Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods

Engagement Session #3

OCTOBER 27, 2016
The purpose of the RIENS study is to:

• Review the zoning rules that currently apply.
• Review the City’s planning approval process for new development in established neighbourhoods to determine if changes to the process are necessary.

Why does it matter?

• Recommendations from the RIENS study will determine the process for evaluating future development applications.
• Ultimately, this could impact the feasibility of an application and the timing of development.

The purpose of this engagement session is to:

• Provide an update on the status of the project.
• Present and receive feedback on the draft recommendations.
Study Area
Process and Deliverables

Task 1: Background Review
- Review all background information
- Review of City’s tools and practices
- Review examples of intensification in Kitchener
- Engagement Session #1
- Stakeholder Meeting #1

Task 2: Preparation of Options
- Preparation of Options (Interim) Report
- Meeting with Committee/Council
- Engagement Session #2
- Stakeholder Meeting #2
- Bus Tour

Task 3: Preferred Recommendation
- Engagement Session #3
- Stakeholder Meeting #3
- Preparation of Final Report
- Presentation to Council/Committee

RIENS – Engagement Session #3
October 27, 2016
A number of draft recommendations have been prepared and they fall into the following categories:

• Change some of the existing Zoning Rules within the Study Area;
• Review the zoning classifications that apply in some specific residential areas;
• Enhance the notification process for Consent and Minor Variance applications;
• Require Site Plan Approval in certain areas as a pilot project;
• Update the Urban Design Manual; and,
• Develop a Citizen’s Guide on Intensification.
Draft Recommendations

1. Change some of the existing Zoning Rules within the Study Area.

   A. Draft Recommendation for Front Yard Setback:
      • Should be the average front yard setback of the two adjacent dwellings.

   B. Draft Recommendation for Building Height:
      • 8.5 metres or the average of the adjacent dwellings on either side (single detached, semi-detached, triplex, or streetfronting townhouses in the R-3 to R-6 zones).

   C. Draft Recommendations for Garage Width, Garage Projection and Driveway Width:
      • When lot width is less than 15 metres, limit to single car garage and single driveway.
      • When lot width is greater than 15 metres, permit double car garage and double driveway.
• The current minimum permitted front yard setback is a minimum of 4.5 metres.
• There is no maximum front yard.
• Under the current rules, a new dwelling is permitted to locate towards the back of a property (as long as the rear yard setback is maintained) even if the front yards of the adjacent dwellings are much closer to the street.

* Minimum front yard setback to garage is 6.0 metres.

Streetview of dwelling (shown in middle) that is set back farther than the adjacent dwellings on either side.

Example 1

Existing dwelling
New dwelling could locate here.
Existing dwelling

Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 7.5 metres

Average setback of adjacent dwellings.

Minimum Front Yard Setback: 4.5 metres*
Front Yard Setback

- Under the current rules, a new dwelling is also permitted to locate at the minimum front yard setback of 4.5 metres from the street, even if the front yards of the adjacent dwellings are located farther than 4.5 metres from the street.

**Example 2**

Minimum Front Yard Setback: 4.5 metres*

* Minimum front yard setback to garage is 6.0 metres.

Average setback of adjacent dwellings.
• **Draft Recommendation:** That the front wall of the dwelling be in line with the average front yard setback of the two adjacent dwellings on both sides of the lot.

• This ensures consistency of the location of dwellings on a lot relative to the existing dwellings on the street, particularly those that are immediately adjacent to the new development.

Under the draft recommendations, the front wall of a new dwelling would be permitted near the yellow line (below).

*Minimum Rear Yard Setback: 7.5 metres*

*Minimum front yard setback to garage is 6.0 metres.*
Scenario 1: Street with one-storey dwellings

- The current maximum permitted building height is 10.5 metres (which can accommodate three-storeys).

- Draft Recommendation: That the maximum permitted building height be 8.5 metres (which can only accommodate two-storeys).
Scenario 2: Street with multi-storey dwellings with a building height greater than 8.5 metres.

- The current maximum permitted building height is 10.5 metres.
- On some streets in the RIENS study area, there are existing dwellings that are already higher than 8.5 metres.

**Draft Recommendation:**

\[
\text{Average of A and B} = \frac{A + B}{2} = \text{Maximum Building Height}
\]

- 10.5 metres
- 10.25 metres
- 10.0 metres
## Garage Width, Garage Projection and Driveway Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• There are currently no rules for garage width and projection in the RIENS study area.</th>
<th><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Garage Example" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This means that this is possible.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Garage Example" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.
2. Review the zoning classifications that apply in some specific residential areas.

- There are some residential areas in the RIENS study area that are zoned R-6 and R-7 that are the site of mainly single detached dwellings and where multiple dwellings are permitted.
- Criteria to assess the re-zoning of these areas could include: consistency of dwelling types in the area, development potential, adjacent land uses and proximity to transit.
- **Draft Recommendation:**
  A. Within secondary plan areas, that the City review the zoning for these areas as part of the future secondary plan review process; and,
  B. Outside of secondary plan areas, that the City review the zoning for these areas as part of the ongoing CRoZBy process.
3. Enhance the notification process for Consent and Minor Variance applications.

• Currently, the City provides notice in the newspaper (which is the minimum requirement) and mails notices to property owners within a 30 metre radius of the subject property (as a courtesy) for Consent and Minor Variance applications.

• Draft Recommendation:
  – That the Council policy for Committee of Adjustment notification be amended by replacing the newspaper ad with the requirement to post a notice sign on the subject property where an application for consent or minor variance has been submitted. Mailed notification to property owners within a radius of the subject property would still be provided.
  – Changing the notice policies for Planning Act processes would more clearly identify properties to the public where there is a proposed change.
Draft Recommendations

Below is an example of a posted sign for a proposed Minor Variance in the City of Vaughan. This is an example of a notice enhancement that the City could require of applicants for Minor Variance and Consent applications.
4. Require Site Plan Approval in certain areas as a 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.
Draft Recommendations

Example of a street in the Central Frederick neighbourhood (above).

Areas identified as potential CHL areas.
5. Update the Urban Design Manual (UDM).

- The City’s current UDM has some guidelines that address development in the central neighbourhoods and infill development.
- The UDM is used to evaluate Planning Act applications, such as Site Plans and Minor Variances, but does not apply to projects that only require building permits.
- Examples of updates to the UDM could include: lot creation guidelines and identifying primary character and compatibility elements to consider.

Draft Recommendation:
- That the City update the UDM to more clearly address the expected form of development in the existing established neighbourhoods and provide some guidance on how future applications are to be considered.
Draft Recommendations

• If necessary, after testing out the new criteria in the UDM, a future step could include consideration of area-specific infill policies in the Official Plan.
• This could occur after on-going monitoring by the City.
• Integrating the guidelines into Official Plan policy provides the City with a further tool to assess future changes in existing established neighbourhoods.
• **Draft Recommendation:**
  – That the City monitor and consider the future need to update Official Plan policies with respect to consent applications. Infill lot creation policies could further guide the creation of lots within established residential neighbourhoods with the criteria then considered in evaluating those proposals.

- A guide may assist citizens and/or applicants in understanding the process and may reduce questions about the process.
- **Draft Recommendation:**
  - That the City prepare a ‘Citizens Guide on Intensification’.
Each table has a copy of the draft recommendations that fall within the following six categories:

- Change some of the existing Zoning Rules within the Study Area;
- Review the zoning classifications that apply in some specific residential areas;
- Enhance the notification process for Consent and Minor Variance applications;
- Require Site Plan Approval in certain areas as a pilot project;
- Update the Urban Design Manual; and,
- Develop a Citizen’s Guide on Intensification.

This exercise requires each table to ‘pick your path’.
- This means that the order, and number of, topics to discuss will be chosen based on the preferences or specific interests at each table.

Each table has a facilitator that will record feedback and comments.

Comment forms are available to provide additional feedback on topic areas that are not covered, if required.
Next Steps

The next steps will be to:

• Meet with the stakeholders group on November 3, 2016;
• Receive feedback through engageKitchener and other avenues in November 2016;
• Finalize recommendations and prepare a final report; and,
Questions?
Thank You