



**Date:** June 22, 2023

**To:** Committee Members

**Author:** George Robinson, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Planning and Development Services

**RE:** Attainable Housing - Residential Zoning Review

---

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

---

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. That Committee of the Whole directs Administration to prepare Zoning By-law amendments on recommendations described in this report for consideration and approval at a future statutory public meeting of Council.

### BACKGROUND

At the December 12, 2022 meeting of Council, in response to a verbal report from Administration regarding Bill 23, the *More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022*, the following resolution was passed:

#### **399-12122022**

Moved By: Councillor Larry Patterson

Seconded By: Councillor Sheri Lowrie

That Administration BE DIRECTED to prepare Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments as required to address legislative and regulatory changes associated with Bill 23, the *More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022*.

On February 1, 2023, Council set its short-term priorities for 2023, which included the development of an:

1. Attainable Housing Plan,
2. Completing a Facilities Assessment Review, and
3. Providing an update on the Main Street Development Plan.

At the February 27, 2023 meeting of Council, amendments to the Zoning By-law 1-2014 were passed to permit Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs) in all single, semi-detached, and townhouse dwellings and backyard accessory buildings in line with Bill 23, the *More*

*Homes Built Faster Act*, 2022 requirements. These amendments are now in effect, and we have started to issue Building Permits for ADUs.

At the April 17, 2023 Committee of the Whole meeting, an update to the Main Street Strategy was provided and important policy decisions were made. This was a key meeting as a transition point from the Main Street Policy Development Review Committee's work to the implementation of the Main Street Strategy. Subsequent Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments are scheduled to follow and will be brought to a future meeting of Council for adoption.

A number of Zoning By-law updates and other housing-related policies have been identified which can contribute to increasing attainable housing in Kingsville. These are zoning changes that would impact residentially designated lands outside of the main street corridor (the Main Street Strategy focused on the main street corridor only). Although a number of policy options can also be considered to encourage attainable and market housing construction, the focus of this report is on changes that can be made to the Zoning By-law in the short term. Administration will bring forward a separate policy-focused housing strategy in the coming months.

## **DISCUSSION**

After reviewing the Zoning By-law, Administration recommends a number of zoning provisions and changes to facilitate development of additional housing units:

1. Allow Semi-detached and Townhouse buildings in more Residential Zones

The intent of the changes to additional residential unit provisions in the *Planning Act* is to allow three (3) dwelling units per lot. Allowing semi-detached and townhouse buildings in more residential zones would provide greater choice in housing type and would result in opportunities for gradual infill development while respecting existing building form.



Location criteria will be attached to only allow semi-detached and townhouse dwellings where existing water and sewer connections are available in order to ensure there is suitable servicing for a higher intensity of development. Location criteria which restricts townhouse dwellings on corner sites will be considered as double frontage resolves access issues and provides more design solutions to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties.

## 2. Adjust setbacks and lot coverage

By adjusting the setbacks in residential zones, residents and builders will have more choice on how and where to build on a lot, which will accommodate additions or renovations to expand the use and lifespan of existing housing.

Reducing the minimum side setbacks from 1.5 metres to 1.2 metres will meet the minimum opening distance required for windows as stipulated in Part 9 of the Ontario Building Code. Most low profile residential zones in Ontario now use a standard of 1.2 metres, where some residential zones in Kingsville retain a 1.5 metre requirement.

Eliminating the exterior side yard setback will allow more options in locating buildings on corner lots, and would help to standardize lot sizes in new subdivisions. Current practice for most new subdivisions is that developers increase the size of corner lots to accommodate the increased exterior side yard, using more land for the same number of units. Sight triangle provisions will remain at the corners of the parcel to ensure visibility for vehicles and pedestrians at intersections.

Standardizing the maximum lot coverage at 40% to 50% of the parcel across all residential zones will allow for greater flexibility in development and will help to accommodate Additional Dwelling Units in rear yard accessory buildings.

## 3. Adjust Lot Area and Lot Frontage minimums (smaller lot sizes)

Land costs are a large component in developing new housing. By allowing smaller lots in our existing zones, there are more opportunities for different varieties of owned housing.

For example, in the R1.1 zone, the current minimum lot frontage is 15 m (50 ft). It is recommended that the R1.1 zoning be changed to allow a 7.5 m (25 ft) lot, and then each existing lot in the zone could be split into two. After calculating a minimum side yard of 1.2 m on each side, the building width on a narrow lot will be 5.1 m (16.7 ft). Alternatively, if lot size is reduced to 10 m (33 ft.), then three lots could be created by combining two adjacent lots. A review of neighbourhood context will be a recommended next step to ensure viability, dividing an existing lot would be easier than the requirement to combine two adjacent parcels.

There are a number of areas in Kingsville that were subdivided prior to the second world war that were plotted using 9.14 m (30 ft) lot fabric. For example, many older streets south of Main Street in Kingsville were originally plotted with 30' or 40' lots. There are examples of smaller historic lot sizes in proximity to Cedar Island that integrate well within the urban fabric and present a denser form of ground-oriented housing suitable for families.

If minimum lot areas or frontages are altered, special provisions for vehicular access widths and locations of driveways should be considered to reduce the amount of hard surfacing in front yards and the aesthetic or curb appeal of front attached garages. Increasing one side setback to 3.0 m (10 ft.) to allow for a side yard driveway potentially leading to a rear yard garage (which is common in older areas of Kingsville) would be a good approach.

#### 4. Bonus lot coverage for unenclosed front porches or balconies

Allowing increased lot coverage for desirable design elements such as unenclosed front porches has been used in other jurisdictions. Allowing this bonus also improves the curb appeal and amenity value of new housing.

#### 5. Adjust Height limits

Allowing increased height in some or all residential zones to allow additional storeys will allow for more units to be constructed. The current height limit in the Medium Density Residential (R3.1) and High Density Residential (R4.1) zones is 11 metres, which is the same as the R1 and R2 zones. This results in requiring projects over three stories to apply for a site-specific zoning exemption even though they are in a higher density zone. A six storey (22 metre) height limit should be considered acceptable for the R4.1 zone and the height limit in the zone should reflect this to reduce the requirement to amend site-specific regulations for each proposal. It is also recommended that the height limit for the R3.1 zone be increased to 12.2m to allow the construction of four storey buildings. These changes could be implemented outside of the main street corridor as a way to expedite housing approvals in established neighbourhoods which are fully serviced with good access to amenities such as parks and commercial uses.

A map showing lands that are currently zoned R3.1 and R4.1, as well as the location of the main street corridor under review, is attached as Appendix A.

## **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Development of additional housing would add to the tax base.

The cost of servicing a single family home with 60' frontage is approximately \$40,000 - \$50,000 per lot, therefore, the cost of infrastructure to support 100 single family homes would be in the \$4 - \$5 million range. As the Town is responsible for maintaining and

replacing this infrastructure, this creates a significant long-term financial burden for the municipality.

The Town is already experiencing an infrastructure funding deficit. Higher density developments with smaller lots, infill developments, and/or multi-unit dwellings (townhouses, six-plexes, etc.) not only provide buyers with a lower price point, but it makes for more efficient use of infrastructure spending. The more taxpayers contributing to the replacement of existing infrastructure, the less pressure there will be on future tax rate increase. Further these types of units fill that 'missing middle' need, and are critical to providing a mix of housing options for a municipality and for young families, professionals, and others who traditionally start out in higher density housing and over time, move through to semi- or single family options later in their lives.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

Senior Management Team and internal staff were consulted at this early stage. Additional public consultation in the form of website postings, public notice, public meetings, and Council meetings would be appropriate and can be adjusted depending on the direction from Council.

### **PREPARED BY:**



---

George Robinson, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Planning and Development Services

### **REVIEWED BY:**



---

Richard J.H. Wyma, CSLA  
Director of Community and Development Services