

March 27, 2024

## Deputation – Re Proposed City-Wide Zoning By-law (4 units)

RECOMMENDED MOTION 1. That the proposed City initiated amendment to Zoning By-law 2009-141 be approved as outlined in Appendix “A” to Staff Report DEV011-24. 2. That the written and oral submissions received relating to this amendment, have been, on balance, taken into consideration as part of the deliberations and final decision related to the approval of the amendment and identified within Staff Report DEV011-24. 3. That pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act, no further public notification is required prior to the passing of this By-law.

### Mayor Nuttall, and Members of Council

Firstly, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the City on the most recent announcements for both Federal and Provincial Funding. 33 million will go a long way building homes and improving and adding infrastructure.

Secondly, I would like to commend Councilor Riepma on his proposed amendments related to setbacks, and height for ARU’s specifically and Councilor Harris for his comments on the fact we have been and continue to meet and exceed our targets.

These amendments created great discussion around what had already been amended and approved by Council in 2021 (with public engagement, and as a result of our shared learning & lived experiences).

The previous and current years stats show us that there has been and continues to be an uptick in second and third suits.

This has helped us to reach our provincial targets, without adding a fourth unit.

So, we are on track. Do we actually need to add a 4<sup>th</sup> unit.

Accessory dwelling units have proven to be too costly for builders. As a result, do not create affordable units. Rents upwards of \$3,000 monthly, given our current economic environment are not affordable.

It only makes sense that building additional units with-in a home already built is going to cost less than starting from scratch. Restore, repurpose, & reuse!

Not all of our housing solutions will come in the form of ARU's with-in our built boundary.

We should also be addressing second and third units as a right outside of our built boundaries and into new subdivisions.

New subdivisions should have a good mix of types of units, not just single-family homes but, rental apartments, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes. Mixed use makes for healthy communities.

### In summary

If we must move forward with this City Wide Zoning amendment (requiring 4 units) to fulfill provincial policy, then I agree with the proposed amendments put forward by Councilor Riepma, with an additional item to address & protect boundary trees.

Although referred to in staff comments, most homeowners do not know or understand the Ontario Forestry Act nor do we educate them in this regard. See staff comment below.

Reduce Tree Cover -pg 17 item 11

These proposed amendments would not impact street trees, as ARUs would not be located within a front yard, and street trees are generally maintained within the municipal right-of-way.

Boundary trees located in rear yards may be impacted by ARUs within an accessory building or structure, however, boundary trees remain considered under the Ontario Forestry Act. The Forestry Act has requirements for all property owners who share boundary trees, including penalties relating to injury or destruction.

Thank you for your time and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

C.Colebatch

