

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, Report No. 39, of the Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing), which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on November 15, 2016, as follows:

***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; and***

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

- C1 Paulette and John Cutler, Westridge Drive, Kleinburg, dated November 1, 2016;***
- C2 Ms. Alexandra Hatfield, Camlaren Crescent, Kleinburg, dated November 2, 2016;***
- C3 Mr. Aaron Hershoff, TACC Developments, Applewood Crescent, Vaughan, dated November 1, 2016;***
- C6 Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated November 1, 2016;***
- C7 Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated November 1, 2016;***
- C8 Mr. Keith MacKinnon, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated November 1, 2016;***
- C9 Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated November 1, 2016; and***
- C16 Mr. Ryan Mino-Leahan, KLM Planning Partners Inc., Jardin Drive, Concord, dated November 14, 2016.***

**2**

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

**The Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) 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 November 1, 2016, be approved;**
- 2) That the presentation by Mr. Tim Smith, Urban Strategies, be received;**
- 3) That the following deputations and Communications be received:**
  - 1. Mr. Leo Longo, Aird & Berlis;**
  - 2. Mr. Joe Collura, and Communication C1, dated October 19, 2016;**
  - 3. Mr. David Brand, Kleinburg & Area Ratepayers Association, Camlaren Crescent, Kleinburg;**
  - 4. Mr. Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting, Millway Avenue, Vaughan, and Communication C13, dated November 1, 2016;**
  - 5. Mr. Bill Manolakos, Keele Street, Maple;**
  - 6. Mr. Richard Lorello, Treelawn Boulevard, Kleinburg;**
  - 7. Ms. Jana Manolakos, Keele Street, Maple;**
  - 8. Mr. Roger Dickinson, Donhill Crescent, Kleinburg, and Communication C15, dated October 31, 2016;**
  - 9. Mr. Anthony Smith, Idleswift Drive, Thornhill;**
  - 10. Ms. Alexandra Hatfield, Camlaren Crescent, Kleinburg;**
  - 11. Mr. Davide Pellegrini, Condor Properties, Highway 7, Concord;**
  - 12. Mr. Richard Rodaro, Woodend Place, Vaughan;**

## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 2

- 13 Mr. Rob Klein, Daleview Court, Kleinburg; and
- 14. Mr. Robert A. Kenedy, MacKenzie Ridge Ratepayers' Association, Georgia Crescent, Maple; and

**4) That the following Communications be received:**

- C2 Mr. John Zipay, Gilbert Court, Burlington, dated October 25, 2016;
- C5 Ms. Helen Lepek, Lepek Consulting Inc., Edith Drive, Toronto, dated October 31, 2016;
- C6 Mr. Joe Balderston, Brutto Consulting, Edgeley Boulevard, Vaughan, dated October 31, 2016;
- C8 Mr. Paul Tobia, Evans Planning Inc., Keele Street, Vaughan, dated November 1, 2016;
- C9 Mr. Jim Levac, Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., Kingsbridge Garden Circle, Mississauga, dated November 1, 2016;
- C10 Ms. Rosemarie L. Humphries, Humphries Planning Group Inc., Chrislea Road, Vaughan, dated October 31, 2016;
- C11 Mr. Tim Jessop, Weston Consulting, Millway Avenue, Vaughan, dated November 1, 2016;
- C12 Ms. Rosemarie L. Humphries, Humphries Planning Group Inc., Chrislea Road, Vaughan, dated October 31, 2016; and
- C14 Antonietta and Joe Giannotti, Southview Drive, Concord, dated November 1, 2016.

#### **Recommendation**

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

- 1. THAT 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) BE RECEIVED; and that any issues identified be addressed in a future Technical Report to Committee of the Whole.

#### **Contribution to Sustainability**

The proposed recommendations are consistent with the Green Directions Vaughan mandate by supporting Goal 2:

- To ensure sustainable development and redevelopment.

#### **Economic Impact**

There are no economic impacts as a result of the receipt of this report.

#### **Communications Plan**

A communications and public consultation plan was implemented as part of the process of conducting this stage of the City-wide Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations. A summary of the stakeholder and broader public consultation process is provided later in this staff report.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 3

Notice of this meeting has been communicated to the public by the following means:

- Notices were mailed and/or e-mailed on October 7, 2016 to stakeholders that attended or provided comment in respect of the Committee of the Whole meeting that was held on the Low-Rise Residential Policy Review that took place on March 1, 2016;
- Notices were mailed and/or e-mailed to all Ratepayers Associations in Vaughan on October 7, 2016;
- Notices were mailed and/or e-mailed to stakeholders that attended the Public Open Houses on April 19, 2016, May 10, 2016, and May 11, 2016;
- Advertised in the Vaughan Citizen and Thornhill Liberal on October 13, 2016;
- Posted on the [www.vaughan.ca](http://www.vaughan.ca) online calendar, the [www.vaughan.ca](http://www.vaughan.ca) City Page Online; the Policy Planning Policies and Studies project page, and the City's electronic billboards.

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of this Public Hearing is to consider proposed amendments to the existing VOP 2010 policies resulting from the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations.

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

##### *Executive Summary*

This Public Hearing report sets out the background and processes underlying the preparation of the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations study and the proposed amendments to VOP 2010 resulting as an outcome of the study. The report is structured as follows, thereby providing:

1. Background on Study the origin of the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Areas;
2. The Policy Context;
3. A summary of the public consultation strategy;
4. Issues identified in the Summary Report on Public Feedback received during the commenting period and Public Open Houses;
5. An overview of the Draft Policy Review: Identifying Vaughan's Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods;
6. Recommended policy amendments to VOP 2010;
7. Clarification of the Intent of the Policies
8. Next Steps; and
9. Conclusions leading to the draft recommendations.

#### **(1) Study Origin and Response**

On March 18, 2014, Council adopted a resolution directing that a review of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010) be undertaken pertaining to policies that permit single and semi-detached houses and townhouses in Low-Rise Residential Areas. Staff were directed to specifically review the Low-Rise Residential Designation permissions and associated urban design, 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.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 4

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 enacted the Keele Street Interim Control By-law 120-2014, which was later subject to Ontario Municipal Board appeals.

At the June 16, 2015 Public Hearing, staff reported on the work of the City's consultant. The consultant's review 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..."

Subsequently, 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;*

*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;*

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 5

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 Committee recommendation by directing staff to reconsider the matter, and by modifying recommendation 1 to the resolution to have staff 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 modified Recommendation 2 of the Committee report 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 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.

On October 5, 2016 Committee of the Whole considered a related staff report on the Low-Rise Residential Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods. This is a companion piece to the policy recommendations made in this report. The Guidelines address the current VOP 2010 policies and provide guidance in their application. The policy amendments provided herein are proposed to provide further clarity to the policies of VOP 2010 when addressing infill development.

Committee of the Whole recommended approval of the staff recommendation "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. Ratification of the Committee recommendation will be considered at the Council meeting of October 19, 2016

This report will provide an update on the community and stakeholder feedback and provide Council with potential policy amendments for consideration at this Public Hearing.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 6

##### (2) Policy Context

The current policy regime governing the development of the Low-Rise Residential Area originates in a number of sources with the Vaughan Official Plan 2010. The detailed policies of VOP 2010 provide direction on the uses permitted and the development and urban design policies to be applied when considering individual proposals.

##### Provincial Policy Statement 2014

All land use decisions in Ontario "shall be consistent" with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), as set out in Section 3 of the Planning Act. It provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. Under the broad objective of strong, healthy communities and efficient, resilient land use patterns, the PPS promotes intensification, housing diversity and cost effective development, as articulated in Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.3. Policy 1.1.3.3, however, acknowledges that existing building stock and areas must be taken into account when identifying appropriate locations and promoting opportunities for intensification and redevelopment.

Of relevance for the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations is Policy 1.7.1(d):

Long-term economic prosperity should be supported by ... encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.

Policy 1.5.1(a) states that healthy, active communities should be promoted by planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity.

##### Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

The Places to Grow Act, the legislation that implemented the Growth Plan, states that all decisions made by municipalities under the Planning Act "shall conform to" the Growth Plan. The Growth Plan establishes employment and residential growth targets for different areas of the Greater Golden Horseshoe and describes policies that inform and regulate where and how growth should occur. Of the policy objectives contained within the Growth Plan, the following are relevant to the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations:

- Population and employment growth will be accommodated by...directing a significant portion of new growth to the built- up areas of the community through intensification (2.2.2.1 (a));
- Population and employment growth will be accommodated by...focusing intensification in intensification areas (2.2.2.1 (b));
- All municipalities will develop and implement through their official plans and other supporting documents, a strategy and policies to phase in and achieve intensification and the intensification target. This strategy and policies will...
  - identify intensification areas to support achievement of the intensification target (2.2.3.6 (c));
  - recognize urban growth centres, intensification corridors and major transit station areas as a key focus for development to accommodate intensification (2.2.3.6 (e)) facilitate and promote intensification (2.2.3.6 (f));

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 7

- Municipalities will develop and implement official plan policies and other strategies in support of the following conservation objectives...Cultural heritage conservation, including conservation of cultural heritage and archaeological resources where feasible, as built-up areas are intensified (4.2.4 (e)).

Schedule 1 of the VOP 2010 identifies Vaughan's Urban Structure. It has designated "Intensification Areas", which are focused on centres, nodes and corridors which are served, or are planned to be served, by higher order transit and "Stable" Community Areas, which are located in the interior of the communities with limited exposure to arterial roads. This study pertains to lands that are located in the Low-Rise Residential designation in the stable "Community Areas".

#### York Region Official Plan

An overarching goal of the York Region Official Plan (YROP) is to enhance the Region's urban structure through city building, intensification, and the development of compact and complete communities. The Plan allocates population targets for each local municipality and requires local municipalities to prepare intensification strategies that identify the role of Regional Centres and Corridors and Local Centres and Corridors in helping to achieve allotted intensification targets. It further directs local municipalities to identify intensification areas (5.3.3). Map 1 of the YROP identifies Regional Centres and Corridors. Local Centres and Corridors are to be identified by the local municipalities (Policy 5.5.2).

As per Policy 7.2.38, Regional streets are to accommodate all modes of transportation, including walking, cycling, transit, automobile use and the movement of goods, as well as public and private utilities.

The YROP's urban design and cultural heritage policies, in Sections 5.2 and 3.4 respectively, are also relevant to low-rise residential areas. Policy 5.2.8 states that it is the policy of Council to employ the highest standard of urban design, which:

- a. provides pedestrian scale, safety, comfort, accessibility and connectivity;
- b. complements the character of existing areas and fosters each community's unique sense of place;
- c. promotes sustainable and attractive buildings that minimize energy use;
- d. promotes landscaping, public spaces and streetscapes;
- e. ensures compatibility with and transit on to surrounding land uses;
- f. emphasizes walkability and accessibility through strategic building placement and orientation;
- g. follows the York Region Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines; and,
- h. creates well-defined, centrally-located urban public spaces.

Regarding cultural heritage, it is an objective of the YROP to recognize, conserve and promote cultural heritage and its value and benefit to the community. It is the policy of Regional Council to:

- To encourage local municipalities to consider urban design standards in core historic areas that reflect the areas' heritage, character and streetscape (3.4.8);
- To encourage access to core historic areas by walking, cycling and transit, and to ensure that the design of vehicular access and parking complements the historic built form (3.4.9).

The policies of the YROP promote intensification while also recognizing the need for infill development and redevelopment to be sensitive to its surroundings and to respect the valued character of established areas. The policies also highlight the need for pedestrian connectivity, walkability and built form compatibility.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 8

#### Vaughan Official Plan

The City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010) was adopted by City Council on September 7, 2010. Volume 1 which contains the City-wide policies governing growth and development is now almost completely in force.

The VOP's purpose is to manage growth within the City of Vaughan. Schedule 1 illustrates the City's Urban Structure and identifies areas that are suitable for intensification and those which are intended to be areas of stability (see Figure 2). This dual emphasis on growth and preservation is reflected in the set of policy objectives of the VOP which include:

- identifying Intensification Areas, consistent with the intensification objectives of the Plan and the Regional Official Plan, as the primary locations for accommodating intensification; (2.1.3.2 (c))
- ensuring the character of established communities is maintained; (2.1.3.2 (e))
- providing for a diversity of housing opportunities in terms of tenure, affordability, size and form; (2.1.3.2 (j))
- establishing a culture of design excellence with an emphasis on providing for a high quality public realm, appropriate built form and beautiful architecture through all new development. (2.1.3.2 (l))

#### **Community Area and Urban Design Policies**

The VOP identifies Community Areas on Schedule 1 - Urban Structure. Maintaining the stability of Community Areas is a primary objective of the VOP and is to be accomplished by providing for a variety of Low-Rise Residential uses on those lands (2.2.1.1 (b)). Two policies in Chapter 2 address the degree of change planned in Community Areas:

- 2.2.3.2. [It is the policy of Council] that Community Areas are considered Stable Areas and therefore Community Areas with existing development are not intended to experience significant physical change. New development that respects and reinforces the existing scale, height, massing, lot pattern, building type, character, form and planned function of the immediate local area is permitted, as set out in the policies in Chapter 9 of this Plan.
- 2.2.3.3. [It is the policy of Council] that limited intensification may be permitted in Community Areas as per the land use designations on Schedule 13 and in accordance with the policies of Chapter 9 of this Plan. The proposed development must be sensitive to and compatible with the character, form and planned function of the surrounding context.

Chapter 9 contains the VOP's urban design and built form policies, the following being the most relevant to this study:

- 9.1.2.1. [It is the policy of Council] 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 and 9.1.2.3;
- 9.1.2.2. [It is the policy of Council] that in Community Areas with established development, new development be designed to respect and reinforce the existing physical character and uses of the surrounding area, paying particular attention to the following elements:



## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 9

- 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 heights and scale of nearby residential properties;
- e. the setback of buildings from the street;
- f. the pattern of rear and side-yard setbacks;
- g. conservation and enhancement of heritage buildings, heritage districts and cultural heritage landscapes;
- h. 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).

9.1.2.3. Within the Community Areas there are a number of older, established residential neighbourhoods that are characterized by large lots and/or by their historical, architectural or landscape value. They are also characterized by their substantial rear, front and side yards, and by lot coverages that contribute to expansive amenity areas, which provide opportunities for attractive landscape development and streetscapes. Often, these areas are at or near the core of the founding communities of Thornhill, Concord, Kleinburg, Maple and Woodbridge, and may also be part of the respective Heritage Conservation Districts. In order to maintain the character of these areas 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 adjacent nearby and facing lots;
- b. Lot area: The area of new lots should be consistent with the size of adjacent and nearby lots;
- c. Lot configuration: New lots should respect the existing lotting fabric;
- 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. Building heights and massing: Should respect the scale of adjacent residential buildings and any city urban design guidelines prepared for these Community Areas;
- g. 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.

Policy 9.2.3.1 sets out the following policies and development criteria for detached and semi-detached houses:

- a. A Detached House is a Low-Rise Residential building, up to three storeys in height, situated on a single lot and not attached to any other residential building. A Semi-Detached House is a Low-Rise Residential building, up to three storeys in height, situated on a single lot and attached to no more than one other residential building situated on a separate parcel.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 10

- b. In Community Areas with existing development, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of Detached Houses and Semi-Detached Houses will respect and reinforce the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved Detached Houses and/or Semi-Detached Houses in the immediate area. Variations are permitted for the purposes of minimizing driveways.

Policy 9.2.3.2 sets out the following policies and development criteria for townhouses:

- a. A Townhouse is a Low-Rise Residential building, up to three storeys in height, situated on a single parcel and part of a row of at least three but no more than six attached residential units.
- b. In Community Areas with existing development, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of Townhouses will respect and reinforce the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved Townhouses in the immediate area. Variations are permitted for the purposes of minimizing driveways and having front entrances and porches located closer to the street than garages.
- c. In areas of new development, 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.
- d. Townhouses shall generally front onto a public street. Townhouse blocks not fronting onto a public street are only permitted if the unit(s) flanking a public street provide(s) a front-yard and front-door entrance facing the public street.
- e. The facing distance between blocks of Townhouses that are not separated by a public street should generally be a minimum of 18 metres in order to maximize daylight, enhance landscaping treatments and provide privacy for individual units.

#### **Mobility and Public Realm Policies**

Since most of the proposals for intensification include a street, laneway or pathway, the mobility and public realm policies of the VOP are also relevant.

Policy 4.2.1.5 states that it is the policy of Council:

- To develop a connected and continuous, grid-like street network that supports convenient and efficient travel by all modes of transportation and to discourage the development of street types that disrupt the grid network. New development shall be planned to support a grid-like street network with multiple connections to collector and arterial streets.

Regarding Local Streets, which are intended to provide access to individual properties within residential areas, Policy 4.2.1.26 states that local streets are oriented to the collector street system in a grid-like manner, while taking into account topographical constraints, desire for solar orientation, and special features, to:

- a. provide convenient connections to collector streets, shopping, transit stops, schools, parks and other community amenities;
- b. promote navigation within concession blocks that is clear and understandable; and,
- c. minimize through-traffic on local streets.

The VOP's public realm policies also address public streets. Policy 9.1.1.2 states that it is the policy of Council that public streets and rights-of-way are considered significant public places and, therefore, their design should balance their multiple roles and functions by ensuring that they:

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 11

- a. accommodate a variety of transportation functions, including walking, cycling, transit and driving;
- b. accommodate municipal Infrastructure and Utilities and, to the greatest extent possible, these functions be provided below grade;
- c. contribute to the greening of the City through the provision of street trees and landscaping;
- d. contribute to the City's overall design aesthetic through high-quality hard and soft landscaping treatments and the incorporation of public art; and,
- e. create an environment supportive of their function as gathering places by providing pedestrian amenities such as wide planted boulevards with appropriate and attractive street furniture and street lighting.

Policy 9.1.1.3 states that it is the policy of Council to improve the pedestrian experience on public streets and rights-of-way by:

- a. requiring sidewalks as per policy 4.2.3.4;
- b. prohibiting rear-lotting on public streets;
- c. avoiding blank facades along sidewalks;
- d. requiring that surface parking areas be buffered and screened from sidewalks through the use of setbacks and landscaping;
- e. providing a zone between pedestrians and high levels of vehicular traffic consisting of landscaping and street furniture, and where appropriate, on-street parking.

Policy 9.1.1.4 states that it is the policy of Council to promote an interconnected grid-like pattern of streets and blocks that is implemented through the following measures:

- a. ensuring the length of streets and blocks assists pedestrian and bicycle circulation;
- b. providing mid-block pedestrian/bicycle pathways where appropriate;
- c. maximizing the number of street connections to arterial roads;
- d. limiting and discouraging cul-de-sacs and window streets; and,
- e. designing streets that are safe for cyclists and, where appropriate, providing for on-street bike lanes. Policy 9.1.1.5 states it is the policy of Council to recognize that some condominium developments will contain common-element streets and walkways. In such instances these features should be designed to simulate a public street and the policies outlined in policies 9.1.1.2, 9.1.1.3 and 9.1.1.4 shall apply.

#### **Natural Heritage Network Policies**

The VOP 2010 recognizes the important role the Natural Heritage Network - the interconnected system of wetlands, woodlands, streams, valleys, and other ecological components - plays in supporting the built environment and human health. Watercourses and other natural features are also found in many of the low-rise residential areas in Vaughan. Below is a summary of the relevant policies in Chapter 3 of the VOP:

- 3.2.1.2. [It is the policy of Council] to maintain the long- term ecological function and biodiversity of the Natural Heritage Network by utilizing an ecosystem function approach to planning that protects, restores and where possible enhances natural features and their functions.
- 3.2.3.4. [It is the policy of Council] that Core Features, as identified on Schedule 2, provide critical ecosystem functions, and consist of the following natural heritage components and their minimum vegetation protection zones:

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 12

- a. valley and stream corridors, including provincially significant valleylands and permanent and intermittent streams, with a minimum 10 metre vegetation protection zone.
- 3.2.3.5. [It is the policy of Council] that specific requirements related to the protection and enhancement of the various elements of Core Features are included in Section 3.3 of this Plan.
- 3.2.3.8. [It is the policy of Council] that development or site alteration on lands adjacent to Core Features shall not be permitted unless it is demonstrated through an environmental impact study that the development or site alteration will not result in a negative impact on the feature or its functions.
- 3.3.1.3. [It is the policy of Council] that an application for development or site alteration on lands adjacent to valley and stream corridors will not be considered by Council unless the precise limits of valley and stream corridors have been established to the satisfaction of the City and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

#### **Implementation Policies**

The implementation policies of the VOP are also relevant to proposals for intensification in existing community areas.

Policy 10.1.1, dealing with detailed planning states:

- Some areas of the City, which may or not be subject to Secondary Plans and/or Block Plans, will also be subject to Site and Area Specific Policies. These policies are to reflect historical conditions or development permissions that have been previously approved and still maintain the main goals and objectives of this Plan, but do not fit within the specific policy structure that has been created in this Plan. Council may approve additional Site and Area Specific Policies through the review of development applications where it is felt that the goals and objectives of this Plan are maintained but a modification to the policy structure is required.

Policies 10.1.1.14 - 10.1.1.26 address Block Plans. Policy 10.1.1.14 states that the City will identify areas subject to a Block Plan process through either the Secondary Plan process or the development review process, to address complexities in smaller planning units, scoped as required in accordance with policy 10.1.1.15. Policy 10.1.1.15 describes a Block Plan as a comprehensive planning framework that describes how the following policy aspects of development will be addressed:

- a. the proposed land uses, housing mix and densities;
- b. traffic management. including the expected traffic volumes on all collector and local streets to precisely define the requirements for items such as traffic signals, stop signs, turn lanes and transit stop locations, traffic-calming measures, and transportation demand management;
- c. the provision of public transit, pedestrian and cycling networks; d. the provision of public and private services and the detailed approach to stormwater management;
- d. protection and enhancement of the Natural Heritage Network, including the detailed evaluation and demarcation of Core Features and Enhancement Areas;
- e. the precise locations of natural and cultural heritage features of the area, including built heritage and potential archaeological resources and proposed approaches to conservation and or enhancement;

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 13

- f. the precise location of any parks, open spaces, schools, community centres, and libraries;
- g. the proposed implementation of sustainable development policies as contained in subsection 9.1.3 of this Plan;
- h. phasing of development ; and,
- i. evaluation of opportunities for coordination with environmental assessment processes for roads and infrastructure that are subject to the Environmental Assessment Act.

Addressing site and area specific policies, Policy 10.11.11.29 states that Council will establish, from time to time, new Site and Area Specific policies, to be contained in Volume 2 of this Plan, through the processing of development applications where it has been demonstrated that the goals and objectives of this Plan are being met.

#### Intensification Areas Identified in Policy

The Vaughan Official Plan 2010 brings the City into conformity with provincial and regional policy regarding intensification. 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. Growth Plan policy 2.2.2.1.b states that population and employment will be accommodated by focusing intensification in intensification areas. Provincial Policy Statement policy 1.1.3.3 provides that, "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, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs".

Both the Region's Official Plan and Vaughan Official Plan 2010 identify intensification areas. The Region's urban hierarchy provides for intensification in its Centres and Corridors policy framework. The City of Vaughan identifies areas of intensification in Schedule 1 – Urban Structure, which further reinforces the location of the Centres and Intensification Corridors as the primary destination of 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, it is in conformity with all relevant Provincial plans and policies.

The Community Area Policy Review focuses only on areas that are designated Low-Rise Residential. This designation makes up a sizeable portion of Vaughan's Community Areas which, as they are considered Stable Areas as stated in policy 2.2.3.2, they "are not intended to experience significant physical change". In addition, a primary objective of the Official Plan in policy 2.1.3.2 (e) is, "ensuring the character of established communities are maintained". When taken together, these layers of policy provide that Low-Rise Residential areas are not meant to be the recipient of a significant amount of intensification.

#### Implications of Secondary Suites

After the adoption of VOP 2010 the Province mandated that Secondary Suites be permitted in existing residential areas. Under the legislation, municipalities are required to amend their official plans and zoning by-laws to accommodate secondary suites in residential areas. The City has undertaken this exercise and is now completing the work to bring forward amendments to VOP 2010 and By-law 1-88 to permit secondary suites as of right throughout the Low-Rise Residential Area, subject to fulfilling a number of criteria. It is expected that staff will be providing a technical report on the draft amendments, together with a report on the required implementation measures, in early 2017.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 14

Secondary suites represent a form of intensification that will broadly apply to the Low-Rise Residential areas. These policies do not address secondary suites, which will be permitted as of right, in the official plan and zoning by-law, subject to meeting a number of tests. These matters will be addressed in the amending planning documents that will come before Council in the near future. It is the intention that the introduction of secondary suites maintain the character of their host neighbourhoods.

#### (3) The Public Consultation Strategy and Issues Identified

City 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 obtained from community meetings.

The following activities comprised the public consultation process, which provided the input that 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

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 led by 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:

- 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) has been comprised of internal City departmental staff and external agencies. Representation on the TAC included staff from Development Engineering and

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 15

Infrastructure Planning, Development Planning, Policy Planning and Environmental Sustainability, and staff from Community Planning and Development Services at the Region of York. The Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Designations work plan included 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 proposed 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 were provided an opportunity to present the changes made to the draft policy amendments and Urban Design Guidelines based on feedback received via written submissions and the public open houses. This included discussion on 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 the executive of the York Region Chapter of BILD to discuss the implications of this study. The outcome of this meeting was reported by way of a communication 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".

(4) Issues Identified in the Summary Report on Public Feedback Received during the Commenting Period and Public Open Houses.

A synopsis of the public feedback is set out below. Please refer to Attachment 1 ("Community Consultation Summary Report - What We Heard") for the complete text.

a) General Built Form

Residents were generally supportive of the proposed design guidelines, especially those that clarified and reinforced existing compatibility requirements. Among the issues that were raised by a number of residents, there was concern that many infill and townhouse developments were creating adverse privacy impacts, the developments were not consistent with the character of the existing neighbourhood, and some townhouse developments are not compatible with the single-detached homes in the neighbourhood. Comments received by the development community generally expressed concern over the proposed guidelines, deeming them to be too prescriptive, requesting more flexibility to allow stacked, back-to-back and low-rise apartments within the subject areas.

b) Neighbourhood Character

There was an indication from comments submitted that the guidelines would benefit from a more definitive description of the areas in which they would apply. In particular, more clarity and on what constitutes the character of those neighbourhoods was provided as a potential remedy.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 16

c) Environmental

There was near-unanimous support among residents for the proposed urban design guidelines to speak to the need to preserve mature trees during infill development and that the proposed guidelines should be enacted as is or even strengthened. Other environmentally-focused comments indicated that residents are concerned that ongoing intensification is negatively impacting existing natural heritage features and that larger and denser development proposals are not providing the required amount of parkland, instead opting for cash-in-lieu payments. Requests were made for the urban design guidelines and/or policies to speak to the importance of stormwater management and other green infrastructure.

d) Transportation, Streets, and Parking

Comments received indicated that there is concern among residents that infill development and townhouse developments in particular, are contributing to congestion on arterial and local roads. A related concern was the belief that investment in public transportation in Vaughan has not kept pace with the development that has occurred, exacerbating traffic congestion. Representatives of the development industry suggested that townhouse developments should be allowed to front on to private streets or laneways where appropriate. Other comments received spoke to townhouse developments not having adequate parking.

e) Development Standards

The majority of the feedback received regarding development standards were provided by representatives of the development industry. In general, their recommendations favoured the current policy framework and indicated that they were concerned that the proposed urban design guidelines and policy amendments were too restrictive. Greater flexibility for the design of townhouse developments, such as by removing the proposed requirement that all townhouses possess a fenced rear yard, was also requested. Submissions from a variety of respondents indicated that they would support the inclusion of lot coverage requirements in the proposed urban design guidelines.

f) Implementation

Several submissions received indicated a concern that the Urban Design Guidelines would be ignored post-adoption. Other comments requested clarification on how the guidelines would be used when the City is reviewing development applications. Comments received from the development industry suggest that the guidelines are too prescriptive and should not be adopted.

g) Public Consultation

Although not directly related to the proposed urban design guidelines and policy amendments, several residents provided feedback about the nature of the public consultation process itself. Some residents were displeased that ratepayers' groups were not engaged directly or proactively prior to the development of the Draft Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations Report while others suggested that ratepayers' groups should be consulted directly as part of the current engagement process.

(5) Overview of Policy Review: Identifying Vaughan's Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods



**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 17

**Methodology for Determining Typologies of Established Community Areas in Vaughan**

Vaughan has a long history of development extending back to the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Most of the development has taken place since 1950. As a result the city has a variety of neighbourhood typologies that reflect the period of development, lot sizes, building types and landscape treatments. The review also considered existing Official Plan policies and zoning by-laws, as well as urban design guidelines, and Heritage Conservation District policies. It was determined that the Official Plan in some instances, needed more specific direction on how to achieve development that respects the character of the host community. Having a solid understanding of the neighbourhood types will serve to guide and assign policies and guidelines to the appropriate areas and situations.

Schedule 1 (Urban Structure) and Schedule 13 (Land Use Designations) of the VOP 2010 were used to identify the limits of Vaughan's designated Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential areas. Detailed aerial photography of the areas and the community fabric and design was then used to identify the distinct types of neighbourhoods within these areas.

Lot frontage was used as the primary determinant of neighbourhood type, since the width of a lot typically has a direct relationship to the following characteristics, which are fundamental to defining the character of a neighbourhood:

- The sizes of houses (building height and massing);
- The setbacks of houses from the street and neighbouring properties;
- The extent of land used for tree planting and other green landscaping;
- The relationship of garages to houses (on larger lots they are typically a less dominant feature).

Other defining elements of neighbourhood character include architecture, tree size and canopy, and private landscaping such as pathways or light fixtures. Since these elements vary from neighbourhood to neighbourhood and are subject to change, they were not criteria used to categorize neighbourhoods. These elements were, however, considered, in assessing the need for, and proposing, policy refinements and guidelines for all established neighbourhoods.

Based on this analysis, Vaughan's residential subdivisions generally fall into five ranges of lot frontages: 30 metres (approx. 100 feet) and greater; 21-29 metres (approx. 70-95 feet); 14-20 metres (approx. 45-65 feet); 10-14 metres (approx. 35-45 feet); and 6-9 metres (approx. 20-34 feet). It was determined that low-rise residential areas with lot frontages in the first two ranges constitute "Large-Lot Neighbourhoods", areas with frontages in the next two ranges are "Medium-Lot Neighbourhoods", and areas with lots 9 metres wide or less are "Small-Lot Neighbourhoods" (Refer to Attachment 2).

**Summary of Neighbourhood Types**

The three neighbourhood types exhibited the following characteristics:

a) Large Lot Neighbourhoods (approximately 21 metres frontage or greater)

- Deep front setbacks of approximately 12 metres (39 feet) or greater
- Deep rear setbacks of 15 metres (49 feet) or greater
- Wide and/or circular/semi-circular driveways
- Attached garages that generally are not dominant features, with varying orientations and designs
- Large detached houses
- Expansive landscaped front and rear yard

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 18

##### Findings:

Large Lot Neighbourhoods are experiencing two types of development pressure which can ultimately alter the character of the neighbourhood if not compatible with the surrounding established development. The first is the replacement of one and one-and-a-half storey houses with “monster homes” that appear to be two-and-a-half or three storeys tall. This has been occurring in many of Vaughan’s older established neighbourhoods. However, in some cases, the transition between newly built homes versus older existing housing stock in these neighbourhoods is significant, and occasionally, garages and/or overly wide driveways dominate the front elevation of the new dwellings.

The second type of development pressure in large-lot neighbourhoods are proposals to subdivide lots into two or more lots for new detached or semi-detached houses where lot dimensions are consistent. Proposals to subdivide these properties alter the consistency of lot frontage and size of dwelling which may potentially change the character of the neighbourhood disrupting the flow of consistency and continuity of the Large Lot characteristics, as side yards are reduced and garages and driveways become more dominant features.

#### b) Medium Lot Neighbourhoods (approximately 10 metres frontage or greater)

- Lot frontage of 10 to 20 metres (33 to 65 feet)
- Front setbacks of 6 to 15 metres (20 to 50 feet)
- Interior side yard setbacks of typically 1.5 metres (5 feet)
- Rear setbacks of 7.5 to 10 metres (25 to 33 feet)
- Wide driveways
- Front yard landscaped area generally less than 50% of the yard.
- 2-storey detached house is the predominant housing type

##### Findings:

Development pressure in Medium Lot Established Neighbourhoods is less acute than in the large-lot neighbourhoods, since the housing stock in these neighbourhoods is relatively newer, and the site and zoning restrictions prevent significantly larger homes from being built. There has been an influx of development applications on medium-lot neighbourhoods proposing to intensify and replace bungalows with 2-storey homes, and rear yard additions are becoming more common. There are some instances where plans of the subdivision of wider size lots were proposed in these neighbourhoods.

#### c) Small Lot Neighbourhoods (approximately 6 to 9 metres frontage)

- Lot frontages of 6 to 9 metres (20 to 30 feet)
- Front setbacks of approximately 5 to 12 metres (16 to 40 feet)
- Side setbacks of approximately 0 to 1.5 metres
- Rear setbacks of approximately 6 to 10 metres
- Single or double car garages
- 2-storeys detached, semi-detached houses and townhouse building type

##### Findings:

Development pressures for these neighbourhoods is also less acute than in the large-lot neighbourhoods, since the housing stock is generally of recent construction, and site and zoning restrictions prevent significantly larger homes from being built. The lots are too narrow for subdivision to be considered.

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 19

d) Arterial Areas

The results of the analysis reveal a number of instances where the lotting and development pattern along an arterial road in some parts of the Community Area is inconsistent with the surrounding neighbourhoods on either side of the arterial road. These areas are generally a result of subdivisions being built around existing houses on large, formerly rural lots, that have arterial frontage with an existing access.

Results from the review also indicate that individual lots and assembled lots along these arterial areas are typically larger than lots in the established adjacent neighbourhood areas. These lots can typically accommodate townhouse developments that would not be appropriate on sites internal to large-lot and medium-lot neighbourhoods because they would be of an incompatible character.

As these areas fall within the “Community Area” designation as per Schedule 1 (Urban Structure) of VOP 2010, they are generally not intended for intensification as per policies 2.2.3.1 to 2.2.3.4. However, there are some areas where modest intensification might be supported provided it can meet the existing VOP 2010 policy requirements. Staff is of the opinion that development along these arterial areas should be addressed through additional policies in the VOP 2010, in accordance with the supplementary urban design guidelines informing their design, so as to ensure they are compatible with the character and context of neighbouring properties and their surrounding established low-rise residential communities.

The report recommends particular policies and urban design guidelines to address a range of issues posed by recent development proposals for arterial areas as well as potential issues that may arise with future proposals, with emphasis on addressing:

- **The introduction of a private driveway / street parallel or perpendicular to the arterial street to provide frontage for dwelling units located behind units fronting the arterial** – the use of laneways, driveways or private streets to provide frontage for development at the rear of units fronting the arterial is not consistent with the pattern of development in Vaughan’s established low-rise neighborhoods, where houses generally front a public street. Front-to-back condition would be created as a result and would result in a significant loss of privacy for the units facing the arterial street.
- **The introduction of private street and pathway networks on very large sites** – Vaughan’s established low-rise residential neighbourhoods are structured and serviced by networks of local public streets that facilitate navigation that is clear and understandable and function as multi-purpose public spaces. Private streets are generally not designed to the standards of a public street and typically prevent opportunities for public connections through private or semi-private sites, which may create issues of safety and security and which limit pedestrian connectivity and porosity.
- **The use of reduced front yard and rear yard setbacks to maximize density on the site** – the clustering of townhouses on a site requiring reduced setbacks that do not reflect the prevailing setbacks in the surrounding area, creates significantly greater massing and visual impact of the houses in the adjacent established neighbourhood. Landscaped front yards should provide room for mature trees, with a minimum front setback of 4.5 metres to reinforce the green character of host neighbourhoods. Rear setbacks that do not respect the existing pattern and zoning standards for the neighbourhood may lead to adverse light, overlook and loss of privacy impacts.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 20

- **Loss of Mature Trees** – townhouse developments that cover much of a site invariably result in the loss of mature trees, which are a defining characteristic of many of Vaughan's established low-rise neighbourhoods.

It is important to note that the aforementioned issues, respecting arterial areas apply to designated Low-Rise Residential areas within Community Areas, as set-out in Schedule 1 of VOP 2010. In these areas the intent of VOP 2010 is for new development to respect and reinforce the established pattern and character of the area. Issues associated with townhouse development in designated "Intensification Areas" might be quite different from those discussed above, since the intent of designated "intensification" areas versus "stable" residential areas differs in the context of VOP 2010. Intensification Areas seek to achieve higher density development in centres and corridors that are, or will be supported, by a high level of transit service.

The study suggests that compatibility in low-rise residential areas along arterial streets can be achieved by respecting and maintaining the prevailing pattern of building orientation, setbacks and landscaping; and can fit or be more compatible within each distinct type of neighbourhood in the City. The recommended policy amendments and urban design guidelines (considered at the October 5, 2016 Committee of the Whole meeting) will help ensure that each infill application respects and reinforces the existing character of the host community area.

#### **Vaughan Official Plan and Zoning By-law**

##### **Review of VOP 2010 Policies**

A review of the existing policy regime in VOP 2010 and By-law 1-88 was undertaken as part of this study. The current policy regime provides guidance as to the City's expectations for development in its stable residential areas, respecting the fact that the City has established Intensification Areas where major redevelopment and infill is already permitted. Section 3 of Attachment 1, highlights the policies related to the regulation of infill development in areas designated Low-Rise Residential in the Community Areas of VOP 2010.

Key policies in Volume 1 of VOP 2010 identified in the study include:

- Community Area Policies – 2.2.1.1 (b), 2.2.3.2. and 2.2.3.3., addressing the degree of change planned in Community Areas i.e. stable areas not intended to experience significant physical change;
- Mobility Policies – 4.2.1.5, 4.2.1.26, also relevant to intensification oriented development proposals;
- Public Realm Policies – 9.1.1.2, 9.1.1.3, 9.1.1.4, 9.1.1.5, addressing requirements for public streets and accessibility including their function, layout and design;
- Urban Design Policies – 9.1.2.1, 9.1.2.2, 9.1.2.3, 9.2.2.1, containing policies on the design and form of development including compatibility criteria for new development;
- Low-Rise Residential Policies – 9.2.3.1, 9.2.3.2, establishes the development criteria for detached, semi-detached and townhouse building forms;

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 21

- Heritage Policies – 6.2.2.9, 6.3.2.4, addresses development adjacent to a Heritage Conservation District and establishes compatibility criteria which must be considered in development applications; and that the character prescribed in the Heritage Conservation District must also be respected and complemented;
- Implementation Policies – 10.1.1, 10.1.1.14 – 10.1.1.26, 10.1.1.29, establishes the criteria and framework for policy implementation, which includes the application of the Block Plan process to coordinate the development of multi-ownership parcels.

Recommended changes to these policies resulting from the study, are discussed later in this report.

#### **Review of Zoning By-law 1-88**

The review considered existing zoning by-law permissions in the designated Community Areas as part of the establishment of “character”, as it provides the basis for understanding the pattern of development and built form controls that the new development in the area must “respect and reinforce”. Reflecting the predominance of detached houses, the most common zoning found in Community Areas is R1V, R1, R2 or R3. Section 3.8 of Attachment 1, provides a table summarizing the key regulations that apply in each zone as well as the typical low-rise residential zones where townhouses are permitted, RM1 and RM2. The study found that since the character of Vaughan’s low-rise residential areas, in many respects, is determined by zoning standards; they have informed the recommended infill guidelines.

#### **Precedent Review: Best Practices in Other Jurisdictions**

One of the tasks identified in the Council direction was to review “best practices in other jurisdictions”. The consultant has summarized the policies and guidelines of other municipalities, primarily in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, that have been developed to regulate and guide change in mature low-rise neighbourhoods. For each, it looked at the methodology and approach of the other municipalities, relevance to the City of Vaughan and provided the study some sample guidelines. The review included an examination of the cities of Toronto and Ottawa, which have been dealing with development pressures in their low-density communities for some time. It also examined the policies and guidelines adopted by some of the more mature suburban municipalities in the GTA, similar to the City of Vaughan. The following municipalities were reviewed:

- Toronto;
- Ottawa;
- Mississauga;
- Brampton;
- Markham;
- Whitchurch-Stouffville; and
- Oakville.

Generally, the official plan policies of the other municipalities were consistent in the identification of important character elements that needed to be preserved in Low-Rise areas and the use of guidelines was widespread. This research informed the preparation of the recommended changes to VOP 2010 and the design guidelines. The full review is set out in Attachment 1, Section 4 “Precedent Review”.

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 22

**Study Conclusions and Recommendations**

The study concludes that there have been an increasing number of applications that seemingly counter the vision and intent for the stable Community Areas identified as set out in VOP 2010. The intent of VOP 2010 is to ensure that development respects, reinforces and is compatible with, the existing scale, lot pattern, character and form of the established neighbourhoods. However, to aid in implementation it would be beneficial if more information is provided on how the applicable policies should be applied to individual development applications to support more consistent interpretations of the Plan.

The study recommends that the City consider refining the VOP 2010 to clarify existing policies and adopting urban design guidelines to support and further clarify the existing policy regime to address the concerns over the compatibility of infill development in Community Areas with a Low-Rise Residential designation. The study proposes a number of amendments to VOP 2010 and further proposes two sets of urban design guidelines, one for general infill development in established low-rise residential areas, and one specific to infill townhouse development.

Staff support the recommendation to introduce supplementary urban design guidelines to support to policies in VOP 2010 as they relate to infill development in stable community areas designated for Low-Rise Residential uses. This was discussed in detail in the October 5, 2016 report to Committee of the Whole. These supplementary Urban Design Guidelines will provide clarity in interpreting and implementing VOP 2010 policies in the form of criteria, illustrations and language and; will also provide greater clarity during the development review process during the implementation of the Official Plan.

While the proposed VOP 2010 amendments and urban design guidelines are complementary and mutually supportive, they are being implemented independently. The guidelines are non-statutory but provide assistance in interpreting the current VOP 2010 policies. This approach was identified in the Council report in March 2016.

**(6) Recommended Policy Amendments to VOP 2010**

Below are the suggested modifications to the policies of VOP 2010. 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. The proposed amendments are also set out in Section 5.1 of the final study report, which forms Attachment 1 to this report.

- **Changes that have been made to the proposed amendments since January 2016 as a result of feedback received from the public, stakeholders and City staff have been highlighted with boxed text.**

The rationale for these changes is provided below the core rationale for each policy, if applicable, and is indicated with a ‘\*’.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 23

#### **Community Area Policies**

##### Proposed amendment to Policy 2.2.3.2:

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.

*Rationale: The proposed amendment clarifies the meaning of “significant” in this context by relating it to a change that would alter the general character of a neighbourhood. It also recognizes that in addition to the existing criteria, the orientation of buildings in a neighbourhood is also fundamental to its character and if altered through redevelopment would mark a significant physical change to the neighbourhood’s established character.*

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

##### Proposed amendment to Policy 9.1.2.1:

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** and ~~9.1.2.3~~ 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 **9.1.2.4 9.1.2.5**;

*Rationale: The above amendment is appropriate if proposed new policy 9.1.2.4 below is adopted.*

*\* Rationale: Slight text change to ensure that policies are ordered numerically, if the proposed new policy 9.1.2.4 is approved.*

##### Proposed amendment to Policy 9.1.2.2:

In 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** ~~paying particular attention to~~ the following elements:

- 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 nearby-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;**

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 24

- 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).

*Rationale: The proposed amendment adds new elements that contribute to the character of a neighbourhood that should be specifically respected and reinforced. The additions to the list of elements recognize that the orientation of buildings, the presence of trees and the general landscape character are fundamental elements that help to define the character of a neighbourhood. The proposed amendment also recognizes that topography and drainage are important considerations when redeveloping a site.*

*\* Rationale: The wording has been slightly modified further to clarify that new development should respect and reinforce the physical character of adjacent properties as well as others in the immediate surroundings, and to clarify that Policy 9.1.2.2 applies to all types of development applications.*

Proposed amendment to Policy 9.1.2.3:

Within the Community Areas there are a number of ~~older~~, 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” [X] (~~Established Large Lot Neighbourhoods~~).** Some of these ~~older~~ established neighbourhoods, **as well as newer 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. ~~Often, these areas are~~ **These include neighbourhoods** at or near the ~~core~~ of 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 ~~these areas~~ **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 ~~adjacent nearby and facing~~ **adjoining or facing** 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 ~~adjacent and nearby~~ **adjoining or facing** lots;
- c. Lot configuration: New lots should respect the existing lotting fabric **in the immediate vicinity** immediately surrounding area;



**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 25

- 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 identified in Schedule 9 (Future Transportation Network), where a Semi-detached House or Townhouse dwelling replacing a detached dwelling may be permitted, subject to Policy 9.1.2.4 and the other urban design policies of this plan;**
- g. Building heights and massing: Should respect the scale of adjacent residential buildings and any city urban design guidelines prepared for these Community Areas;
- h. 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.

*Rationale: The proposed amendment recognizes that in addition to the older, established neighbourhoods found in Thornhill, Concord, Kleinburg, Maple and Woodbridge, there are “newer” estate lot neighbourhoods within Community Areas with similar characteristics to be respected and reinforced.*

*The addition of a new schedule (Schedule 1B: Areas Subject to Policy 9.1.2.3 - Vaughan’s Large Lot Neighbourhoods), consistent with Figure 2 in the study report, will clarify which areas of the city this policy applies. By having the policy apply to established large-lot neighbourhoods generally, the question of the age of a neighbourhood and whether or not it qualifies as “older” becomes less relevant and more emphasis is placed on the characteristics of these neighbourhoods to be respected and reinforced by new development.*

*The proposed amendments to 9.1.2.3(a) and (b) clarify the area to be considered when lot severances are proposed, recognizing that lot frontages and areas vary across Community Areas; so long as new lots are consistent with the size of adjacent lots, that aspect of the neighbourhood’s character should be respected and reinforced. The proposed new policy regarding dwelling types recognizes that Vaughan’s large-lot neighbourhoods are defined by single detached dwellings, and more intense dwelling types might be appropriate only at the edges of the neighbourhood along arterial roads.*

*\* Rationale: The word “older” was removed from the third sentence for consistency with the original proposed removal of the word “older” from the first sentence. The word “facing” was removed from subpoint “b” in order to account for situations where lots across the street may be significantly different in size from the new lot under study. This change recognizes that permitting the subdivision of large lots on the basis that lots across the street are narrower disregards the precedent that would be set for other large lots on the same block, which could lead to incremental and significant change to the character of the neighbourhood.*

*The language was updated in subpoint “c” for clarity of interpretation.*

*The terms are capitalized in subpoint “f” to be consistent with their capitalization elsewhere in the VOP 2010.*

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 26

Proposed new Policy 9.1.2.4:

Notwithstanding Policy 9.1.2.3, where a lot in an established Low-Rise Residential neighbourhood 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 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;
- e. The scale and massing of townhouse developments shall respect the scale and massing of adjacent development and any applicable urban design guidelines.
- f. ~~Access to additional dwellings will be provided by a shared driveway and Developments should protect for future interconnection with adjacent properties. No additional access points onto an Arterial Street will be permitted. to minimize accesses to the Arterial Street. Access arrangements on Arterial Streets shall be to the satisfaction of York Region. arrangements shall comply with the policies of the York Regional Official Plan.~~
- g. **Where a parcel does not front an Arterial Street, as identified on Schedule 9 (Future Transportation Network), townhouses shall not be permitted.**

*Rationale: This proposed new policy recognizes that townhouse developments, as well as semi-detached houses, are not common in most of Vaughan's long established neighbourhoods and if introduced would mark a significant physical change, which would be contrary to Policy 2.2.3.2. The policy also recognizes, however, that unusually deep and/or wide lots at the edges of established communities along arterial roads may present opportunities to accommodate townhouse developments with minimal or no adverse impact on the larger established neighbourhood. The criteria in the proposed policy are intended to ensure that townhouse developments respect the physical character of the established neighbourhood and achieve compatibility.*

*\* Rationale: The terms are capitalized in the policy language to be consistent with their capitalization elsewhere in the VOP 2010.*

*Subpoint "f" was added to ensure that the proposed policy is consistent with the requirements of York Region. Regional Official Plan Policy 7.2.53 states that, "[It is the policy of Council] 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".*

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 27

*Policy 9.1.2.4 (g) has been added to clarify that new townhouse development will only be considered in the Low-Rise Residential designation on parcels where there is frontage and access onto an Arterial Street.*

*For clarity, proposed Policy 9.1.2.4 would be inserted after Policy 9.1.2.3 and subsequent Policies would be renumbered accordingly.*

Proposed new Policy 9.1.2.5:

**Where a new street network and other infrastructure are required to facilitate and service new development ~~on deep formerly rural lots~~ in established Community Areas, the City may require a Block Plan, as per Policies 10.1.1.14 - 10.1.1.15, 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.**

*Rationale: Policy 10.1.1.14 states that the City may identify areas subject to a Block Plan through the development review process to address complexities in smaller planning units. The proposed new policy clarifies that unusually large lots within Community Areas, or assemblages of such lots, may constitute a smaller planning unit that requires a Block Plan to ensure they develop in a rational and efficient manner that fully conforms to the VOP 2010.*

*\* Rationale: The phrase “on deep formerly rural lots” was removed because the requirement for a Block Plan may apply in more settings than on deep formerly rural lots”. For clarity, proposed Policy 9.1.2.5 would be inserted after the new proposed Policy 9.1.2.4 and subsequent Policies would be renumbered accordingly.*

Proposed amendment to Policy 9.2.2.1(c):

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

- 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.

*Rationale: Policy 9.2.2.1 specifically identifies which building types are permitted in Low-Rise Residential Areas. The proposed amendment to the policy qualifies that these building types are subject to additional policies within the VOP 2010 that speak to the design and compatibility of those building types. The proposed amendment is intended to aid the interpretation of this policy and clarify the relationship between the built form and urban design policies of the VOP 2010.*

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 28

*\* Rationale: Modifications to Policy 9.2.2.1(c) are proposed to support and clarify the interpretation of VOP 2010.*

Proposed amendment to Policy 9.2.3.1(b):

In **established** Community Areas **where Detached Houses and Semi-Detached Houses exist, with existing development**, 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 ~~Detached Houses and/or Semi-Detached houses~~ **of the same type** in the immediate area. Variations are permitted for the purposes of minimizing driveways.

*Rationale: The proposed amendment clarifies that the policy is intended to apply to proposed new development in established neighbourhoods and ensure new detached and semi-detached houses are only introduced where they already exist.*

Proposed amendment to Policy 9.2.3.2(b):

In **established** Community Areas ~~where Townhouses exist~~, with existing development, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of **new** Townhouses will respect and reinforce the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved ~~Townhouses~~ **development** in the ~~immediate area~~ **surrounding area provided they are 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.**

*Rationale: The proposed amendment clarifies that the policy is intended to apply to proposed new development in established neighbourhoods. The prohibition against back-to-back townhouses recognizes that their form and orientation are not in keeping with the pattern and character of existing development in areas designated Low-Rise Residential.*

*\* Rationale: Reference to existing townhouses was removed as there were areas where minimal townhouse examples to provide a precedent. Further this would now be counter to the intent of the proposed amendment and was removed.*

*The word “surrounding area” is added in place of “immediate area” to support the interpretation of the geographic extent to which the Policy will apply.*

*The phrase “and shall be consistent with Policies 9.1.2.2, 9.1.2.3 and 9.1.2.4” is added to clarify that new townhouses should respect and reinforce the character of other built and approved development in the immediate surrounding area; they still need to be consistent with the updated provisions of VOP 2010.*

*Stacked townhouses are added to the final sentence to clarify that both stacked and back-to-back townhouses should not be permitted in established Community Areas.*

CITY OF VAUGHAN

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 29

Proposed amendment to Policy 9.2.3.2(c):

In ~~areas of new development~~ **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.

*Rationale: The proposed amendment clarifies that it applies to new, still developing neighbourhoods and not any area where there is new development.*

Proposed amendment to Policy 9.2.3.2(d):

Townhouses in **designated Low-Rise Residential areas** shall generally front onto a public street ~~or public open space~~. ~~In other areas where Townhouses are permitted, they shall be encouraged to front a public street or public open space.~~ Where a townhouse ~~block end unit~~ does not front a public street but flanks one Townhouse blocks ~~not fronting onto a public street~~ are only permitted if the unit(s) flanking a public street, **the flanking unit(s) shall** provide a front yard and front-door entrance facing the public street.

*Rationale: The proposed amendment recognizes that dwellings fronting a public street or open space is a defining characteristic of Vaughan's Community Areas and ensures this pattern will be maintained with new housing, including townhouses. It also recognizes that flexibility regarding this requirement may be needed in other areas, namely intensification areas, where frontage on private streets, mews or open spaces may be more practical and desirable for achieving density and other urban design objectives.*

*\* Rationale: The word "block" is changed to "end unit" to ensure consistency with the above Policy that encourages Townhouses to front a public street or open space. If an end unit flanks a public street, then the flanking unit(s) should be required to provide a front yard and front-door entrance facing the public street. The reference to townhouses fronting onto public open space in Low-Rise Residential areas has been removed to ensure consistency with proposed new Policy 9.1.2.4, consistent with VOP 2010.*

Proposed new Policy 9.2.3.2(f):

~~New townhouses in established Low-Rise Residential areas where townhouses do not currently exist in the immediate vicinity of the site or where the site does not front an Arterial Street, as identified in Schedule 9 (Future Transportation Network), will require an Official Plan Amendment shall not be permitted.~~

*\* Rationale: This policy was proposed in the January 2016 version of the study that proceeded to Council on March 22, 2016. It has been replaced by the addition of proposed new Policy 9.1.2.4 (g) which provides that "Where a parcel does not front an Arterial Street, as identified on Schedule 9 (Future Transportation Network), townhouses shall not be permitted."*

Proposed amendment to Policy 9.2.3.3(a):

The following policies and development criteria apply to Stacked Townhouses:

- a) Stacked Townhouses are attached ~~Low-Rise Residential~~ houseform buildings comprising 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.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

#### Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 30

*\* Rationale: The removal of the phrase “Low-Rise Residential” to describe a stacked townhouse form is proposed in order to clarify that stacked townhouses are not a permitted built form as per Policy 9.2.2.1(c).*

#### (7) Clarification of the Policy Intent

The proposed amendments to VOP 2010 are intended to preserve and protect stable Low-Rise Residential neighbourhoods from incompatible development. However, it is not intended to:

- Make any existing development in the Low Rise Residential Area Legal Non-Conforming;
- Affect the legal status of any development that is currently approved and unbuilt;
- Override any specific permission contained in a site or area specific plan or secondary plan as shown on Schedules 14 a-c to VOP 2010;
- Affect the planning of New Communities, insofar as determining the appropriate mix and distribution of uses and the density and design parameters;
- Prevent any applicant from making an application to amend VOP 2010 to have a proposal considered on its merits, where it has been determined that a non-conformity exists;
- Prevent Council from directing that a comprehensive study be undertaken to address any area in the Low-Rise Residential designation which has been determined to be an area of transition that may benefit from changes in policy to guide its future evolution;

Where necessary, specific policies will be developed to ensure that the intended outcomes identified above are properly reflected in VOP 2010. This will be addressed in the Technical Report, with the benefit of the final refinement of the policies.

#### (8) Next Steps

A Technical Report will be provided to a future Committee of the Whole meeting that will address any issues raised at this Public Hearing. Approval of the amendments to VOP 2010 by Committee of the Whole and the subsequent ratification by Council will allow for the drafting of the implementing Official Plan Amendment for adoption by Council. On adoption, by Council the amendments would proceed to the Region of York for approval.

#### **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.

#### **Regional Implications**

York Region will continue to be consulted in respect to any potential impacts on the Region's arterial street network, and their comments will be addressed in the forthcoming Technical Report for a future Committee of the Whole meeting.

## **CITY OF VAUGHAN**

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Item 2, CW (PH) Report No. 39 – Page 31

#### **Conclusion**

This report sets out the basis for a number of proposed amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan that will serve to address a series of issues that were identified by Council on October 20, 2015. The report describes the process that led to the undertaking of the supporting study, “Policy Review: Vaughan Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study”, the underlying policy basis for the new policies, the public consultation process and the analysis that led the draft policy amendments.

Therefore, it is recommended that this report be received and that any issues raised at the Public Hearing, or raised in subsequent correspondence, be addressed by the Growth Management Portfolio’s Policy Planning and Environmental Sustainability team in a future Technical Report to the Committee of the Whole.

#### **Attachments**

1. Policy Review: Vaughan Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study – Final Report
2. Community Consultation Summary Report – What We Heard
3. Proposed Schedule 1B for VOP 2010: Areas Subject to Policy 9.1.2.3 - Vaughan’s Large Lot Neighbourhoods
4. Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development in Established Low-Rise Residential Neighbourhoods

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

Kyle Fearon, Planner I, Policy Planning Ext: 8776  
Melissa Rossi, Manager, Policy Planning Ext: 8320