

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE JUNE 4, 2001**

### **AMENDMENT TO ZONING BY- LAW FILE Z.01.016 CITY OF VAUGHAN - DESIGN STANDARDS REVIEW**

#### **Recommendation**

The Commissioner of Planning & Urban Design recommends:

THAT Staff be directed to prepare the necessary amendments to the Zoning By-law to implement the amended design standards contained in Attachment 1 and forward them to a future meeting of Council for enactment.

#### **Purpose**

The Design Standards Review (the "Review") consists of a review of the current residential zoning standards and determining a revised zoning framework which reflects the objectives, principles and policies as set out in OPA #600 to guide the development of the City's new communities, including Blocks 11, 18, 33W, 39N and 40. The purpose of the Review is to establish a zoning framework that encourages more innovative forms of housing, meets community urban design objectives and market expectations, and enables implementation through both consumer and development industry support.

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

On September 11, 2000, Council directed Community Planning Staff, in consultation with Staff of the Engineering, Urban Design, Legal, Works, Fire, and Building Standards Departments, to undertake a study addressing issues identified as a result of the implementation of OPA #400, and to include a consultation process with the development community and the public.

On October 10, 2000, Council approved the Terms of Reference for the Design Standards Review (DSR), which included the following principle matters: a review of the current design standards and road cross sections; consultation with stakeholders; development and presentation of draft recommended design standards; and, a final report and recommendations.

In October 2000, Anne McIlroy of Brook McIlroy Inc., in consultation with Totten Sims Hubicki Associates, was retained by the City to assist Staff with the Review. Since this time, Staff has worked closely with the Consultant and has set up an advisory committee structure consisting of representatives from relevant City departments, agencies and boards. The Committee is responsible for providing direction and decisions, consulting with the development industry and the public, by way of a series of internal and external community meetings and consultation and consensus building.

The exercise has been citywide, but primarily impacts future residential development approvals within the new urban areas, and to a lesser degree, infill development in the older areas. The primary objectives were identified to:

- enhance quality of life and overall design aesthetics, while minimizing operational requirements;
- review the City's current urban design guidelines, road right-of-way standards, operational procedures and policies and make recommendations for changes as appropriate;
- obtain input from the public and stakeholders, special interest groups and the development and building industry;
- integrate the design solutions of each department/discipline into a comprehensive set of "corporate" design standards;

- have regard for operational procedures and requirements such as snow clearance, garbage removal, site services and boulevard and tree maintenance;
- have regard for the public safety and coordinating design standards of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles; and,
- have regard for accessibility issues.

Decisions to revise existing standards have evolved throughout the process of the Review and through committee, public and stakeholder input. At the outset of the Review, a list of design standard issues was compiled to be addressed comprehensively, including:

#### Right-of-way Design Standards (Public Realm)

- Boulevard and sidewalk design
- Tree locations
- Above and below grade utility locations
- On-street parking
- Community feature locations
- Entrance feature locations
- Greenway Designs
- Community Mailboxes
- Stormwater management design

#### Lot Design Standards (Private Realm)

- Minimum building setbacks including location of porches, air conditioners and meters.
- Wide shallow lot designs
- Townhouses units permitted in a row
- Corner lot designs
- Garage and driveway dimensions and locations
- Lot grading and drainage

#### Design Standards Implementation

- Coordination between departments
- Purchaser's information (e.g. sales pavilions)
- Urban Design Guidelines and Zoning Regulations
- Block Plan and Site Plan Approval Process

Regular committee meetings were held with the Commissioner of Planning & Urban Design and Committee representatives comprised of Department Directors and Managers from the Community Planning, Urban Design, Engineering, Building Standards, Growth Management, Public Works, Forestry, Fire and Legal Services Departments. The Committee and sub-groups of the Committee met on a regular basis, which provided the opportunity to collectively discuss the issues and propose recommendations for standards improvement.

Within the first month of the Review, individual interviews were held with Department representatives to discuss the various issues. A review of the current design standards of the following municipalities was undertaken: Richmond Hill, Markham, Mississauga, Oakville, Kitchener and Niagara-on-the-Lake. The common issues identified throughout the municipal review included:

- The visual dominance of the street-facing garage due to the projection of the garage and its proportion to the principle building façade.
- The lack of habitable living space at the front of dwellings.

- The dominance of driveways within the front yard and at the street edge, minimizing opportunities to landscape the front yard, plant street trees, locate above-grade utilities and street furniture and provide on-street parking.
- Laneways
- Stormwater Management

A workshop for community stakeholders and members of the development industry was held on December 5, 2000 to provide an opportunity for comment and input into the direction of the Design Standards Review.

Council Working Session was held on January 30, 2001 to present the current direction of the Design Standards Review and to obtain input and direction from Council. Council recommended that the Committee and consultants continue to work on developing and refining the design standards.

A notice of public hearing was placed in the Liberal on March 2, 2001 and March 3, 2001 and sent to the City of Vaughan ratepayer associations. To date, no comments have been received. The recommendation of the Committee of the Whole on March 26, 2001, to receive the public hearing and forward a comprehensive report to a future Committee meeting, was ratified by Council on April 2, 2001.

### **Conclusion**

A primary objective of both OPA #400 and OPA #600 is to provide attractive streetscapes through the attention to the design of the public realm, built-form and the relationship between private development and public areas. The public and Council have come to perceive that the by-law implementing OPA #400 has led to problematic urban design approaches to suburban development, especially with respect to monotonous and poorly functioning streetscapes. Now that the City has had working experience with the by-law standards, it is intended that revisions to certain aspects of the by-law will achieve a higher quality of urban design objectives for the future communities.

The Design Standard Review is intended to guide the standards for the future design and construction of residential communities in the City of Vaughan. The Design Standards Review Study was initiated in response to Council's resolution on September 11, 2000, regarding issues relating to residential building activity since the approval of OPA #400. The issues identified relate predominantly to small lot residential (less than 12.5m), where there has been a tendency to overbuild detached, semi-detached and townhouse forms on the lots.

Throughout an extensive review, with involvement of all stakeholders, the list of issues has evolved, related to both the public and private realms. With the co-operation of the many participating disciplines, solutions evolved and balanced for priority, and translated into a chart of new standards. These issues and solutions are contained in the attached report in detail and on the attached chart in summary. To this end, Staff recommends that the revised design standards as summarized in Attachment 1 be approved, and that Staff be directed to bring forward the implementing by-law to a future Council meeting for enactment.

Should Council concur, the Recommendation of this report can be adopted.

### **Attachments**

1. Amended Design Standards
2. Design Standard Recommendations

**Report prepared by:** Bianca M.V. Bielski, Manager, Development Planning, ext. 8485

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL DeANGELIS  
Commissioner of Planning & Urban Design

JOANNE R. ARBOUR  
Director of Community Planning

/LG

R:\WORKING\BIELSKI\3DSRJUN401.CW.DOC

**BY-LAW # 1 - AMENDED DESIGN STANDARDS**

No	TABLE A Zone Provisions: Single, Semi-detached, and Townhouse Dwellings	By-law 1-88, Schedule "A" (metres)	By-law 1-83, Schedule "A1" (metres)	Proposed Standard (metres)
1	<p><b>Minimum Front Yard Setback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-From property line to front face of 2 car garage where driveway crosses sidewalk. 6.4</li> <li>- From property line to front face of 2 car garage where driveway doesn't cross sidewalk. 6.4</li> <li>- From inside edge of sidewalk to front face of 1 car garage where driveway crosses sidewalk. -</li> <li>- From outside edge of curb to front face of 1 car garage where driveway doesn't cross sidewalk. -</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Front Yard Setback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-on a lot accessed by a driveway 4.5-15.0</li> <li>-on a lot accessed by a lane 4.5-15.0</li> <li>-on a lot with a front porch 4.5-15.0</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.0</li> <li>6.0</li> <li>10.0</li> <li>10.0</li> <li>4.5</li> <li>4.5</li> <li>4.5</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Minimum Interior Side Yard Setback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- attached Garage/Less than 12.0 m lot 1.2-1.5 and 0.3</li> <li>- attached Garage/ More than 12.0 m lot 1.2-4.5 and 0.3</li> <li>- garage located in the rear yard accessed by a driveway 4.5</li> <li>- abutting a non-residential use ( including a walkway) -</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2 and 0.6</li> <li>1.2 and 0.6</li> <li>2.75 and 0.6</li> <li>2.75 and 1.2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2 and 1.2</li> <li>1.2 and 1.2</li> <li>3.5 and 1.2</li> <li>3.5 and 1.2</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Minimum Exterior Side Yard Setback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- with a side yard porch 4.5-9.0</li> <li>- adjacent to a rear lane -</li> <li>- adjacent to a site triangle -</li> <li>- site triangle abutting an entrance feature -</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.0</li> <li>2.4</li> <li>0.6</li> <li>0.6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.5</li> <li>3.0</li> <li>1.2</li> <li>3.0</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Minimum Rear Yard</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-on lot accessed by a driveway 7.5</li> <li>-on a lot accessed by a lane 7.5</li> <li>-on a wide shallow lot 7.5</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.5</li> <li>13</li> <li>6.0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.5</li> <li>15.0</li> <li>7.5</li> </ul>
5	<p><b>Maximum Driveway Width</b></p>		By-Law Sect. 4.14 (f)	50% house frontage
6	<p><b>Interior Garage Dimensions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- less than 11.0m lots -</li> <li>- 11.0 to 11.9 m lots -</li> <li>- 12.0 to 12.5 m lots -</li> <li>- greater than 12.5 m lots -</li> </ul> <p>Note: The interior garage width shall be a maximum of 60% of the house frontage if the garage is flush or recessed with the front building façade. Projecting garages shall be a maximum width of 50% of the building façade.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Min. 3.0 wide by 6.0</li> <li>Min. 3.0 wide by 6.0</li> <li>Max. 4.5 wide</li> <li>Max. 5.0 wide</li> <li>Min. 5.6 wide by 6.0</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Minimum Lot Depth</b></p>	-	23.5	27.0
8	<p><b>Maximum Building Height</b></p>	9.5-11.0	9.5-11.0	11.0

## **ATTACHMENT NO. 2**

### **DESIGN STANDARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

A complete set of zoning standards was developed as an amendment to Bylaw 1-88 in August 1997, to apply the objectives of OPA #400 for a more compact urban form of new residential development. These standards have the overall effect of permitting a larger house on a smaller lot, constructed closer to the property lines.

The application of reduced zoning standards within the public and private right-of-way has created significant concerns about the future direction of new residential development. In particular, standards applied to small lot development (12.5 metres and less) have created repercussions on all areas of residential site design. The cause of this is significantly due to the use of lesser setbacks and the disproportionate amount of house to lot. The reduced front, side and rear yards collectively compromise the image of the streetscape and minimize opportunities for adequate site drainage, the placement of trees, driveways, above grade utilities and other street furnishings.

The following are the current design standard issues for which design standards have been recommended and of which, in part, revised design standards are included in Attachment 1:

#### **Public Right-of-Way:**

Streets, walkways, greenways, parks, open space and stormwater management ponds are the primary components of the public-right-of-way. The role of the public right-of-way is to support transportation, pedestrian and service requirements within an enriched public realm that connects the community as a whole, and neighbourhoods within it together. The street network is the principle interface between built form and the public realm. As the infrastructure most used by residents and visitors, streets play a dominant role in determining the character of the neighbourhood.

#### **Boulevard and Sidewalk Design:**

The principle issues relate to:

- Reduced development standards that permit double car garages on small lots result in multiple curb cuts for driveways creating consistent interruptions to the public sidewalk and to the street edge. The cumulative image of the street is dominated by the image of driveways and minimal landscaping.
- Street trees placed between the curb and the sidewalks are less likely to survive the effects of snow loading and salts.
- The City's objective of providing at least one public sidewalk on residential streets is not always realized.
- Central street medians designed for primary streets including arterial and collector roads are too narrow for planting and irrigation systems.

Therefore, to address these matters, Staff recommends:

- a) Reduce the amount of driveway permitted to cross the public-right-of way, thereby improving the pedestrian realm by creating a better balance between landscaped area and the public sidewalk.
- b) Locate street trees away from the street edge within the 2.75m landscape strip between the sidewalk and the property line.
- c) Provide public sidewalks on at least one side of the street, and where feasible, on both sides of the street.
- d) Central street medians should be a minimum of 4.0m in width to permit trees and other planting to be planted within the median.
- e) A 1.5 m sidewalk shall be placed 2.75m from the property line, leaving 1.25m between the sidewalk and the curb.
- f) A public sidewalk with a minimum width of 1.5 m shall be placed on at least one side of residential streets.

### **Street Tree Locations:**

The principle issue is that there are reduced opportunities for street tree planting and landscaping within the boulevard

Therefore, Staff recommends that:

- a) Street trees shall be placed in the 2.75m boulevard strip between the property line and the sidewalk.
- b) Plant street trees at a ratio of one for each property and two for each flankage lot.
- c) Plant street trees a minimum of 3.0m from the street curb away from snow storage, salt damage and other elements that may encumber the full growth potential of trees.
- d) Species selection should avoid the creation of a streetscape monoculture.
- e) Species should be of a shade tree variety, however, there may be exceptions for ornamental or functional reasons.

### **Minimum Frontages on Culs-de-sac and Angle Bends:**

The principle issue is that lot frontages on culs-de-sac and angle bends that permit double car garages and driveway access from the street create a sub-standard street edge condition, including, tapered driveways with little or no space on either side of the driveway for snow storage or landscaping.

Therefore, Staff recommends that:

- a) The number of lots on culs-de-sac should be limited through the application of minimum frontages.
- b) The width of driveways at the curb edge should ensure no tapering of driveways is required, and that adequate snow storage is available between properties.
- c) Street tree planting should be accommodated within the public right-of-way.
- d) Limit the use of culs-de-sac to locations where through-street conditions are not appropriate.

- e) Limit the length of culs-de-sac streets to aid in their access and egress, particularly where no other links to adjacent street are provided.
- f) Lot frontages on culs-de-sac and angle bends must be a minimum of 13.5m (44 feet) measured 6.4m back of the property line, where 6.0m wide (double-car garage) driveways apply.
- g) Generally lot sizes and their corresponding curb frontages must be increased to allow for straight and non-tapered driveways for all culs-de-sac and inside corner lots. The recommended increases are directly dependant upon the width of the garages/driveways that are provided. Single car garages with 3.0 wide driveways must provide 4.0m of curb frontage per lot. Whereas double car garages/driveways 6.0m wide must provide 7.0m of curb frontage.
- h) A minimum 1.0m wide area for snow storage and boulevard treatments at the street edge shall be provided.
- i) A minimum radius of 13.0m measured from the centre point of the cul-de-sac to the curb edge shall be applied.
- k) The depth of culs-de-sacs shall be limited to a maximum of 70m measured from the centre point of the radius of the turning circle, to the intersecting street line.
- l) Where appropriate, pedestrian walkways with a minimum width of 5m shall be located at the end of the cul-de-sac to provide connections to adjacent streets and open space areas.

### **Rear Lanes:**

The principle issue is that Council has directed that the use of rear lanes be minimized, and that any rear lane developments be subject to Council approval.

Therefore, Staff recommend that:

- a) The use of rear lanes be minimized and used only where needed to provide access to housing fronting on to arterial and major collector roads, where driveway access is prohibited, impractical or unsafe.
- b) Locate rear lanes to allow housing to front on to parks or open space conditions to provide an overview of the area.
- c) Rear lanes shall provide a minimum lane right-of-way of 8m with a minimum .5m setback to the garage wall.
- d) Travel pavement width should be 6.0m, providing a setback of 1.0m between the travel lane and the garage face to accommodate snow clearance.
- e) On one side of any garage in a rear lane, a minimum side yard of 3.0m for semis and 4.5m for singles shall be provided to allow for visual connections from the lane to the rear of the house, and to promote safer laneway conditions.
- f) On semis and singles, the side-yard beside the garage may also be used as an additional driveway parking space.
- g) Rear lane garages associated with townhouses require no side setbacks, however, a minimum 3.0 metre setback must be provided between a maximum of 6 townhouse garages constructed in a row.



### **Above Grade Utility Locations:**

The principle issues are that there are negative visual and physical impacts of above grade services including hydro, telephone and cable boxes. Also, streets that have smaller lots require a greater number of above grade utilities. The location of above grade services reduces opportunities to plant street trees.

Therefore, Staff recommends that:

- a) Minimize the visibility of above grade utilities through options, including burying utilities below grade and where utilities are required to be above grade, locating them in less visible locations such as within the public right-of-way of flankage lots.

### **Community Entrance Feature Locations:**

The principle issues are that community features are located on private property and are often too close to private dwellings. The repair and ongoing maintenance of entrance features is the responsibility of the homeowner. Also, an excessive number of entrance features are being placed within neighbourhoods at local road intersections at the choice of home builders, in addition to the major community entrance features at arterial and collector roads required by the City.

Therefore, Staff recommends that:

- a) Increase exterior side yards of dwellings to community entrance features.
- b) Community entrance features shall be located on the street side-edge of the property line or sight triangle. Setbacks between the entrance feature and a private dwelling must be a minimum of 3.0 metres.
- c) Entrance features shall be located a minimum of 1.5 metres from the public sidewalk or street edge where there is no sidewalk.
- d) While the developer may fund the capital cost of the entrance feature, the ongoing cost of maintenance and repair shall be the responsibility of the City.
- e) Permit entrance features only at selected arterial and collector roads, as an entrance to the neighbourhood, restricting them within the neighbourhood.

### **Community Mailboxes:**

The principle issue is that community mailboxes lack coordination in their location and design.

Therefore Staff recommends that:

- a) Criteria for locations and mailbox design are created.
- b) Designs for mailboxes with Canada Post are co-coordinated.

### **Stormwater Management Ponds:**

The principle issues are that stormwater management ponds are recognized as valuable community amenities and that there are concerns relating to public safety, access, nuisance species (geese, rodents) and whether to manicure edges. Stormwater management facilities should have public access and be integrated as positive and safe amenities within the community and open space system. Consideration should be given to consolidating ponds or limiting the number of ponds required in order to reduce the ongoing costs of maintenance by the City. The objective of creating a few well-designed community ponds will assist in greater concentration of use as well as provide a public focus and connections between surrounding communities.

Therefore, Staff recommends that:

- a) Stormwater Management Ponds (SWM) should wherever feasible, be integrated as community amenities to optimize their use as a component of the publicly accessible open space network.
- b) SWM ponds should be considered an amenity as important and desirable to the community as other open space where the street and block pattern utilizes views and access to the SWM through continuous lot frontage and wherever possible, street frontage.
- c) The design of ponds should avoid fencing requirements and permit perimeter access to ponds through a combination of pond edge treatments including direct access and overlooks.
- d) A hierarchy of design treatments should be available to address the various conditions of pond locations (e.g. on-line ponds vs. table land ponds)
- e) Of the total linear perimeter distance of any watercourse, woodlot or stormwater management pond (SWM) which is adjacent to a new development area, a minimum of 60% of the perimeter shall be bounded by a public road right-of-way, or public park, or any combination of these, providing that the abutting parks, SWM and school sites are bounded as well on 60% of their perimeters by a combination of public roads and publicly-owned and accessible lands.

### **Lot Design Standards (Private Right-of-Way):**

The principle issues are that:

- Homeowner's expectations are not being met due to the general decrease in lot sizes with insufficient setbacks.
- Front, side and rear yard setbacks are too tight in relation to house size.
- Small lots with minimum setback standards are being built with too much house on the lot. As the lot size decreases, the house size is generally not reduced in proportion to the lot.
- A lack of precision in construction creates encroachments within minimum standards and results in front porches too close to the street edge or sidewalk, small rear yards with poor drainage and no room for decks or storage sheds. Minimum side yards often include encroachments such as side entrances, meters and air-conditioners and prevent sufficient access to the rear yard.
- The increased permitted yard encroachments has further increased the overall buildable area on the lots and reduced the setbacks.
- Setbacks at corner lots between the dwelling and sight triangles are too small.

- Corner lot houses are built too close to sight triangles where entrance features and privacy fencing is located.

Therefore, Staff recommends that:

- a) City's zoning by-laws should be amended to increase minimum sizes and minimum yard requirements to produce a more functional residential design. There is generally a need to increase the minimum amenity areas for both the front and rear yards and provide for better access to the rear yards. The overall separation between structures should be increased and also provide for a greater separation between the dwelling units and the public right-of-way.
- b) The dwelling size should be constructed in proportion to the lot size. When the lot size decreases, the dwelling size should decrease proportionately.
- c) No encroachments should be permitted other than a front porch in the front yard and a deck/porch or garden shed in the rear yard. Porch encroachments should include connecting steps.
- d) A minimum rear yard amenity area of 50 square metres must be provided, excluding porches, garden sheds and other encroachments.
- e) The garage width should not exceed the habitable portion of the house. The negative impact of projecting garages is emphasized when the width of the garage exceeds the width of the habitable portion of the house.
- f) A mix of housing types, setbacks and garage treatments in the streetscape should be achieved through the distribution of house designs and lot sizes. Approximately 1/3 of the houses on a street block shall have side yard driveways or rear attached garages; up to approximately 1/3 of the house on a street block should have garages that may occupy up to 60% of the width of the total façade; and the remaining 1/3 of the houses on a given block should provide garages varying in width but occupying 50% or less of the front façade of the house.

**Minimum Front Yard Setbacks:**

Staff recommends that:

- a) From the property line to the front face of a two-car garage where the driveway crosses a sidewalk the minimum front yard setback shall be increased from 5.8 m to 6.0m.
- b) From the property line to the front face of a two-car garage where the driveway does not cross a sidewalk the minimum front yard setback shall be increased from 5.0m to 6.0m.
- c) From the inside edge of the sidewalk to the front face of a one-car garage where the driveway crosses a sidewalk the minimum front yard setback shall be 10m.
- d) From the outside edge of the curb to the front face of a one-car garage where the driveway does not cross a sidewalk the minimum front yard setback shall be 10 m.
- e) The minimum front yard setback on a lot accessed by a driveway or lane shall be increased from 3.0m to 4.5m.
- f) Lots with a front porch may encroach into the front yard by a maximum of 3.0m including access steps to preserve a 1.5m no encroachment zone between the dwelling and property line.
- g) Lots with a front porch must be set back a minimum of 1.0m from the driveway edge.

### **Minimum Interior Side Yard Setbacks:**

Staff recommends that:

- a) On a less than 12.0m lot with an attached garage the minimum interior side yard setback shall be increased from 1.2 and 0.6m to 1.2 and 1.2 m.
- b) On a greater than 12.0-metre lots with an attached garage the minimum interior side yard setback shall be increased from 1.2 and 0.6m to 1.2 and 1.2m.
- c) On a lot with a garage located in the rear yard accessed by a driveway the minimum interior side yard setback shall be increased from 2.75 and 0.6m to 3.5 and 1.2m.
- d) On a lot abutting a non-residential use (including a walkway) the minimum interior side yard setback shall be increased from 2.75 and 1.2m to 3.5 and 1.2 m.

### **Minimum Exterior Side Yard Setbacks:**

Staff recommends that:

- a) The minimum exterior side yard setback (including those with a side yard porch) shall be increased from 3.0 to 4.5m.
- b) On lots adjacent to a rear lane the minimum exterior side yard setback shall be increased from 2.4 to 3.0m.
- c) On lots adjacent to a site triangle (including those with a front or side yard porch) the minimum exterior setback shall be increased from 0.6 to 1.2m.
- d) On lots adjacent to a site triangle (including those with a front or side yard porch) abutting an entrance feature, the minimum exterior setback shall be increased from 0.6 to 3.0m.

### **Minimum Rear Yard Setbacks:**

Staff recommends that:

- a) On lots accessed by a driveway the minimum rear yard setback shall remain as 7.5 m measured from the rear face of the garage, or rear property line, to the rear face of the dwelling.
- b) On lots accessed by a lane the minimum rear yard setback shall be increased from 13.0 to 15.0 m.
- c) All other lots shall have a minimum rear yard setback of not less than 7.5 m measured from the rear property line to the rear face of the dwelling.
- d) Rear yard decks/porches and garden sheds shall be permitted rear yard encroachments, provided that a minimum 50 square m is maintained as landscaped amenity space. Driveways may not be included as part of the rear yard amenity space.

### **Minimum Driveway Width:**

Staff recommends that the maximum driveway width shall not exceed 50% of the lot frontage.

### **Garage Dimensions and Projections:**

Staff recommends that:

- a) On lots less than 11.0m interior one-car garage dimensions shall be a minimum 3.0m wide by 6.0m deep.
- b) On lots 11.0 to 11.9m interior one-car garage dimensions shall be a minimum 3.0m wide by 6.0m deep. A maximum width of 4.5m may be applied to permit a one and a half car garage with storage.
- c) On lots 12.0 to 12.5m a maximum width of 5.0m may be applied to permit a one and a half car garage with storage.
- c) On lots greater than 12.5m interior two-car garage dimensions shall be a minimum 5.6m wide by 6.0m deep.
- e) One access step only may be permitted into the interior of the garage
- f) The minimum height clearance from structural or mechanical encumbrances (including overhead bulkheads, lofts, garage closures, etc.) in the garage shall be 2.0 m.
- g) The interior garage width shall be a maximum of 60% of the house frontage if the garage is flush or recessed with the front building face.
- h) The maximum garage recession from the front building face shall be 2.75m.
- i) The interior garage width shall be a maximum of 50% of the house frontage if the garage is projecting from the front building façade.
- j) The maximum garage projection from the front building face shall be 2.75m. A front porch is recommended in this condition.

### **Minimum Lot Depth:**

Staff recommends that the minimum lot depth shall increase from 23.5 to 27.0m.

### **Maximum Building Height:**

Staff recommends that:

- a) The maximum building height should change from 9.5 (wide shallow lots) to 11.0 m, to a consistent maximum height of 11.0m for single, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings.
- b) Building height shall be measured from grade level at the front of the house to the mid-point of the roofline for a pitched roof, or the midpoint of the parapet for a flat roof.

### **Wide-shallow lots:**

The principle issues include that the current standards for wide shallow lots do not reflect the intent of this form of housing in which a wider lot that permits an attached garage facing the street is combined with a shallow lot depth. The minimum width and depth of wide shallow lots combined with the current setback standards has resulted in too much house on the lot.

Therefore Staff recommends that:

- a) Wide shallow lots should not be permitted in their current form.

- b) The minimum setbacks, lot depth, setbacks and proportion of garage to house required for single, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings should apply to the wide shallow lot form.

### **Semi-Detached Lots:**

Staff recommends that:

- a) Increase the minimum lot frontage from 7.5m to 9.0m per dwelling unit.
- b) See Section 3.3.3 and Table A for minimum setbacks.
- c) Discourage the housing form of detached units on a semi-detached lot. (Permitted by by-law exception only)
- d) Only attached semis where two dwellings share a fully attached party wall should be allowed on semi-detached lots.

### **Townhouse Lots (garage facing the street):**

The principle issues include:

- For corner lots and end units for townhouses, the by-law should be amended (all housing forms) to require an increasing of the lot frontages and areas based the house form and the zone classification.
- The current minimum width for townhouses at 5.5m is too narrow.
- Townhouse blocks of more than six attached units create a monotonous streetscape image, and create access difficulties between units for emergency services.

Therefore, Staff recommends that:

- a) Increase the minimum lot frontage from 6.0m to 6.5m.
- b) Allow a maximum of 6 dwelling units attached together
- c) See above for minimum lot depth & yards.

### **Rear Lane Townhouses (garage facing rear lane):**

Staff recommends that:

- a) Increase the minimum lot frontage from 4.5 - 5.4m to 6.5 for a single car garage and 10.0m for double car garages.
- b) Increase the minimum metre separation between the dwelling unit and the detached garage from 6.0 to 7.0m.
- c) Increasing the garage setback from the rear lane from 0.60m to 1.0m.
- d) Increase side yards for townhouse end units from 1.5m to 2.0m to facilitate access for emergency services.
- e) A maximum of two garages shall be paired together with minimum setbacks of 1.2m on either side.
- f) Fencing shall include a doorway within one of the side yards to allow entry between the lane and rear yard.

### **Corner Lots:**

The principle issues include:

- Corner lots and townhouse end units should be amended to require increased setbacks based on the lot location and proximity to sight triangles, entrance features and privacy fencing.
- The application of minimum setbacks at corner lot setbacks does not permit front porches to be properly integrated on corner sites. Where front porches are included, they are too shallow (less than 1.5 metres [5 feet]) to be used as active areas for sitting or socializing.
- Community features within the public right-of-way including landscaping and gateway or signage elements are located too close to dwellings that are built to minimum setbacks.

Therefore Staff recommends that:

- a) The minimum exterior side yard setback (including those with a side yard porch) shall be increased from 3.0 to 4.5m.
- b) On lots adjacent to a rear lane the minimum exterior side yard setback shall be increased from 2.4 to 3.0m.
- c) On lots adjacent to a site triangle (including those with a front or side yard porch) the minimum exterior setback shall be increased from 0.6 to 1.2m.
- d) On lots adjacent to a site triangle (including those with a front or side yard porch) abutting an entrance feature, the minimum exterior setback shall be increased from 0.6 to 3.0m.
- e) Lots adjacent to corner lots shall place driveways on the opposite side furthest from the corner lot to increase sight lines impeded by privacy fencing while exiting from the driveway to the street.

### **Parking: Minimizing the Presence of Garages and Driveways:**

The principle issues include:

- Current parking standards reducing the established parking space and garage standards of By-Law 1-88.
- Many site-specific by-law exceptions contain provisions that reduce the new standards even further.
- Zoning requires 3 parking spaces on the lot for all single-family dwellings regardless of lot size. Again there are special exceptions on a development-by-development basis. Typically 2 spaces are provided in the driveway and one is provided in the garage. The second space in garage usually has reduced width and/or length and therefore cannot be included in the calculations. (In some cases encroachments are constructed within the second garage space to the point that a car cannot be parked.)
- No zoning standards exist for minimum double car garage sizes.
- Garage widths are too narrow i.e. can't get out of car and the car door hits garage wall inside the garage and/or the front porch outside on the driveway.
- Difficulty in parking cars within driveways without overhanging the sidewalk and roadway.
- Difficulty in removing snow from sidewalks due to cars parked in the driveways blocking the sidewalk.

- Lots less than 12.0m with front yard double car garages create a house and streetscape image that is garage and driveway dominated.
- Multiple curb cuts at the street edge interfere with pedestrian activity on sidewalks and reduce opportunities for street tree planting, placement of utilities and street parking.
- The proportion of the garage dominates dwellings over the habitable portion of the house at grade where opportunities to provide front porches, windows and front facing rooms are minimized.
- Public safety through CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) opportunities for casual surveillance of the street from the house is decreased.

Therefore Staff recommends that:

- a) Return to the standards of By-law 1-88 for single garages and parking space sizes and regulate permitted encroachments into the minimum parking/garage sizes.
- b) Increase the front yard setbacks for single garages that would allow two parking spaces to be parked in tandem between the sidewalk and the garage or the curb and the garage where no sidewalk is being provided.
- c) Increase the front yard setbacks for double car garages.
- d) Regulate the minimum sizes of garages and driveway widths based on the lot frontage.
- e) Remove the existing zoning provision that allows one half of the common wall that separates the garage from the dwelling to be included within the minimum garage size.

### **Streetscapes and Attached Garages:**

The principle issues are:

- Streetscapes are dominated by the consistent image of attached garages.
- In the majority of cases, the maximum width of the garage width shall not exceed 50% of the lot frontage. This requirement would provide for 5-metre wide garages on 10 m (32 feet) lot. This style of dwelling typically has a wide garage door (Something less than a double) and a door providing access to the dwelling that is usually recessed slightly (2.5 m ± see below) along the front building elevation. These factors provide for a streetscape dominated by garages.
- The projection of the attached garages from the dwelling units has a negative effect on the streetscape.
- The maximum garage projection is regulated by (“The famous”) Sub-note # 8 to Schedule “A1” of By-Law 1-88. Sub-note # 8 provides for a range between 2.5 to approx. 4.5 ± m subject to approx. 1.5 ± provisions.

Therefore Staff recommends:

- a) To reduce the garage dominance on the streetscape the maximum width of the garages should not exceed 50% of the width of the dwelling. This cannot be accomplished in all cases (lot frontages) and at the same time provide for adequate parking on the lots. The Committee are recommending that lots with frontages between 11 and 12.5m have reduced standards that will allow for a double car garage smaller than the recommended 5.6m wide double car garage (See Section 3.3.2.6, Interior Garage Dimensions and Table A).



- b) The projection or recession of the attached garage shall be a maximum of 2.75 m. (Configuration of the floor space adjacent to the garage within the unit - hallway) This poses a particular problem for lots with frontages between 11 - 12.5m where there is the need for wider garages and limited lot frontages restricting the front useable dwelling area.

### **Driveways:**

The principle issues are:

- The homeowner's expectations are that the driveways should be straight from the garage and not tapered or skewed and be as wide as the outside dimensions of the garage.
- Driveways are being tapered and skewed at outside corners and culs-de-sac lots.
- Driveways are being tapering and skewing of driveway to avoid street hardware and to provide room for snow storage.
- There is insufficient curb frontage in front of the lots to provide for zoning and engineering designs standards.
- The By-law requires 3 parking spaces on the lot for single-family dwellings. Builders either must provide a double car garage with one parking space in the driveway or two in the driveway and one in the garage. In either case the driveway has to be approximately 6.0m wide.
- Presently to comply with the parking requirements of the By-law, and the limited available curb frontage for lots in a cul-de-sac, double car garages must have their driveways tapered or skewed to match the limited curb frontage available. This results in conformity with the zoning by-law but creates an undesirable situation for the homeowners (See Section 3.2.3, Minimum Frontages on Culs-de-Sac and Angle Bends).

Therefore Staff recommends that:

- a) The draft plan of subdivisions must be reviewed and approved having lots that have the appropriate curb frontages while still providing for straight and non-tapered driveways.
- b) Maintain the existing driveway standards respecting separation of abutting driveways and setbacks to all on street hardware.
- c) Require the submission of Engineering Construction Drawings that will specify the location and size of driveways on a lot. Driveway locations must include the locations of all on street hardware and provide for driveway widths that comply with the zoning by-laws. These locations must provide for straight and non-tapered driveway locations taking in account proposed house location. Both the zoning and grading staff should review these plans prior to their approval. (Condition of Draft Approval)
- d) Existing Lot Grading Criteria should be reinforced to ensure that under no circumstances are driveways are built straight and should not be tapered or skewed. The house designs and locations must be altered or revised to ensure the appropriate driveways at all times.

### **Lot Grading and Drainage:**

The principle issues include:

- Small lots with minimum setbacks have improper drainage.
- Rear yards with catch basins require large swales to direct runoff that are disproportionate to the rear yard.
- Side yards are too narrow to accommodate drainage between properties, causing erosion at grass areas.

Therefore Staff recommends that the building setbacks be increased to create a balanced proportion of lot to house, and to allow drainage to be directed between properties. In addition, rear lot catch-basins should be minimized and only provided where necessary because of topography.

**Permitted Yard Encroachments:**

The principle issues include:

- Homeowner's expectations are not being met. (Porches etc. too close to the street and lot lines)
- There is too much home in proportion to the lot. The house is too close to street and backyards are too small.
- There is insufficient access to the rear yard with current side yard setbacks.
- Special problems for corner lots with sight triangles and entrance features.
- A complete set of set of permitted yard encroachment standards was developed in conjunction with the introduction of the new urbanism developments to the City. Generally these standards have the effect of permitting a larger variety of encroachments closer to the property lines. The homeowner's expectations are not been meeting with these reduced standards.
- Yard encroachments (front porches, steps etc.) are permitted within 0.60m of property lines and in some cases right up to the property line (sight triangles)
- Hydro/electrical meters protrude within 0.60m side yard.
- 0.30m reserves are included within minimum setback requirements for the lots.
- Side doors entrances permitted within 1.20m side yards (permitted by by-law exception only) protrude within side yards. Covered porches allow an increasing of the maximum garage projections. (See sub-notes to By-law Schedule "A1")

Therefore Staff recommends that:

- a) City's zoning by-laws should be amended to reduce the permitted yard encroachments.
- b) Increase the minimum amenity areas for both the front and rear yards and provide for better access to the rear yards. (See Section 3.3.2, Zoning Recommendations.)
- c) Allow permitted yard encroachment no closer than 1.5m to any front, exterior side or no closer than 1.2m for sight triangles (except eaves and gutters).
- d) Allow only covered porches (not enclosed with walls) with or without a cold cellar underneath to encroach a maximum 1.5m into a 4.5m side yard. The steps associated with the covered porches may be permitted to encroach a further 1.5m into the required 4.5m yard. Notwithstanding the forgoing, no permitted yard encroachment shall be permitted within 1.50m from a front, exterior side lot line or sight triangle.
- e) Eliminate the 0.30m reserve required for zoning setback calculations.

- f) Re-establish the standards of 1-88 respecting side yard entrances. (Min. 1.80m to door providing access to the dwelling unit with a minimum 1.2 side yard access to the door.)

Staff's recommendations are contained with Attachment 1.

### **Design Standards Implementation**

The Design Standards Review process has been undertaken with the participation and on-going consultation between the Community Planning, Urban Design, Works, Growth Management, Engineering, Buildings, Forestry, Legal Services and Fire Departments. The implementation of the Design Standards will require the continued commitment between all departments as development procedures take place.

A team approach to each phase of development review is recommended. The team should include a senior management representative and additional staff member from each department to ensure the continuity of representation of one department member at key meetings and during development review procedures (Block Plan, Site Plan and Urban Design Guideline Review).

### **Summary**

The City of Vaughan has a variety of residential, commercial and public use building types and architectural expressions within each type. The result is a rich and varied building fabric that has evolved over the City's history. To ensure an interesting building fabric with diverse residential opportunities, a variety of architectural expressions and a mixture of building types are recommended.

Buildings must demonstrate a high quality of architectural design appropriately applied to its context.

The design and location of residential building elements including porches entrances, windows and building projections should be scaled and detailed to support the comfort and safety of pedestrian activity between the public and private realm.