the height of the building that is infilled has used as a guideline two homes that are tall on either side, but the one on the right has a subterranean garage. As so few homes in the study area are of this type, I don't believe that going down to put a too large house on an infill house with this type of garage should be permitted, if there aren't any on either side of the house to be infilled. Perhaps the height should be relative to the city street centreline elevation - not necessarily to an arbitrary point on the yards adjacent to the house being infilled.
3) This is the one that I have the most to comment upon. I'm certain that there would be considerable resistance to the inclusion of 'thrust' garages to the streetscape in the neighbourhoods, as beyond doubt this would not be in keeping with the streetscape of these neighbourhoods. I tentatively agree with what you are proposing, but again, there are unresolved issues with this.
The first of these is identified in the examples offered - which I've included here:

Janine, I nominally agree in theory with the recommendations proposed, but again with some qualifications. The single car garage as proposed on the right would seem to be a reasonable thing - but the extra front yard parking spot that has been added under the guise of a 'walkway' is totally unacceptable and should not be permitted. Certainly, a city curb cut that would provide this sort of thing is wholly unacceptable. You need only place two cars in front of the house on the right to realize that this is entirely out of character with any of the neighbourhoods in the study area. As a landscape architect, I'm continually asked by homeowners to plan such a thing, and in this case there is not only an issue of streetscape aesthetics, but one of groundwater percolation/absence of greenspace that has not been accommodated. If this has to be done by covenant, so be it.
I believe that part of this problem lies with the desire of those building to 'max out' the allowable property space with a house structure. Wholly absent from the discussion has been whether or not the SIZE of house on the lots proposed are in keeping with the neighbourhoods. If the average square footage of most of the houses on a street is, say 1400 - 1800 sq ft, then perhaps what would be 'in keeping' would be houses of the same footprint/size as what has already been established there. Building a 'larger house' does not increase
density. The example used is a bit misleading, too, as neither example would appear to be a duplex. I reside on Locust Street, and recently the house across the street from me was purchased and has been converted to duplex. Parking has been placed in the rear, as has the additional space for the new residents - so that the duplex does not change the streetscape at all. The 'type' of house proposed in the example does not take into account the ability to extend parking, driveway etc. to the rear or deeper into the side yards - and that it SHOULD if the existing streetscape has similar layouts.

In terms of garages, one of the greatest failings in newer subdivisions is the belief that an attached garage = a parking space for a car. The example on the right would not be tempted to be done if there were penalties for doing so, and if the homeowners actually used the garage for parking a vehicle. Stricter enforcement of overnight street parking bylaws would, I believe, settle this. Yes, it might inconvenience a couple to have to move cars around. But as a homeowner who has lived in the East Ward for most of his life, the ritual of moving cars from a single long driveway is a price to be paid for urban living. The example shown imposes a suburban precept on an urban situation.

4) I agree with the recommendation to sign and mail. As an advertiser to the Record, I know that they no longer have the readership to warrant an ad as being the sole place of posting. Another thought would be to break the city into neighbourhoods, and post these changes to a web page that could be an RSS feed to those interested. Let's face it, most people care most about where they directly live. If you had all of the variances posted for East Ward to RSS, it would be bookmarked and thus new ones would be easily seen and found.

5) Re: Site Plan Approval for homes in my neighbourhood (it was interesting to find the example from my street there). Goodness Janine - I think the planning folks have enough on their plate, and enough difficulty getting larger projects through site plan approval, to think about considering this for every situation in the study area. However, I think that a 'modified' Site Plan approval process for these sort of developments might be warranted. To do this might require quite a bit of work to establish design guidelines for those communities in the study area that in fact might run contrary to those that are currently in place for newer areas or larger projects. I'm all for more time being spent to make sure that the buildings are 'in keeping'... but 'preserving heritage' can easily run amok to what might be considered reasonable by the residents. Putting together some kind of guidelines might require a lot more public input, but I think might make this something worthwhile. Under those qualifications, I support the use of Site Plan Approval.

6) I think the Citizen's guide should have the design guidelines I've alluded to. It should also include a timeline of how much time the steps in the process (for permits etc.) and associated permit costs might be.

7) Additionally... I don't believe any tree planting that is on private property (not city owned) should fall under the auspices of site plan approval in the study area. Buffering or screening of parking or other structures maybe - but the resident of the space should not be dictated to as to what tree is suitable. Continuity of street tree planting should not be done on private property - but on city property only. This should resolve issues with large ill-suited native maples like Sugar maples being planted under hydro lines.

Finally, I live in the study area, as does my father (Peter), so please consider this a comment from 2 residents. Both our postal codes begin with N2H.

Thanks again for your kind attention to these comments.

Sincerely,

Perry J. Grobe

"Grobe's...Where the Accent Is On Grow!"

OALA, CSLA

GROBE NURSERY AND GARDEN CENTRE
1787 Greenhouse Road
R.R. #2
Breslau, Ontario N0B 1M0
Just off Kitchener-Guelph Hwy 7

info@grobenursery.com
http://www.grobenursery.com

Ph: 519-648-2247
Fax: 519-648-3439

landscapeontario.com

LandscapeOntario.com - Green For Life!
Dear Janine,

I understand the RIENS comments are due today. For this study, please accept our previous correspondence to include. I have also attached our presentation to Kitchener’s Planning and Strategic Initiatives Committee on August 12 2013 which still applies. We believe that there is growing demand for gentle density and modern infill housing found in larger cities. We ask you to consider flexible, and effective rules, to support this housing type. We have worked on your official plan policies and hope your city can promote modern infill housing that enhances neighbourhood character - this is about promoting compatible infill and allowing for some change.

In particularly, we ask that your process support modern housing designs and to consider 8 and 10 Bismark Avenue as an example. In addition to the immediate adjacent properties, neighbourhood should be viewed and evaluated in context of a larger context as these neighbourhoods were built over time. Some flexibility on reduced rear yards will be needed. If you want a strong streetscape, we encourage to maintain the 4.5 façade setback provision as this is the basis of our model. We would also encourage car port designs, reduced lot areas, reduced rear yards as considerations in the zoning and to allow for greater flexibility on height given new lots will be more narrow. Based on our trial site plan process, we express concern about architectural review comments. We believe our design can set the standard for modern infill housing. Please consider our designs in your process as we have been working on this for five years and supports many of your Reorganization Study findings. There is exciting architecture and award winning infill homes in Ottawa and we believe Kitchener can offer a similar experience.

Thank you for you consideration. I have copied Rick Merrill and a discussion is encouraged.

Sincerely,

Ben Eby
Low Rise Housing – A new form of urban intensification (gentle density)

Planning & Strategic Initiatives Committee
Residential Intensification – Infill Housing
August 12, 2013

The Planning Partnership
“urban” Low-Rise Housing

- Found in larger cities like Vancouver, Toronto and Ottawa

- Located near: transit, amenities + creative employment

- Provides housing choices that complements high-density condos

- A broad demographic - includes families

- A form of “gentle density” when high quality design provided
Local Experience + Context

- Limited local examples

- Some positive examples that enhance neighbourhood – more is needed

- Growing creative class + high density urban housing:
  - Victoria Commons
  - City Centre
  - 1 Victoria

- inTownInc. first company to introduce modern low-rise infill housing found in larger cities

Waterloo semi-detached home
Allen Street (over $500,000)

Mansion St. Towns
Urban Infill Examples in TO & Ottawa

(no site plan required)
InTown Inc. First Project in “Innovation District”

(through committee of adjustment process)

Through Committee of Adjustment:

CofA included: conceptual site plan | landscape plan | conceptual elevations

Company has set a new standard for low rise infill housing through CofA process

Project approved and moving forward
Revised plans
(for modern urban living with landscaping)
Report CSD 13-084
Residential Intensification – Infill Housing

- Company support a “high standard” of urban design / compatibility.

- City can add more tools in Committee of Adjustment process to evaluate intensification projects – not site plan process.

- New tools can be added to Committee of Adjustment process like 8+10 Bismark Ave. – these address “compatibility” through a streamlined, coordinated and cost effective process. These are small projects and a simple process would work.

- Urban zoning regulations are needed – 8+10 Bismark provides a good precedent.

- Need to talk about engineering process for this type of small scale housing.

- Flexibility and costs are required for market conditions and project viability.

- Kitchener has opportunity to be a leader in Region for this type of modern infill.

- Work together for right tools.
Hi Janine,

For the past several years I have been building infill homes in Waterloo (Uptown west) under the operating company NEO Developments Inc. To date we have demolished and rebuilt (3) homes in the area, are about to renovate a heritage style house, and have (2) more new builds lined up for the spring of 2017. The NEO brand revolves around small scale development, as we have carved out a niche for developing unique custom re-build designs (every model is tastefully designed to accommodate the owner, and neighbourhood needs, with the exterior appearance a high priority). Volume is not our mandate.

As you know in Kitchener, I am operating under the Intown Inc. name, and want to let you know I am concerned about proposed height restriction recommendations. To help explain my concern, the attached house located at 108 Dawson St. (FYI, I found this review on social media) is essentially at the current 10.5m limit, which accommodates the foundation, 10’ main floor (which is very important on small scale houses, to make them feel more spacious than the property generally allows), 9’ second floor, and necessary sloped roof. The contemporary style of the home is irrelevant, as 27 Menno (which is diagonally located across the street), was constructed in a traditional manner. It too, also wouldn’t have complied with a 8.5m high limit.

I would like to reiterate and express my concern over this proposed change, and would not like to see projects like this on, be referred to the committee of adjustment over the 2.0m difference in height. If anything, we would like to see the height limit increased modestly, to accommodate loft style 3rd floors. This has been expressed to the City of Kitchener in past correspondence.

I appreciate your time to read this email, and am happy to discuss further.

Thanks,

-Ben
The sexiest house in Waterloo award goes to...
To: Rod Regier, Commissioner of Planning, Development & Legislative Services

Cc: Janine Oosterveld, Manager of Site Development & Customer Service, Planning Division, City of Kitchener
    Leon Bensason, Coordinator, Cultural Heritage Planning, City of Kitchener

From: Members of the Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC)

Subject: Support for the City of Kitchener Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

The Region of Waterloo’s Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC) commends the City of Kitchener’s effort to undertake the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS) and would like to show their support for the proactive approach taken to manage redevelopment and intensification in established neighbourhoods.

The committee reviewed and discussed the draft recommendations presented at the public workshop held on Oct. 27, 2016. HPAC is supportive of the City’s review of its planning approval process to determine if it will be effective in preserving Kitchener’s established neighbourhoods. The unique character of many of these older communities
is well defined and has evolved organically over time. It will be important to manage change in these sensitive neighbourhoods as the introduction of light rail transit and legislated intensification creates the potential for significant transformations through more rapid and large-scale redevelopment. HPAC particularly commends the recommendation to explore the requirement for site plan approval in neighbourhoods identified in the City's Cultural Heritage Landscape Study in an effort to ensure that new developments are complementary to the character of the existing streetscapes and housing stock.

Following Council approval, HPAC encourages the City of Kitchener to share the RIENS findings with other Area Municipal planning staff. This sharing of information may encourage similar reviews of planning approval processes in other municipalities, leading to the conservation of many of the Region’s unique, often historic, established neighbourhoods.
Good evening,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the RIEN Study. My apologies for the late comments, but I hope you find them to be of assistance.

As a starting point, I would like to suggest that the general context for which this study will apply to is smaller scale developments. That is to say, smaller infill lots, underutilized properties, or properties that are falling into disrepair to the point that it makes more sense to reconstruct than to renovate are the main area of focus. My comments are specific to the these types of projects and do not consider renovations and/or additions to existing structures.

It is my opinion that the proposed regulations are too restrictive and will have a high likelihood of deterring small projects from ever occurring. Small scale intensification can provide for some of the most compatible forms of intensification, because of their very nature of being "small" (i.e. less impact on traffic, infrastructure, natural environment, large shadowing, etc.). In general, these types of developments should be welcomed by the City and it's significance in contributing to intensification targets should not be taken lightly. They encourage a wider array of developers to participate since they are more feasible for small developers and can realize a wider array of designs and forms due to the creativity needed around smaller lot sizes. Kitchener is a progressive and innovative City and we need to allow for creative forms of housing to achieve intensification goals.

With the above in mind, I have summarized my comments as follows:

1. The proposed regulations are much too prohibitive and directly conflict with the City's Official Plan policies. Even the least dense residential designation, Low Rise Residential, which compromises much of the City and the study area, encourages a range of housing forms and heights. To suggest that a 3-storey single detached home may not be appropriate next to a bungalow or even a 2-storey is taking a step backwards in planning theory. If the use proposed is compatible with its surroundings, than it should be promoted. Even new subdivisions promote a range of building heights, including taller, narrower townhouses next to single-detached homes. The following Low Rise Residential Official Plan policies are noted:
   1. Policy 15.D.3.9 - The City will encourage and support the mixing and integrating of innovative and different forms of housing to achieve and maintain a low-rise built form.
   2. Policy 15.D.3.12. - No building will exceed 3 storeys or 11 metres in height, at the highest grade elevation, whichever is the lesser...
2. Do not confuse poor architecture and design with compatible form. Many of the greatest cities have a mixing of housing types and densities. It creates vibrancy and uniqueness. With time, any well designed building will blend into the urban fabric and will add to the character of the neighbourhood. Neighbourhoods should always be evolving and different housing styles should be introduced. We should be moving away from homogeneous facade types to those that provide diversity and different housing choice. Design is very subjective and NIMBYism will be faced on almost all intensification
projects. The City needs to take the position that they welcome intensification and redevelopment in existing neighbourhoods.

3. The areas of study already share a mix of building heights and setbacks. In particular, the Vanier and Rockway neighbourhoods are filled with bungalows and two-storey homes which are adjacent to three and four storey apartment buildings, ranging from triples to 15-plexes. These neighbourhoods showcase a variety of housing forms, building locations and heights. These different housing forms were introduced adjacent to each other 50-70 years ago when they were first developed. Just because what's beside someone right now may not be the same shape and form as what is proposed, does not make it inappropriate or incompatible. In my opinion, basic zoning regulations in place today generally provide for appropriate design guidance in these study areas.

4. How can neighbourhoods ever intensify if they are limited to their low density surroundings? The best intensification areas are those with larger lots that have smaller homes on them. From a land price perspective, these are the most attractive to redevelop. However, the proposed policies do not support that notion, limiting redevelopment to a very low rise format, and in some cases, to a smaller scale than what currently exists on the property. Said policies won't encourage redevelopment.

5. Limiting heights to potentially 8.5m would barely accommodate a two story home in most cases. Between land costs, building costs and demolition costs, more ability to build up is required. I would suggest that current low rise zoning permitting 10.5m is appropriate.

6. Both setbacks and height limitations should not be determined by just the neighbouring properties. There are so many other factors to consider and each site should be evaluated on its own merits. Consider the following scenarios:
   1. What if the current building on the site is a tall building or has reduced setbacks than its neighbours? Should it not be permitted to be rebuilt as such?
   2. What about properties with large side yard setbacks from their neighbours? This separation should lessen any perceived impact and should be considered.
   3. What about taller structures on the opposite side of the street? Do they not also influence the street facade?
   4. How do you apply the regulations to a corner lot?

7. Leave current front yard setbacks as are currently provided for, unless a road widening is required. These encourage homes to be brought closer to the street and foster social interaction. They also help support redevelopment on shallower lots.

8. I agree with the principle of not allowing a garage to project past a front porch/entrance. This is a good design principle that should be implemented City-wide and would solve a lot of the poor infill designs that have occurred in recent past.

9. Do not require Site Plan Control on projects under 3 units. This adds significant cost and time to small projects, which may render them uneconomical.


11. I often hear from Council the importance of affordable housing in the City. Small scale intensification makes this possible, but the reality is that a developer will need the ability to build taller and occupy a larger footprint to achieve economies of scale.

I fully appreciate that there has been some recent history of poorly designed homes. My recommendation is to simply use the Consent or Minor Variance process to require a developer to submit building elevations/site plan to the satisfaction of the City as a condition of their approval. This will capture the majority of infill and redevelopment projects and provides the appropriate flexibility for staff to comment on and "control" the design. However, it does not restrict a developer to unreasonable regulations. Every property has its own context and should therefore be analyzed independently.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,