

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, Report No. 13, of the Committee of the Whole, which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on April 19, 2017, as follows:

***By receiving the following Communications:***

- C1. Mr. Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting, Millway Avenue, Vaughan, dated April 4, 2017;***
- C2. Ms. Lesley Knight, Keele Street, Maple, dated April 4, 2017;***
- C3. Mr. Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting, Millway Avenue, Vaughan, dated April 4, 2017;***
- C4. Mr. Mark Yarranton, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated April 4, 2017;***
- C6. Mr. Paul Tobia, Evans Planning Inc., Keele Street, Vaughan, dated April 4, 2017;***
- C10. Ms. Wendy Nott, WND Associates, Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, dated April 13, 2017;***
- C11. Ms. Wendy Nott, WND Associates, Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, dated April 13, 2017; and***
- C13. Mr. Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting, Millway Avenue, Vaughan, dated April 19, 2017.***

**5**

**COMMUNITY AREA POLICY REVIEW  
FOR LOW-RISE RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATIONS  
AMENDMENT TO THE VAUGHAN OFFICIAL PLAN 2010  
FILE 15.120.1  
WARDS 1 TO 5**

**The Committee of the Whole recommends:**

- 1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management and the Director of Policy Planning and Environmental Sustainability, dated April 4, 2017, be approved;**
- 2) That the presentation by Mr. Tim Smith, Urban Strategies Inc., Spadina Avenue, Toronto, be received;**
- 3) That the following deputations and Communication be received:**
  - 1. Mr. David Brand, Board Member of the Kleinburg and Area Residents Association (KARA), Camlaren Crescent, Kleinburg;**
  - 2. Mr. Claudio Brutto, Brutto Consulting, Edgeley Boulevard, Vaughan, on behalf of the property owners of 61-83 Hayhoe Avenue, Vaughan, and Communication C36, dated April 4, 2017;**
  - 3. Ms. Elvira Caria, Chair, Vellore Woods Ratepayers Association, Bunting Drive, Woodbridge; and**
  - 4. Mr. Robert Klein, Daleview Crescent, Kleinburg; and**
- 4) That the following Communications be received:**
  - C2. Mr. Sudhir Chopra, dated March 28, 2017;**
  - C3. Ms. Caterina Principe, Benemax Financial Group, dated March 30, 2017;**
  - C4. Mr. Frank Principe, Ontario Sales Manager, JohnVince Foods, Steeprock Drive, Toronto, dated March 30, 2017;**
  - C5. Ms. Grace Gonzalez, dated March 30, 2017;**
  - C6. Ms. Susana Alvarez, dated March 30, 2017;**
  - C7. Ms. Grace Gonzalez, dated March 30, 2017;**
  - C9. Ms. Isabel Garcia, dated March 30, 2017;**
  - C10. Ms. Helen Lepek, LEPEK Consulting Inc., Edith Drive, Toronto, dated March 30, 2017;**
  - C11. Mr. Rudy Bussoli, JohnVince Foods, Steeprock Drive, Toronto, dated March 31, 2017;**

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 2

- C13. Mr. Roger Dickinson, dated March 31, 2017;
- C14. Ms. Kathryn Angus, dated April 3, 2017;
- C15. Mr. Leo F. Longo, Aird & Berlis LLP, Bay Street, Toronto, dated April 3, 2017;
- C17. Pat Canizares, dated March 30, 2017;
- C18. Tania and Carmela Lamanna, dated April 3, 2017;
- C19. Mr. Danny Tomassini, dated April 3, 2017;
- C20. Ms. Rosemarie Humphries, Humphries Planning Group Inc., Chrislea Road, Vaughan, dated April 3, 2017;
- C21. Ms. Rosemarie Humphries, Humphries Planning Group Inc., Chrislea Road, Vaughan, dated April 3, 2017;
- C22. Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, Associate/Senior Planner, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated April 3, 2017;
- C23. Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, Associate/Senior Planner, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated April 3, 2017;
- C24. Ms. N. Jane Pepino, Aird & Berlis LLP, Bay Street, Toronto, dated April 3, 2017;
- C25. Alfio and Agata Tomassini, dated April 3, 2017;
- C26. Maria and Eraldo Di Pasquale, dated April 3, 2017;
- C27. Ms. Josie Palermo, dated April 3, 2017;
- C28. Bernadette and Antonio Rafael, dated April 3, 2017;
- C29. Paulette and John Cutler, dated April 3, 2017;
- C30. Maria and Martino Donato, dated April 4, 2017;
- C31. Mr. Ryan Guetter, Vice President, Weston Consulting Group, Millway Avenue, Vaughan, dated April 4, 2017;
- C32. Mr. Ryan Virtanen, Partner, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated April 4, 2017;
- C33. Mr. Ryan Virtanen, Partner, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated April 4, 2017; and
- C34. Mr. Mark Yarranton, President, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated April 4, 2017.

**Recommendation**

The Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management and the Director of Policy Planning and Environmental Sustainability recommend:

1. THAT the presentation on the City-Wide Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations, Amendment to Vaughan Official Plan 2010 BE RECEIVED; and
2. THAT the draft amendment to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010, forming Attachment 4 to this report, reflecting the modifications set out in Section (6) and Attachment 2 hereto, BE APPROVED and be brought forward for adoption subject to final staff review.

**Contribution to Sustainability**

The recommended Official Plan amendment is consistent with the Green Directions Vaughan mandate by supporting Goal 2:

- To ensure sustainable development and redevelopment.

**Economic Impact**

There are no economic impacts resulting from the approval of this report.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 3

#### **Communications Plan**

On March 21, 2017, a Courtesy Notice of this Committee of the Whole meeting was mailed/e-mailed to those individuals who requested notification as a result of the Public Hearing on November 1, 2016 and/or by written correspondence. This notice was also posted on the City's website at [www.vaughan.ca](http://www.vaughan.ca), the City Page Online.

#### **Purpose**

To report on the issues that emerged from the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing and the proposed changes resulting from the subsequent staff review, earlier consultation with stakeholders including BILD; and to obtain direction to proceed with adoption of the recommended amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010), subject to final staff review.

#### **Background - Analysis and Options**

##### **Executive Summary**

This technical report addresses issues identified as a result of the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations study and the proposed amendments to VOP 2010 (Volume 1). The report is structured as follows, thereby providing:

- (1) Key Messages
- (2) Study Origin and Response
- (3) The Consultation Process – the public and City/external agencies;
- (4) The Policy Context;
- (5) Overview of the Policy Review: Identifying Vaughan's established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods in Established Community Areas;
- (6) Issues Identified in Deputations and Communications received at the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing and November 15, 2016 Council meeting;
- (7) Recommended policy amendments to VOP 2010;

##### **Attachments**

The following supporting material is found in the attachments.

1. The Policy Review: Vaughan Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study – October 2016
2. The Community Area Policy Review Technical Report - Comments Received
3. The Community Consultation Summary Report – What We Heard
4. The Draft Amendment to the VOP 2010
5. The Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods
6. The Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) Extract – November 1, 2016

##### **(1) Key Messages**

In summary, key messages defining this process and the outcome include:

- The amendments are targeted at the Low-Rise Residential designation within the Community Areas.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 4

- The intent of the proposed policy amendments is to ensure that townhouse development and other forms of infill development are compatible with Low-Rise Residential areas in Established Community Areas, consistent with the policies of VOP 2010, addressing issues such as the appropriate location, buffering, and orientation to public roads.
- One of the main changes provides that townhouse dwellings will only be permitted in the Low-Rise Residential designation in Established Community Areas on parcels of land with frontage onto arterial roads, subject to criteria.
- Notwithstanding the last point, it is not the intent of the amendments to prohibit the development of townhouses in undeveloped or developing parts of the Low-Rise Residential Area (i.e. Developing Community Areas) that have previous approvals for townhouses that are unbuilt at this time. Undeveloped areas that have been or will proceed through a planning process, including Block Plans, zoning, and draft plans of subdivision that have planned for this housing form should be allowed to proceed.
- The areas with frontage onto arterial roads in the Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods in existing Community Areas are not Intensification Areas, as reflected in the Vaughan Official Plan and endorsed by the Region of York and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board, in accordance with the Provincial Growth Plan.
- Within Intensification Corridors, Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods with properties that are rear lotted on the arterial street or have frontage on a window street parallel to the arterial street are generally not considered to be appropriate for intensification, as set out in Policies 2.2.59 (Regional Corridors) and 2.2.5.14 (Primary Intensification Corridors).
- Community Areas are not intended to “experience significant physical change” (VOP 2010). It is the intent that any townhouse development in the Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods in Established Community Areas have high regard for compatibility with the adjacent Low-Rise Residential areas.
- The policies will permit townhouse dwellings on arterial roads in the Low-Rise Residential areas in Established Community Areas; however, they must conform to the OMB approved Official Plan policies, as informed by the design guidelines that were approved by Council on October 19, 2016. In conforming to the policies and guidelines, the development yield may be reduced.
- Development on small or irregularly shaped parcels often present design challenges that compromise the ability to achieve infill townhouse development on the arterial frontages that would be attractive, functional and compatible with the surrounding area. In these instances, land assembly is preferred. The policies confirm that the application of a Block Plan process to plan on a multi-parcel basis is an available option.
- Where permitted, townhouses in a Low-Rise Residential neighbourhood within Established Community Areas do not include stacked townhouses, or “back-to-back” townhouses.
- It is also not the intent to eliminate townhouse development from the developing Community Areas or the new Secondary Plan areas (New Community Areas) as their planning processes provided for the integration of townhouse development through their respective Secondary Plans and subsequent approval processes.

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 5

- If it is determined through the application of the policies of VOP 2010 that a proposed townhouse development does not conform to the Official Plan, the applicant may apply for an Official Plan amendment to seek relief from the contentious policies. While the Official Plan amendment would be considered on its own merits, the intent of maintaining compatibility with the established Low-Rise Residential community will remain a priority consideration.
- It is recognized that there may be instances where lands located in the Low-Rise Residential designation in the Community Areas (either fronting onto an arterial or elsewhere) are in transition (i.e. there are multiple proposals for alternative uses or densities). The option remains with Council to direct that a study be undertaken to determine the long range future of such areas, which may result in an Official Plan amendment.
- The effect of the policies will not substantially impact the supply of housing or compromise the Provincial, Regional and City policies regarding intensification. It may marginally reduce the number of townhouses through the need to conform to the design policies, on arterial townhouse sites, in the Low-Rise Residential areas in Established Community Areas.
- Provincial direction requiring the accommodation of secondary suites in residential areas as-of-right has the potential to substantially increase the number of residential units in the Low-Rise Residential designation. As a result, removing townhouses from the designation will have minimal impact on the housing supply or mix, while maintaining the physical character of the residential areas. Council has approved amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan and By-law 1-88 to permit Secondary suites along with an implementation program. The adoption of the implementing Official Plan amendment is expected in the second quarter of this year
- The fact that there are minor restrictions in the number of townhouse units that may result from the proposed amendments, overall affordability will not be affected. In 2015 the average sale price of resale townhomes was approximately \$575,283 on a Region-wide basis (Affordable Housing Monitoring Analysis, York Region, 2016). This is beyond the regional affordability limit of \$459,170 (Affordable Housing Monitoring Analysis, York Region, 2016). Regional data for 2016 is not available as yet. Indications are for 2016, the average price of a resale townhouse in Vaughan exceeded \$800,000 (T.R.E.B.). Secondary suites have a greater potential to provide affordable units in this context.
- All development applications submitted in the Low-Rise Residential areas in the Established Community Areas prior to the approval of the amendments to the Official Plan resulting from this process will be reviewed on the basis of the policies that were in effect at the time the applications were submitted. However, such applications would be subject to the Urban Design Guidelines approved by Council on October 19, 2016. These guidelines were based on the existing policies and will be considered in the review of all such applications.
- The lands in the Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods in the Established Community Areas are worthy of protection. They help to define Vaughan and will continue to do so well into the future. They provide an important source of housing, and traditionally have formed the basis of the City's stable neighbourhoods and communities.
- The new role of the Low-Rise Residential designation in the Established Community Areas as a provider of Secondary Suites will further enhance these locations as a source of a broad array of housing services, extending from Secondary Suites to large lot single detached dwellings.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 6

- Any changes to the density, character and ambience of the established Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods in the Established Community Areas needs to be carefully considered, with appropriate public input, technical analysis and Council scrutiny and approval.

(2) Study Origin and Response

On March 18, 2014, Council adopted a resolution directing that a review of the VOP 2010 be undertaken pertaining to the policies that permit single and semi-detached houses and townhouses in Low-Rise Residential Areas. Staff was directed to specifically review the Low-Rise Residential permissions and associated urban design and land use compatibility policies and report back to Committee with policy options to protect stable residential neighbourhoods including but not limited to opportunities for amendments to VOP 2010.

On September 2, 2014, a Members Motion was brought forward to Committee of the Whole seeking Council's direction to enact an Interim Control By-law (ICBL), freezing development on lands designated Low-Rise Residential, fronting Keele Street from Church Street to Fieldgate Drive in the community of Maple until the completion of the City-wide policy review on Low-Rise Residential areas was complete.

On September 3, 2014, Council ratified the Committee recommendation authorizing the ICBL and subsequently enacted the Keele Street Interim Control By-law 120-2014, which was later subject to Ontario Municipal Board appeals.

At the June 16, 2015 Committee of the Whole Public Hearing, staff reported on the work of the City's consultant undertaking the City-wide policy review. The consultant's work encompassed both the City-wide Low-Rise Residential Policy Review and the Keele Street Interim Control By-law study.

The one-year term of the Interim Control By-law ended on September 3, 2015. On June 23, 2015, it was resolved "That Council not extend the interim control by-law and that any discussion of townhouse densities be referred to the comprehensive five year official plan review mandated by the Planning Act...".

On October 7, 2015, a Members motion was brought forward to Committee of the Whole seeking Council's direction for staff to undertake a study of the policies governing land use change in the Community Area of VOP 2010. The resolution provided:

*Whereas, the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP-2010) identifies Community Areas, which are primarily characterized by ground related residential housing stock that is subject to the Low-Rise Residential designation of the Plan;*

*Whereas, policies are provided in VOP 2010 to protect and strengthen the character of these areas;*

*Whereas, the Community Areas will remain mostly stable; while some incremental change is expected to occur as neighbourhoods mature, such change is not intended to result in significant physical change;*

*Whereas, limited intensification may be permitted in Community Areas, provided that such development must be sensitive to and compatible with the character, form and planned function of the surrounding areas;*

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 7

*Whereas, in consideration of the application of the current Community Areas policies, it is appropriate to review the policies pertaining to the Community Areas, to ensure that they provide the appropriate level of clarity and direction necessary to maintain the special character of these areas.*

*It is therefore recommended: that staff undertake a study of the policies governing land use change in the Community Areas of VOP 2010;*

- 1. That the study examine such policies in consideration of the following criteria:*
  - Clarity of interpretation;*
  - Ability to ensure compatibility;*
  - The need to provide more definitive policy and or schedules;*
  - Such criteria as may emerge as a result of the study;*
  - Recommended policy amendments or schedules as required;*
- 2. That the study identify implementation options for the consideration of Council, as required;*
- 3. That staff report in the first quarter of 2016 on the findings of the study implementation options and to obtain Council direction on further actions.*

Committee of the Whole approved the resolution, which was ratified by Council on October 20, 2015. Council, in its approval, modified the resolution by directing staff to also consider *best practices in other jurisdictions*.

On March 1, 2016, staff brought forward a report to Committee of the Whole to address Council's direction of October 20, 2015. The staff report included the draft *Policy Review: Vaughan Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study*, conducted by Urban Strategies Inc., which responded to the criteria contained in the October 20, 2015 Council resolution. In addition, staff also brought forward implementation options based on the findings of the review.

Three options were recommended which included: 1) Development and Implementation of Urban Design Guidelines in support of the policies of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010; 2) Development and implementation of a set of recommended Official Plan Amendments; and 3) To incorporate the proposed amendments to VOP 2010 into the City's Municipal Comprehensive Review process. Council directed that staff proceed with Options 1 and 2, where a set of Urban Design Guidelines would be prepared, in addition to proceeding immediately with amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010.

In addition, Council ratified the Committee recommendation on March 22, 2016 and in doing so modified Recommendation 2 of the Committee report to provide as follows:

That the draft "General Low-Rise Residential Infill Guidelines" and the draft "Townhouse Infill Guidelines" set out in this report, applying to the Low-Rise Residential Areas within the Community Areas of VOP 2010, be received and distributed to stakeholders for comment and that such comment is requested no later than May 31, 2016, and that community meetings, if required, be organized in all Wards;

As a result, staff and the consultants conducted three Public Open Houses at three separate locations (east, west and central) throughout the City to provide the affected communities with the opportunity to review the proposed amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010, the Urban Design Guidelines, and the work completed to-date. Comments from stakeholders and the public were collected until immediately after Council's deadline of May 31, 2016.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 8

In accordance with Council's March 22, 2016 direction, on October 5, 2016 Committee of the Whole considered a staff report on the Low-Rise Residential Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods. The Guidelines address the current VOP 2010 policies and provide guidance in their application. The policy amendments provided herein are proposed to provide greater clarity in the application of the current policies of VOP 2010 when addressing infill development.

On October 5, 2016 Committee of the Whole recommended "That the draft Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods be approved". Further information was requested in the form of a communication to Council.

On October 19, 2016, Council ratified the Committee recommendation to approve the Urban Design Guidelines for Low-Rise Residential Designated areas. Further direction was provided to examine alternative treatments for deeper lots fronting onto arterial streets that would include the introduction of private laneways. This is addressed in more detail in Section (6) g) "Urban Design Guidelines"

On November 1, 2016 the report on the proposed amendments VOP 2010, as directed by Council on March 22, 2016, proceeded to Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing). The Committee received the Public Hearing report and presentation on the City-wide Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations Study and the proposed amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010).

On November 15, 2016, Council ratified the Committee recommendation resulting from the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing report, which was amended by the addition of the following: "By approving that the draft official plan amendment address issues raised due to the differences with shape and size of lots proposed for low rise intensification".

Communications and deputations were received from stakeholders and members of the public as a result of the public hearing process. These responses are discussed in the main body of this report, in Section (6) "Issues Identified in Deputations and Communications ...." and in Attachment 2, "Comments Received".

#### (3) The Consultation Process: The Public and City Departments and External Agencies

As a result of the March 1, 2016 report, staff conducted a public consultation process that led up to Committee of the Whole's October 5, 2016 consideration of the Urban Design Guidelines and the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing on the proposed amendments to VOP 2010.

As directed by Council, staff solicited feedback from the stakeholders, the public, and government agencies through Public Open Houses, Technical Advisory Committee meetings, and via the City's website. Comments from the public were requested no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2016, and comments were also obtained from community meetings. The public consultation strategy resulted in the production of the attached summary report entitled Community Consultation Summary Report – What We Heard (Attachment 3).

The following activities comprised the public consultation process, which informed the preparation of the recommended amendments:

##### a) Public Open Houses

- i. April 19, 2016 - 7:00 pm - 9:00 pm - Vaughan City Hall
- ii. May 10, 2016 - 7:00 pm - 9:00 pm - North Thornhill Community Centre
- iii. May 11, 2016 - 7:00 pm - 9:00 pm - Vellore Village Community Centre



## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 9

Each of the public consultation meetings began with an open house component where the public was able to review a series of presentation panels describing the project, the background and proposed policy amendments and urban design guidelines. This was followed by a formal presentation from the City's lead consulting team focusing on the background, methodology, rationale and proposed recommendations. A question and answer period was held after the presentation for those members of the public wanting to hold more detailed discussions with the study team.

The public was notified of the study and these meetings by way of newspaper ads in the Vaughan Citizen and Thornhill Liberal on April 7<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016. In addition, the public was notified through the City's social media channels, electronic signage, targeted mail outs, and Councillor Newsletters.

#### b) Interactive Information and Updates

Prior to the three public meetings, the following information was made available on the City's project page:

- The March 1, 2016 Committee of the Whole staff report;
- A copy of the proposed Official Plan Amendments to VOP 2010 and "Draft General Infill Guidelines" and "Townhouse Infill Guidelines";
- A Feedback form;
- The Presentation Panels;
- The Open House Presentation.

#### c) The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Designations Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was composed of internal City departmental staff and external agencies. Representation on the TAC included staff from Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning, Development Planning, Policy Planning and Environmental Sustainability, and staff from Community Planning and Development Services at the Region of York. The process provided for two TAC meetings, which were held on the following dates:

##### i. TAC Meeting 1 - May 10, 2016

The initial meeting served as an introduction to the project staff, consultants, and work program going forward. The TAC was given an update on the status of the study, followed by a presentation on the draft policy amendments and Urban Design Guidelines that were presented to Committee of the Whole on March 1, 2016. The TAC provided a number of comments and considerations that were noted by the study team.

##### ii. TAC Meeting 2 - June 29, 2016

The lead consultants presented the changes made to the draft policy amendments and Urban Design Guidelines based on feedback received from the written submissions and the public open houses. This included discussion of the Community Consultation Summary Report and the major issues raised in the Policy Review report.

#### d) Meeting with BILD (York Region Chapter)

On October 11, 2016 staff met with representatives of the York Region Chapter of BILD to discuss the implications of the proposed amendments resulting from this study. Concerns

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 10

discussed at the meeting included the opinion that the limitation on the use of private laneways was overly restrictive and that the Guidelines did not recognize situations on arterial streets where there were deeper lots. It was noted that these types of proposals have in the past proceeded on the basis of an Official Plan Amendment application. The outcome of this meeting was reported by way of Communication C6, Report No. 34 to the Council meeting of October 19, 2016. The communication was directed as a result of the staff report to Committee of the Whole on October 5, 2016 on the “Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Areas” (Attachment 5).

The results of this process have informed the preparation of this report.

#### (4) Policy Context

The current policy regime governing the development of the Low-Rise Residential Area originates from a number of Provincial, Regional and City sources. The detailed policies of VOP 2010, in accordance with Provincial and Regional policy, provide direction on the uses permitted and the development and urban design policies to be applied when considering individual planning initiatives. An overview of the planning context is discussed in the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing report (Attachment 6), in Section 2 of the report titled “Policy Context”.

#### (5) Overview of Policy Review: Identifying Vaughan’s established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods in Established Community Areas

As part of the study, the consultant undertook an analysis to identify the City’s established Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods. An overview of the methodology, study conclusions and recommendations is provided in the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing report, (Attachment 6) Section 5 titled “Overview of Policy Review: Identifying Vaughan’s Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods”.

#### (6) Issues Identified in Deputations and Communications received at the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing and November 15, 2016 Council Meeting

Staff received submissions from a number of sources, which will be addressed in this report. For the purpose of responding to the comments and requested changes, two categories of revisions were identified. These include:

- a. Issues raised by multiple parties that may have broader policy implications; and
- b. Other issues that may be resolved through minor changes to the policies of VOP 2010 or further clarification.

Issues that have broader implications are discussed in the staff report in the subsection entitled “Identified Issues and Responses”, which is set out below. More minor issues are identified and commented on in the “Community Area Policy Review Technical Report - Comments Received”, forming Attachment 2. Where warranted, modifications to the proposed amendments to VOP 2010 Volume 1 have been recommended.

#### The Responses to the Comments

Several objectives were considered in analyzing the submissions made by landowners, planning consultants, residents, and commenting agencies regarding the proposed amendments to VOP 2010 Volume 1. This included ensuring that the principles of VOP 2010 were maintained, that the broader policy direction was considered (Regional Official Plan, Places to Grow) and the application of sound planning principles.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 11

The submissions were each considered on their own merit and recommendations made on appropriate responses and actions. In addition, Staff identified areas where changes should be made to the proposed policies. The “Community Area Policy Review Technical Report - Comments Received” (Attachment 2) presents information response/concerns/requests, staff comments and any recommended policy and schedule changes. Summaries in Attachment 2 are presented in the following in tabular format:

- The Item number;
- The submission date;
- The origin of the submission;
- The correspondence content, as summarized by Staff;
- Staff comment on the submission; and
- Staff recommendation on the submission.

The following deputations and written submissions were received at the Public Hearing and Council:

#### Deputations

- Mr. Leo Longo, Aird & Berlis
- Mr. Joe Collura, Vaughan
- Mr. David Brand, Kleinburg & Area Ratepayers Association, Camlaren Crescent, Kleinburg
- Mr. Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting, Millway Avenue, Vaughan
- Mr. Bill Manolakos, Keele Street, Maple
- Mr. Richard Lorello, Treelawn Boulevard, Kleinburg
- Ms. Jana Manolakos, Keele Street, Maple
- Mr. Roger Dickinson, Donhill Crescent, Kleinburg
- Mr. Anthony Smith, Idleswift Drive, Thornhill
- Ms. Alexandra Hatfield, Camlaren Crescent, Kleinburg
- Mr. Davide Pellegrini, Condor Properties, Highway 7, Concord
- Mr. Richard Rodaro, Woodend Place, Vaughan
- Mr. Rob Klein, Daleview Court, Kleinburg
- Mr. Robert A. Kenedy, MacKenzie Ridge Ratepayers' Association, Giorgia Crescent, Maple

#### Written Submissions

- Mr. Joe Collura, dated October 19, 2016
- Mr. John Zipay, Gilbert Court, Burlington, dated October 25, 2016
- Ms. Helen Lepek, Lepek Consulting Inc., Edith Drive, Toronto, dated October 31, 2016
- Mr. Joe Balderston, Brutto Consulting, Edgeley Boulevard, Vaughan, dated October 31, 2016
- Mr. Paul Tobia, Evans Planning Inc., Keele Street, Vaughan, dated November 1, 2016
- Mr. Jim Levac, Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., Kingsbridge Garden Circle, Mississauga, dated November 1, 2016
- Ms. Rosemarie L. Humphries, Humphries Planning Group Inc., Chrislea Road, Vaughan, dated October 31, 2016
- Mr. Tim Jessop, Weston Consulting, Millway Avenue, Vaughan, dated November 1, 2016
- Ms. Rosemarie L. Humphries, Humphries Planning Group Inc., Chrislea Road, Vaughan, dated October 31, 2016
- Mr. Ryan Guetter, dated November 1, 2016

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 12

- Antonietta and Joe Giannotti, Southview Drive, Concord, dated November 1, 2016
- Paulette and John Cutler, Westridge Drive, Kleinburg, dated November 1, 2016
- Mr. Roger Dickinson, Donhill Crescent, Kleinburg, dated October 31, 2016
- Ms. Alexandra Hatfield, Camlaren Crescent, Kleinburg, dated November 2, 2016
- Mr. Aaron Hershoff, TACC Developments, Applewood Crescent, Vaughan, dated November 1, 2016
- Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated November 1, 2016
- Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated November 14, 2016

The issues having broader implications are discussed in greater detail below.

#### Responses Received from Community Members

Deputations and communications received at the Public Hearing from the members of the public were broadly supportive of the proposed amendments to VOP 2010. The comments received included: the amendments are seen as a step forward in addressing compatibility issues in stable Community Areas, they level the playing field for community members in addressing their concerns over infill development, and they balance City needs with developer needs, while still protecting the intent of the Places to Grow Act.

#### Comments from York Region Transportation Planning and Development Planning

Following the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing, York Region Transportation Planning and Development Planning staff reviewed the proposed policy amendments to VOP 2010. On the nature of intensification in Community Areas in both the Regional Official Plan and VOP 2010, York Region staff indicated:

The Regional Official Plan and the Vaughan Official Plan are premised on a complementary hierarchy of intensification areas, focused on centres and corridors. The Vaughan Official Plan has a well-articulated policy regime that directs intensification to appropriate intensification areas. As such, intensification in Community Areas, especially adjacent to Regional arterial roads, should be only permitted in limited circumstances. Significant levels of intensification within Community Areas would not be in keeping with the planned urban structure at the Regional or local level, and has the potential to increase vehicular conflicts where intensified private driveways intersect with Regional arterial roads.

Region staff are of the opinion that in order to facilitate orderly development in a planned comprehensive manner, a municipally led area in-fill study should occur to identify the best redevelopment plan for an area, if there are adjacent properties of similar size and redevelopment potential.

Similarly, Region staff have indicated that single lot redevelopment on a private road should only occur in limited circumstances and must allow efficient and through traffic flows and the safe travel of large service vehicles. To encourage the efficient flow of traffic through in-fill areas, Regional staff supports:

The provision of municipally owned roads that interconnect with adjacent properties and create a finer grid road network. Developments with private driveways should only be permitted where a property is large enough and can comprehensively develop in an independent manner. In situations where interconnects are required across multiple properties, roads should be dedicated to Vaughan as public rights-of-way.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 13

With regard to access to these sites, the Region discourages the creation of multiple lots with multiple access points, as per Regional Official Plan Policy 7.2.53:

"To restrict vehicle access from developments adjacent to Regional streets to maximize the efficiency of the Regional street system through techniques such as suitable local street access, shared driveways and interconnected properties. Exceptions may be made to this policy in Regional Centres and Corridors, and mainstreets."

York Region staff indicated that when an infill area requires direct access to a Regional Road, the Region will require a Transportation Mobility Plan, and recommend that the City identify areas of future infill development and prepare secondary plans to identify roadway infrastructure needed to accommodate these developments.

#### Identified Issues and Responses

##### a) Notice and Information Available to Public

###### Issue

Deputations received at the Public Hearing assert that proper notice was not provided in accordance with the Planning Act and as prescribed in Ontario Regulation 543(06) in that inadequate information was made available in advance of the Public Hearing.

###### Response

The Planning Act Section 17(19.3) provides that, "the information required under subsection (19.5) shall be made available to the public at a public meeting or in the manner set out in the official plan for informing and obtaining the views of the public in respect of the proposed amendments" under the Act. This includes the notification requirements and the posting of supporting the material 20 days in advance of the public hearing.

The Vaughan Official Plan 2010 Section 10.1.4 Notification Procedures for Statutory Public Meetings sets out the manner in which the public is informed of public hearings to obtain their views on proposed amendments. This Official Plan policy responds to the portion of Section 17(19.3) that provides, "... or in the manner set out in the official plan." The City's procedure was followed to notify the public in advance of the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing. In addition, supporting information was provided on the City's website 20 days in advance of the Public Hearing consistent with the Planning Act. As such, the notice requirements were fulfilled in accordance with the policies of the City's Official Plan, as authorized by the Planning Act.

##### b) Impact on Potential to Implement Condominium Infill Development

###### Issue

Deputations identified a concern that the proposed amendments would prohibit the ability to introduce condominium infill development to these sites.

###### Response

While the requirement for an Official Plan Amendment application is determined on a site-by-site basis, planning staff has been consistent in requesting an Official Plan Amendment when infill townhouse development applications are submitted as a plan of condominium. The amendments proposed in this report would not affect this in any way.

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 14

c) Inclusion of Setbacks in Proposed New Policy

Issue

Deputations and communications received expressed the concern that the proposed new policy 9.1.2.4(d) creates setback requirements that should not be included as Official Plan policy, and are more appropriately prescribed in zoning regulation.

Response

Policy 9.1.2.4(d) contains two principles regarding setbacks for townhouses in established Low-Rise Residential areas. First, that, "The general pattern of front, side and rear yard setbacks in the adjacent established neighbourhood shall be respected and maintained", and "Front yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 4.5 metres to provide an appropriate buffer between the road and the dwellings and to accommodate landscaping. Rear yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 7.5 metres".

The first principle is general in nature, and is intended to recognize that there is a general pattern of setbacks in an area, but also that they should be respected and maintained. The second principle is based on the minimum setbacks provided in By-Law 1-88, and is intended to convey the City's desire to not deviate from these minimums for infill development occurring in established Low-Rise Residential areas. VOP 2010 policy 10.2.1.7 does provide for minor variations to numerical standards contained in the plan, provided that the variations respond to conditions unique to the site, and are supported through a Planning Justification Report and/or Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City.

However, establishing specific numerical setback requirements in Official Plan policy may create challenges when the Zoning By-Law is updated, which may result in new setback requirements, as noted by members of the Technical Advisory Committee. Official Plan policy is intended to be more general in nature. It is more appropriate to address yard requirements in the Design Guidelines and the implementing Zoning By-law on the basis of the Plan's compatibility policies. The proposed policy has been updated to reflect this response, through the elimination of specific numeric setbacks.

d) Appropriateness of Intensification in Community Areas

Issue

Several of the communications from landowners focused on the implications of the proposed policies on meeting the intensification policies and targets of senior levels of government. It is argued that by creating more definitive policy criteria regarding the location, frontage, and compatibility of townhouses in Low-Rise Residential designated areas, the City would be limiting its ability to meet intensification targets assigned by Provincial and Regional policies. Respondents stated that this would result in less diverse housing options, less affordable housing, and less efficient use of infrastructure. In particular, many of the respondents shared a preference for townhouses (particularly situated on deep lots) fronting onto laneways (also referred to as private common element roads), and use as their justification the need for the City to achieve, "an appropriate level of intensification".

Response

Policy 1.1.3.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) states, "Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas,

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 15

including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs”. Policy 2.2.2.1.b in the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe states that population and employment will be accommodated by focusing intensification in intensification areas. The Growth Plan identifies urban growth centres, intensification corridors, major transit station areas, brownfield sites and greyfields as areas where intensification is meant to be focused.

Both the Region’s Official Plan and Vaughan Official Plan 2010 establish where growth will take place to 2031 and clearly identify intensification areas. The Region’s urban hierarchy directs intensification to its Centres and Corridors policy framework. The City of Vaughan identifies areas of intensification on Schedule 1 – Urban Structure, which further reinforces the location of the Centres and Intensification Corridors as the primary destination for additional density. The City’s Urban Structure plan has been endorsed by York Region and has been approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. As such, the City’s Urban Structure (Schedule 1 to VOP 2010) is in conformity with all relevant Provincial plans and policies.

The Community Area Policy Review focuses on areas that are designated *Low-Rise Residential* in the Community Area. This designation makes up a sizeable portion of Vaughan’s Community Areas, and they are considered to be “Stable Areas”. As such, they “are not intended to experience significant physical change” (Policy 2.2.3.2, VOP 2010). A primary objective of Vaughan Official Plan 2010 is to, “ensure the character of established communities is maintained” (policy 2.1.3.2 (e)). Therefore, it is the intent of the Plan that Low-Rise Residential areas not be the recipient of a significant amount of intensification.

As such, townhouses will continue to be permitted on arterial street frontages in the Low-Rise Residential designation in Established Community Areas, subject to meeting certain conditions. This encompasses a limited geography and while the townhouses are still permitted, the resulting developments may only be able to achieve lesser densities. While townhouses will no longer be permitted beyond the arterial frontages in the Low-Rise Residential designation in Established Community Areas, Townhouses will be permitted in new or currently developing portions of the Low-Rise Residential designation. The introduction of secondary suites will ensure that additional units can be added to address issues of demand and affordability without “significant physical change”. The introduction of secondary suites would provide a more affordable option. Therefore, this direction should be maintained.

#### e) Transition to Amended Policy Framework and Applicability of Policy Amendments

##### Issue

A recurring question asked how and when the proposed policy amendments would apply. Many of the respondents that raised this issue represent landowners with development applications that are at varying stages of the development review process.

##### Response

Legal precedent provides that when an application is submitted, the Official Plan policies in effect at the time of the application are the basis for its review. This means that the City cannot apply policies that were not in effect when the application was submitted.

Applications that are deemed complete and accepted by the City are reviewed on the basis of the in effect policy at that time. Official Plan Amendments proposed through this policy review may take considerable time to be fully approved and brought into force. Development

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 16

applications that have already been received and are currently in the early or late stages of the review process will not be subject to the proposed Official Plan amendments recommended by this study.

As noted, many of the respondents had active applications that were before the City. Other comments also indicated an interest in this study proposing transition policies that provide guidance as to how future policy amendments would be applied. In response, a further policy has been recommended that would provide that any existing, legally approved townhouse development, in the Low-Rise Residential designations would continue to have legal conforming status under the VOP 2010.

#### f) Compatibility with Neighbourhood Character

##### Issue

A number of respondents were concerned that the proposed policies were too prescriptive and inappropriate for implementation at the Official Plan level. Primary concerns focused on: Only permitting townhouses on parcels that front onto arterial roads in Low-Rise Residential Designated areas; only allowing townhouse units to front onto public roads and not laneways; the inclusion of minimum setbacks in Official Plan policy; and generally, that these policies do not allow development applications to respond to varying site conditions.

##### Response

The intent of Section 9.1.2 – “Urban Design and Built Form” of VOP 2010, with respect to Community Areas is to ensure that the character and integrity of the Established Community Areas designated Low-Rise Residential do not experience significant physical change. The proposed amendments respond to an increase in the number of development proposals for infill townhouse and other intensified forms of development that were not considered to be consistent with the existing character of the surrounding neighbourhoods. The proposed amendments represent a balanced approach to protecting the character of communities that are “not intended to experience significant change”, while providing for limited intensification and appropriate redevelopment, within an identifiable geographical area.

The amendments are proposed to clarify specific policies related to compatibility, and augment them with policies that are specific to infill developments. The purpose of these clarifications is to ensure that infill development is integrated into established neighbourhoods in a way that meets the intent of the compatibility policies in VOP 2010. Locational references are established to address areas requiring specific treatment. For example, a new Schedule–1B “Areas Subject to Policy 9.1.2.3 – Vaughan’s Established Large Lot Neighbourhoods”– is introduced to identify where Policy 9.1.2.3 can be applied. This policy creates additional protection for communities especially vulnerable to infill pressures by distinguishing those neighbourhoods according to lot size. The proposed new policy 9.1.2.4 specifically directs townhouse development to the edges of the Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods in Established Community Areas to parcels that have frontage on an Arterial Street.

These policies are intended to ensure that infill and townhouse developments respect the physical character of established neighbourhoods to achieve compatibility, while recognizing that unusually deep or wide lots on arterial roads at the edge of established communities present an opportunity for townhouse development.



**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 17

g) Urban Design Guidelines

Issue

Several respondents raised concerns with respect to the approved Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods and their relationship to the proposed amendments to the policies of the Official Plan. Issues raised in deputations and communications include: There being a lack of some specific design elements that were not included in the design concept image included as part of the Townhouse Infill Guidelines Summary; that the guidelines do not address deep and narrow infill sites; and a concern that the Urban Design Guidelines are being made into formal policies removing the ability to deviate from the Guidelines without an Official Plan Amendment.

Response

In response to these concerns, on October 19, 2016, Council approved the Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods subject to the following:

1. That staff be directed to finalize the guidelines with the requirement that conceptual designs be prepared, with stakeholder input, to investigate opportunities to incorporate private driveway or laneway internal circulation systems to accommodate development in deeper parcels fronting onto arterial roads, within the Low-Rise Residential Area; and
  - a. That the conceptual designs are prepared to maintain the principles of the Infill Guidelines that serve to protect compatibility with the adjacent Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods;
  - b. That the conceptual designs be incorporated into the guidelines as an appendix serving to illustrate how compatibility can be achieved; and
  - c. That the guidelines and any clarifying amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010) clearly indicate the requirement for the submission of official plan amendment applications to implement a private Townhouse laneway development in the Low-Rise Residential Area of the Community Area.

This will allow the testing of concept designs to determine what degree of compatibility may be achieved. It will also allow further consultation with stakeholders. The resulting concepts would be added to the townhouse component of the guidelines by way of an appendix.

The approved Urban Design Guidelines support the approved policies in VOP 2010, and do not specifically address the proposed VOP 2010 policy amendments resulting from this review. When VOP 2010 is amended, the final Urban Design Guidelines will be reviewed to ensure consistency with the new policies. Staff will continue to refine the Guidelines in accordance with Council direction, including stakeholder consultation, with a view to finalization in the second quarter of 2017.

The Guidelines do not constitute policy at the level of the Official Plan but do assist in the interpretation of the Plan. Notwithstanding the Guidelines, the intent and purpose of the policies will always need to be maintained. The Guidelines are flexible, whereby alternative solutions may be developed that still meet the intent of the Plan.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 18

##### (7) Recommended Policy Amendments to VOP 2010

This section of the report sets out the recommended policy amendments to VOP 2010 resulting from this process.

##### a) Addressing Differences in the Shape and Size of Lots

The Committee recommendation from the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing report on the proposed VOP 2010 policy amendments was ratified by Council on November 15, 2016. In doing so the following direction was provided:

**By approving that the draft official plan amendment address issues raised due to the differences with shape and size of lots proposed for low rise intensification;**

As a result of this analysis, staff is of the opinion that a main problem associated with the arterial lots is their fragmentation. This leaves a series of lots of varying depths, areas and frontages, which individually may not be ideal development parcels. Development benefits from the creation of regularly sized parcels that form a logical planning unit. The larger and more regularly shaped the unit, the better the opportunity to optimize development potential while providing for the functional and aesthetic characteristics that will make the site attractive and livable. In instances of smaller or irregularly shaped lots, this is best overcome by land assemblies that create the developable units necessary to support a quality development. VOP 2010 currently provides this direction and would benefit from further elaboration.

Changes to the proposed policy amendments have been introduced in Section 7.b) "Proposed Policy Amendments" of this report, as provided below, to reinforce the existing policies in Chapter 10. Policy 10.1.1.4 provides for the use of the Block Plan process to support and implement land assemblies. The need for a Block Plan can be identified through a Secondary Plan process; or through "the development review process, to address complexities in smaller planning units, scoped as required in accordance with policy 10.1.1.5." To build on this policy the following measures are proposed to address the need for comprehensive development:

- Policy 9.1.2.5 has been updated to provide for a Block Plan to address such matters as the configuration and design of streets;
- New policy 9.1.2.4(f) was also updated to address the need for interconnected streets where limited intensification is expected to occur on multiple adjacent lots and clarify that the City and Region are the approval authorities in this matter.

Strategic land assemblies are a key to overcoming many of the issues associated with development of deep, irregular or smaller lots fronting on the arterial corridors.

##### b) Proposed Policy Amendments

Below are the suggested modifications to VOP 2010 resulting from feedback obtained from the Public Hearing on November 1, 2016, in addition to feedback received from the Technical Advisory Committee and continuing staff review. In the revised policies below:

- **Strikethroughs represent text proposed for deletion;**
- **Bolded text represents new text.**

Each proposed modification is followed by the rationale for the changes. These changes are also reflected in the draft official plan amendment forming Attachment 4 to this report. For

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 19

completeness, all policy changes that were proposed in the November 1, 2016 Public Hearing report are incorporated into the following amendments, and only those changes made after the Public Hearing are indicated in bold or as a strikethrough.

#### **Community Area Policies**

**VOP 2010 is amended by:**

1. Deleting policy 2.2.3.2 and substituting therefor the following:

Community Areas are considered Stable Areas and therefore Community Areas with existing development are not intended to experience significant physical change that would alter the general character of established neighbourhoods. New development that respects and reinforces the existing scale, height, massing, lot pattern, building type and orientation, character, form and planned function of the immediate local area is permitted, as set out in the policies of Chapter 9.

*No change required.*

#### **Urban Design and Built Form Policies**

2. Deleting policy 9.1.2.1 (preamble and sub. a.) and substituting therefor the following:

That new development will respect and reinforce the existing and planned context within which it is situated. More specifically, the built form of new developments will be designed to achieve the following general objectives:

- a. in **Community Areas**, new development will be designed to respect and reinforce the physical character of the established neighbourhood within which it is located as set out in policies 9.1.2.2 – 9.1.2.4 or, where no established neighbourhood is located, it shall help establish an appropriate physical character that is compatible with its surroundings, as set out in policy 9.1.2.5. **An Established Community Area is a portion of the Community Area identified on Schedule 1 (Urban Structure) generally bounded by Major or Minor Arterial streets or other significant features such as the Natural Heritage System which is entirely or almost entirely developed and occupied, such that its physical character is well defined;**

*A definition of Established Community Area is added to provide greater clarity. These areas mainly include all of Thornhill, Concord, Woodbridge and Maple as well as portions of Kleinburg, Vellore and Carrville. They also include estate lot subdivisions that are relatively isolated from other development. Since these areas are “built out”, their physical character has been established, even if the character will naturally evolve as new trees and houses age. The general expectation is that these neighbourhoods will not change significantly based on the policies of VOP 2010. As Vaughan builds out and evolves, and its remaining designated Community Areas develop the boundaries of the established areas will need to be periodically reviewed and revised.*

3. Deleting policy 9.1.2.2 and substituting therefor the following:

In **Established** Community Areas ~~with established development~~, new development, as reflected in any zoning, variance, subdivision, consent or part lot control exemption application, will be designed to respect and reinforce the existing physical character and uses of the surrounding area, specifically respecting and reinforcing the following elements:

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

#### Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 20

- a. the local pattern of lots, streets and blocks;
- b. the size and configuration of lots;
- c. the building type of nearby residential properties;
- d. the orientation of buildings;
- e. the heights and scale of adjacent and immediately surrounding residential properties;
- f. the setback of buildings from the street;
- g. the pattern of rear and side-yard setbacks;
- h. the presence of mature trees and general landscape character of the streetscape;
- i. the existing topography and drainage pattern on the lot and in the adjacent and immediately surrounding properties;
- j. conservation and enhancement of heritage buildings, heritage districts and cultural heritage landscapes;
- k. the above elements are not meant to discourage the incorporation of features that can increase energy efficiency (e.g. solar configuration, solar panels) or environmental sustainability (e.g. natural lands, rain barrels).

*Minor change incorporates the term “Established Community Areas”.*

#### 4. Deleting policy 9.1.2.3 and substituting therefor the following:

Within the **Established** Community Areas there are a number of established residential neighbourhoods that are characterized exclusively or predominantly by Detached Houses located on generally large lots with frontages exceeding 20 metres and/or by their historical, architectural or landscape value. These neighbourhoods are generally identified on Schedule 1B “Areas Subject to Policy 9.1.2.3 – Vaughan’s Established Large Lot Neighbourhoods”. Some of these established neighbourhoods, including estate lot neighbourhoods, are also characterized by their substantial rear, front and side yards, and by lot coverages that contribute to expansive amenity areas, which provide for attractive landscape development and streetscapes. These include neighbourhoods at or near the Local Centres of Thornhill, Concord, Kleinburg, Maple and Woodbridge, and may also be part of the respective Heritage Conservation Districts. For clarity, the policy text prevails over the mapping shown on Schedule 1B. In addition to those areas identified on Schedule 1B, this policy shall also apply to other areas where the subdivision and redevelopment of a large lot or multiple large lots would not respect and reinforce the elements identified in Policy 9.1.2.2.

In order to maintain the character of established, large-lot neighbourhoods, the following policies shall apply to all developments within these areas (e.g., land severances, zoning by-law amendments and minor variances), based on the current zoning, and guide the preparation of any future City-initiated area specific or comprehensive zoning by-laws affecting these areas.

- a. Lot frontage: In the case of lot creation, new lots should be equal to or exceed the frontages of the adjoining lots, or the average of the frontage of the adjoining lots where they differ;
- b. Lot area: The area of new lots should be consistent with the size of adjoining lots;
- c. Lot configuration: New lots should respect the existing lotting fabric in the immediately surrounding area;
- d. Front yards and exterior side yards: Buildings should maintain the established pattern of setbacks for the neighbourhood to retain a consistent streetscape;
- e. Rear yards: Buildings should maintain the established pattern of setbacks for the neighbourhood to minimize visual intrusion on the adjacent residential lots;
- f. Dwelling types: A new dwelling replacing an existing one shall be of the same type, as defined in Section 9.2.3 of this Plan, except on a lot fronting an Arterial Street, as

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 21

- g. identified in Schedule 9 (Future Transportation Network), where a Semi-detached House or Townhouse replacing a detached dwelling may be permitted, subject to Policy 9.1.2.4 and the other urban design policies of this plan;
- h. Building heights and massing: Should respect the scale of adjacent residential buildings and any city urban design guidelines prepared for Community Areas;
- i. Lot coverage: In order to maintain the low density character of these areas and ensure opportunities for generous amenity and landscaping areas, lot coverage consistent with development in the area and as provided for in the zoning by-law is required to regulate the area of the building footprint within the building envelope, as defined by the minimum yard requirements of the zoning by-law.

*Minor change to incorporate the term “Established Community Area”.*

5. Adding the new Policy 9.1.2.4

Notwithstanding Policy 9.1.2.3, where a lot **or a parcel composed of multiple lots** in an ~~Established~~ **designated** Low-Rise Residential neighbourhood **in an Established Community Area** fronts an Arterial Street, as identified in Schedule 9 (Future Transportation Network) of this Plan, limited intensification in the form of Semi-detached Houses or Townhouses may be permitted, subject to the following:

- a. All new dwellings shall front and address a public street ~~to be consistent with the orientation of existing dwellings in the established neighbourhood;~~
- b. Parking for units fronting on an Arterial Street shall be located at the rear of units or underground, accessed by a shared private laneway or driveway requiring minimal curb cuts, to minimize the impact of parking and driveways on the streetscape;
- c. Private laneways or driveways shall not be used to provide frontage for residential dwellings;
- d. The general pattern of front, side and rear yard setbacks in the adjacent established neighbourhood shall be respected and maintained. Front yard setbacks shall **be consistent with minimum setback requirements** ~~be a minimum of 4.5 metres~~ to provide an appropriate buffer between the road and the dwellings and to accommodate landscaping. Rear yard setbacks shall also **be consistent with minimum setback requirements** ~~be a minimum of 7.5 metres.~~;
- e. The scale and massing of townhouse **and semi-detached house** developments shall respect the scale and massing of adjacent development and any applicable urban design guidelines.
- f. **Subject to policies 9.1.2.4.a through e. and g., where future intensification on adjacent lots would be appropriate and is anticipated through a Block Plan or Development Concept report,** developments ~~should~~ **shall** protect for future **street and/or laneway** interconnections with the adjacent properties to minimize accesses to the Arterial Street **and facilitate the establishment of a rational and efficient street and laneway network over time.** Access arrangements on Arterial Streets shall be to the satisfaction of **the City and York Region.**
- g. Where a parcel does not front an Arterial Street, as identified on Schedule 9 (Future Transportation Network), townhouses shall not be permitted.

*With regard to the preamble in the first line of the policy, the additional language acknowledges situations where lots may have been assembled into a development parcel for the purpose of achieving comprehensive development.*

*With regard to subpoint “a”, the clause is proposed to be removed to allow for additional flexibility in specific cases where the orientation of new townhouses on a new public street*

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 22

*could be different from the orientation of dwellings in the surrounding established neighbourhood. This accommodation would depend on the alternative not adversely impacting the character of the rest of the neighbourhood.*

*With regard to subpoint “e”, the term semi-detached house is proposed to be added to recognize that both townhouses and semi-detached houses are permitted forms of limited intensification.*

*With regard to subpoint “f”, this clause is further revised to address the need for interconnected streets and laneways where it is anticipated that intensification will occur on multiple adjacent lots, and to clarify that both the City and the Region are approval authorities on matters relating to the road networks.*

6. Adding the new Policy 9.1.2.5

Where a new street and/or laneway network and other public or private infrastructure are required to facilitate and service new development in Established Community Areas, the City **will** require a Block Plan, as per Policies 10.1.1.14 - 10.1.1.15, **to ensure an orderly and comprehensive approach to development in the area. A Block Plan submission will be required in order for an application to be deemed complete and will**~~to~~ address such matters as:

- a. the configuration and design of streets;
- b. traffic management;
- c. extensions and connections to existing pedestrian and cycling networks;
- d. the provision of public and private services and the detailed approach to stormwater management;
- e. the protection and enhancement of the Natural Heritage Network;
- f. the precise locations of natural and cultural heritage features of the area;
- g. the precise location of any parks and open spaces;
- h. the proposed implementation of sustainable development policies as contained in subsection 9.1.3 of this Plan; ~~and,~~
- i. phasing of development **on the subject site (if applicable) and in the broader area; and**
- j. **compatibility with the existing neighbourhood character as per Policies 9.1.2.1 to 9.1.2.4.**

*Further refinements to this proposed policy are recommended in order to provide an in-text rationale for the requirement of a Block Plan within Established Community Areas where new streets, street and/or laneway networks, or other infrastructure such as wastewater services are required in accordance with the City’s current Block Plan policies. The proposed refinements also clarify that the City of Vaughan will require a Block Plan in these circumstances and that the submission of an appropriately scoped Block Plan is a condition of deeming an application to be complete. This requirement ensures that proponents of limited intensification within Established Community Areas consider and study the surrounding context and propose a plan that will ensure that future development is able to take place comprehensively via streets and other infrastructure. Finally, sub-point “j” is proposed to ensure that the proposed Block Plan accounts for the established character of the surrounding low-rise residential neighbourhoods.*

7. Deleting Policy 9.2.2.1.c. and substituting therefor the following:

The following Building Types are permitted in areas designated as Low-Rise Residential, pursuant to policies in subsection 9.2.3 of this Plan:

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 23

- i. Detached House;
- ii. Semi-Detached House, subject to Policies 9.1.2.3, 9.1.2.4, and 9.2.3.1;
- iii. Townhouse, subject to Policies 9.1.2.3, 9.1.2.4, and 9.2.3.2; and,
- iv. Public and Private Institutional Buildings.

*No change required.*

8. Adding the following Policy 9.2.2.1 d.

**In applying Policy 9.2.2.1.c. the following shall apply:**

- i. In developing Community Areas, Townhouses as identified in 9.2.2.1.c. iii. will be permitted in accordance with Policy 9.2.3.2.c.;**
- ii. All Townhouse uses in the Low-Rise Residential designation in the Established Community Areas that have been legally approved shall continue to be considered a legal conforming use under VOP 2010;**
- iii. Policy 2.2.5.9 and 2.2.5.14 shall apply to the portions of the Established Community Area designated Low-Rise Residential that are located within the Regional Corridors and the Low-Rise Residential Areas located in the Primary Intensification Corridors.**

*This policy was added to provide greater clarity in interpreting the plan. Subsection i identifies that these policies are intended to apply to townhouses in the Established Community Areas and not areas that are still developing. It will allow other applications in the Developing Community Areas to proceed in accordance with their respective approval processes, which will provide for the appropriate development of townhouses. This will also allow the planning for the New Community Areas to proceed on the basis of their respective processes.*

*Subsection ii confirms that there is no intent to create legal non-conformities as a result of the application of these policies. If, for example a townhouse exists or receives approval in a New Development Area on a Developing Community Area they will continue to enjoy legal conforming status under VOP 2010.*

*Subsection iii accounts for situations where Established Community Areas designated Low-Rise Residential coincide with Regional Corridors or Primary Intensification Corridors, which are identified as Intensification Areas. Policies 2.2.5.4, 2.2.5.14 deal specifically with lands that do not have frontage directly on the arterial street, being either rear-lotted or having frontage on an internal window street. These areas are generally not considered appropriate for intensification under policies 2.2.5.4 and 2.2.5.14. This new policy is intended to ensure that the same level of protection applies in instances where reverse frontage/window street areas in Established Community Areas designated Low-Rise Residential coincide with an Intensification corridor. This will not affect situations where lots have direct frontage on the affected Arterial Streets in Intensification Areas. They will continue to be developed in accordance with the Intensification Area policies and will not be affected by the amendments.*

9. Deleting Policy 9.2.3.1.b. and substituting therefor the following:

In Established Community Areas where Detached Houses and Semi-Detached Houses exist, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of new Detached Houses and Semi-Detached Houses will respect and reinforce the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved houses of the same type in the immediate area. Variations are permitted for the purposes of minimizing driveways.

*No change required.*

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 24

10. Deleting Policy 9.2.3.2.b. and substituting therefor the following:

In Established Community Areas, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of new Townhouses will respect and reinforce the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved development in the surrounding area and shall be consistent with Policies 9.1.2.2, 9.1.2.3 and 9.1.2.4. Variations are permitted for the purposes of minimizing driveways and having front entrances and porches located closer to the street than garages. For clarity, back-to-back and stacked townhouses shall not be permitted in areas designated Low-Rise Residential. Back-to-back townhouses share a rear wall as well as a sidewall(s), resulting in a building with two facades where individual entrances to the units are located with no rear yard. Stacked townhouses are defined in Policy 9.2.3.3.

*No change required.*

11. Deleting Policy 9.2.3.2.c. and substituting therefore the following:

In developing Community Areas, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of Townhouses will be determined through the process of developing and approving Secondary Plans, Block Plans, Plans of Subdivision, Zoning By-laws, and/or urban design guidelines.

*No change required.*

12. Deleting Policy 9.2.3.2.d. and substituting therefor the following:

Townhouses shall generally front onto a public street. Where a townhouse end unit does not front a public street but flanks **a public street**, ~~one~~ the flanking unit(s) shall provide a front yard and front-door entrance facing the public street. **Notwithstanding the above, Townhouses in designated Low-Rise Residential areas in Established Community Areas shall be developed in accordance with Policy 9.1.2.4.**

*The word “one” is replaced by “a public street” to provide greater clarity. The existing policy 9.2.3.2.d was maintained to provide that townhouses shall generally front onto a public street but where it does not front on a public street but flanks a public street, the flanking unit shall provide a front yard and front door facing the public street. The policy was amended to identify that the development of townhouses in the Low-Rise Residential designation in Established Community Areas will be directed by policy 9.1.2.4.*

13. Deleting Policy 9.2.3.3.a. and substituting therefor the following:

The following policies and development criteria apply to Stacked Townhouses:

- a) Stacked Townhouses are attached houseform buildings comprising of two to four separate residential units stacked on top of each other. Stacked Townhouse units are typically massed to resemble a street Townhouse and each unit is provided direct access to ground level.

*No change required.*

Adding Map 1B: Areas Subject to Policy 9.1.2.3 - Vaughan's Large Lot Neighbourhoods to VOP 2010 Volume 1 to thereby identify Vaughan's Large Lot Neighbourhoods as being subject to Policy 9.1.2.3.



## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2017**

Item 5, CW Report No. 13 – Page 25

*Schedule 1B identifies the areas that will be subject to Policy 9.1.2.3 which identifies the City's large lot neighbourhoods. It provides greater clarity in where the policies apply. The purpose of policy 9.1.2.3 is to preserve the character of these large lot neighbourhoods when applications for infill development are considered. Schedule 1B forms part of the draft Official Plan amendment that forms Attachment 4 to this report.*

#### **Relationship to Term of Council Service Excellence Strategy Map (2014-2018)**

This report relates to the Term of Council Service Excellence Strategy by supporting the following initiatives:

- Continued cultivation of an environmentally sustainable city;
- Updating the Official Plan and supporting studies.

#### **Conclusion**

At the statutory Public Hearing held November 1, 2016, the Committee of the Whole received oral deputations and written submissions from the public and other stakeholders, and directed that any issues be addressed in a Technical Report at a future Committee of the Whole meeting. This decision was ratified by Council on November 15, 2016.

Written and oral submissions received from private citizens/landowners and other development interests have been analyzed and recommendations have been developed to respond to the identified issues (Attachment 2). The approaches taken to some of the broader policy issues have also been addressed in the main body of the report entitled "Identified Issues and Responses" as set out within Section (6).

The Policy Review has resulted in proposed amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010, which respond to the policy regime collectively established by the Province (e.g. Places to Grow), the York Region Official Plan, and VOP 2010. The amendments provide for clarity of interpretation and more definitive policies that will support compatible infill development. This will address the unique needs of the Low-Rise Residential Areas in the Established Community Areas.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposed amendments to VOP 2010 be approved and that the implementing Official Plan amendment be brought forward for Council adoption.

#### **Attachments**

1. Policy Review: Vaughan Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study – October 2016
2. Community Area Policy Review Technical Report - Comments Received
3. Community Consultation Summary Report – What We Heard
4. Draft Amendment to the VOP 2010
5. Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods
6. Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) Extract – November 1, 2016

#### **Report prepared by:**

Kyle Fearon, Planner, ext. 8776  
Melissa Rossi, Manager of Policy Planning, ext. 8320

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)