

Document 3 – Details of Public Consultation

This study has been ongoing since the passing of the Interim Control By-law 2018-326 in October 2018.

To ensure effective consultation involving City staff and community representatives, Staff created a technical working group in support of the study, with the intent of discussing issues relating to development in Westboro, and ensuring that all interested parties were kept up to date on and had input in consultation and circulation materials associated with the study.

The working group included members from the following organizations:

- The Westboro Community Association (WCA);
- Save Westboro,
- Greater Ottawa Home Builders Association (GOHBA);
- Councillor Jeff Leiper's office; and
- Staff from the Planning, Infrastructure, and Economic Development Department.

First Discussion Paper – September-October 2019

In September 2019, Staff completed and circulated the first Discussion Paper for public comment. This discussion paper included details on the following topics:

- Existing and past development trends which led to the passing of the Interim Control By-law;
- Important characteristics of the study area, including landscaping, walkability, and built form;
- Issues of site design and compatibility of multi-unit dwellings within the neighbourhood;
- Discussion questions relating to the above.

This paper received comments from 117 residents.

Open House – December 2019

Based on the comments received from the first Discussion Paper, Staff hosted an Open House in December 2019 at the Churchill Seniors' Centre (345 Richmond Road). The purpose of this open house was to focus more specifically on community characteristics and key issues relating to infill development, and thus focused discussion on the following topics:

- Neighbourhood Change
- Density
- Parking
- Urban Design
- Trees and Landscaping

This open house was attended by over 170 residents, and a significant level of comments were made on all of the discussion topics.

Second Discussion Paper – April-May 2020

These comments formed part of the basis for key principles that were developed in the intended zoning for the study area. Based on this, and the policy direction set out by the Council-adopted Preliminary Policy Directions for the new Official Plan, Staff developed a second Discussion Paper in April 2020 which laid out a vision for the neighbourhood, and a number of potential zoning standards that could be implemented in support of that vision.

Comments were received from 24 individuals, as well as comments from the WCA and from GOHBA. These comments ranged from general support of the goals and key principles outlined in the Discussion Paper to concerns about one or more elements of the zoning proposals, including opposition to the potential permitted levels of density suggested in the discussion paper.

Zoning Circulation – October 2020

Based on review of the comments provided through these public consultation activities, as well as discussion with interested organizations via the study working group, Staff prepared and circulated the subject zoning regulations in this report in October 2020 for public comment.

An online open house (including electronic participation) was hosted by Councillor Leiper's office on October 29, 2020, during the circulation period for the proposed amendment. Staff presented an outline of the proposal at this open house and answered questions from residents and participants about the proposed zoning.

In response to the zoning amendment circulation, comments were received from 20 individuals, as well as comments from the WCA and GOHBA. These comments ranged from general support of the proposed amendment, to concerns regarding one or more elements of the proposal, to opposition to the proposed increases of permitted density in various parts of the study area, notably on corner lots and areas adjacent to major streets.

A summary of the comments and concerns received throughout the Second Discussion Paper (which laid out the underlying "vision" and key principles behind the study) and the proposed zoning amendment are detailed below, with responses from staff to each concern outlined.

Where comments were made on behalf of, or echoed by, either the Westboro Community Association (**WCA**) or the Greater Ottawa Home Builders Association (**GOHBA**), that source is identified in brackets.

Topic	Comment	Staff Response
Scope of Amendment	Why is the proposed amendment only for this specific “study area”, rather than all of Westboro (which starts at Hilson on the east to Golden on the west and includes areas north of Richmond Road to Scott and south to Carling)?	The area subject to the proposed zoning amendment is the same area covered by Interim Control By-law 2018-326, which prompted the need for this study. Amendments to areas outside this study area are beyond the scope of the Westboro Infill Zoning Study, and consequently this report.
Density	Concerns about increased density on corner lots and next to major streets – how do we ensure that this does not “creep” further onto local streets?	Interior lots on local streets are proposed to remain zoned R3, except that townhouses are proposed to be permitted. Apartment buildings of four units or more on interior lots on local streets will still require a Zoning By-law Amendment, and will need to be reviewed on their merits and fit within the context of neighbouring lots.
Density	Although this amendment would focus the greatest level of intensification on the properties adjacent to the major roads (Byron, Churchill, Dovercourt), it would legitimize an inward shift of the borders and would allow increased levels of intensification on properties located on “local streets”, including townhouses and multi-unit apartments.	<p>Multi-unit apartments of 4 units or greater would only be permitted on corner lots or “transition zones” on local streets. The remainder of local streets will remain zoned R3, such that a Zoning By-law Amendment would be required to permit such a building.</p> <p>Townhouses are more similar in form to semi-detached dwellings (except that more than 2 units are attached per building), and are more generally permitted in most R3 zones. With this in mind, Staff see no reason to continue prohibiting this use within the study area, given that townhouses can be designed with a built form and scale similar to that of detached or semi-detached dwellings.</p>
Density	Object to allowing R4 zoning on corner lots and “transition areas” – this will represent a profound change to the character of these streets. (WCA)	In response to concerns with respect to the potential for change within these areas, it is proposed to limit the maximum number of units within an apartment building on corner lots and transition areas to six. It is also proposed to apply the same height

		<p>provisions to these lots as are proposed for interior lots on local streets, to soften the transition in built form. This means that buildings on these lots cannot be taller than 8.5 m in height unless a pitched roof is provided.</p> <p>Nevertheless, Staff are of the opinion that these represent appropriate sites for additional density over and above that of the interiors of local streets.</p> <p>These lots will be subject to the same requirements in terms of landscaping and parking restrictions, as well as maximum building depths, to ensure that important characteristics of the neighbourhood are addressed by new infill development on these sites.</p> <p>While it is expected that change will occur as the demand for housing grows, the restrictions proposed to be put in place are intended to ensure that predominant neighbourhood characteristics can still be recognized within Westboro, regardless of what redevelopment occurs. This is not incompatible with allowing additional density, including multi-unit dwellings.</p>
Density	<p>Allowing four to eight units on a lot that previously contained a single-detached dwelling is excessive intensification and should not be permitted.</p>	<p>Staff note that on the interiors of local streets, no more than three principal dwelling units will be permitted (except in the case of townhouses).</p> <p>While it is possible that lower density forms, namely detached and semi-detached dwellings, may also contain secondary dwelling units, such that the “combined total” number of dwelling units is four or more, Staff note that permitting secondary dwelling units within these housing forms is required under the <i>Planning Act</i>, and represent appropriate options</p>

		for additional intensification.
Density	<p>The belief of City Planners and developers that the level of intensification and the number of dwelling units is unrelated to the adverse impacts of infill developments and that the primary concern of residents relates to the size of the building envelope relative to the lot size is incorrect. The number of dwelling units has a dramatic impact on neighbourhoods and continues to be a major concern of Westboro residents.</p>	<p>It is not the position of Staff that the number of dwelling units is entirely unrelated to the potential impact of an infill development. Staff acknowledge that an increased number of dwelling units can result in additional impacts, such as the overall size and built form of the building, as well as supporting amenity area, waste management, and other functional services, that need to be addressed on-site without negatively impacting adjacent lots.</p> <p>As such, Staff are of the opinion that the ability to develop a new residential building, whether single-detached or multi-unit, should be based primarily on the ability to properly manage those impacts first and foremost. In Staff's opinion, if a multi-unit building can demonstrate adequate space for waste management, amenity area, and landscaped area for trees, it should be allowed to build to the same size and footprint as a permitted semi-detached or detached dwelling. However, current zoning often has the effect of restricting or prohibiting the multi-unit building purely by virtue of containing more units, such that it would not be permissible as-of-right even where those concerns can be shown to be addressed.</p> <p>It is recognized that local streets comprise a smaller residential built form and thus the zoning permissions on those lots contemplate smaller buildings containing fewer dwelling units. However, it is not appropriate to restrict the zoning to fewer than 3 units per building, given that that built form can accommodate such a building.</p>
Density	Westboro predominantly	Staff recognize that a significant

	<p>comprises single family, and to a lesser extent semi-detached, homes, and it is disingenuous for city planners to pretend otherwise.</p> <p>Oppose changes that would allow for buildings that deviate from this pattern.</p>	<p>proportion of existing dwellings in the study area are detached or semi-detached dwellings, and are in many cases one to two storeys in height.</p> <p>However, the fact that this represents the predominant pattern on local streets does not preclude the ability for a range of housing forms, including semi-detached, triplex, and townhouse dwellings, from being accommodated on these streets where their exterior built form and design are compatible with that existing context.</p> <p>As noted in the report, a key principle behind the proposed zoning is that where the exterior built form and site design are compatible with surrounding context, there should be flexibility in the number of units permitted within the interior of that built form.</p> <p>Although infill can be larger in floor area than older homes, a variety of housing forms can be designed and built in a manner that addresses the characteristics of lots containing established detached housing forms, including pitched roofs, landscaping and mature trees, and other similar features.</p> <p>With this in mind, and given the policy directions set out in the current and new Draft Official Plan for increased intensification in urban wards, it is the position of Staff that it is inappropriate to restrict permitted housing types strictly to single and semi-detached dwellings, regardless of what dwelling types may be predominant on a given street.</p>
Density	Byron Avenue is not a major	While it is acknowledged that Churchill

	<p>street; it is not like Churchill Avenue. Object to proposed zoning along this street. (several residents, and a similar opinion was expressed by WCA)</p>	<p>Avenue represents the primary major street within the study area, Staff note that Byron Avenue is also considered a “collector” street in the current Official Plan, and is also in close proximity to a number of services and amenities such as the Byron Linear Park, and to a Traditional Mainstreet in Richmond Road.</p> <p>With all this in mind, while it is not proposed to permit 4-storey buildings on Byron as it is on Churchill, Staff are of the opinion that Byron is an appropriate street on which to concentrate additional density, such that 3-storey apartment dwellings should be a permitted use.</p>
<p>Density</p>	<p>While we recognize the need for more housing in Ottawa, we don't think all (or even most) of that 190,000 new housing (as has been projected in the Council-adopted Growth Management Strategy) needs to be in Westboro. A balance between green space, building aesthetics, and density is required.</p>	<p>The regulations aim to reach a balance between providing a range of required densities (based on neighbourhood context) and ensuring that new infill maintains and reinforces key characteristics of Westboro, including greenspace and built form.</p> <p>The Growth Management Strategy, as well as the new draft Official Plan, contemplate that infill and new housing will need to occur in a wide range of urban neighbourhoods – Westboro is only one such neighbourhood. The zoning recommendations in this report intend to give a general direction as to how zoning in support of this policy direction may be implemented, which can consequently be applied to other neighbourhoods within the City.</p>
<p>Density</p>	<p>Unless similar revisions to infill-related zoning provision are also made for other areas of the City's built-up area, Westboro and its current residents will experience a rapid, largely uncontrolled,</p>	<p>The scope of the subject zoning amendment is limited to the area covered by the Westboro Interim Control By-law. However, the direction of this zoning amendment is intended to be reflective of the overall direction contemplated in the new draft Official</p>

	<p>and highly disruptive transformation of their neighbourhood. Westboro will end up bearing a disproportionate burden of the intensification that the City contemplates under the Growth Strategy.</p>	<p>Plan, which foresees that a greater proportion of Ottawa’s growth will need to be accommodated within existing neighbourhoods.</p> <p>While the City cannot directly control which neighbourhoods are subject to development pressure and housing demand, it is expected that infill and intensification will occur in urban neighbourhoods across the City.</p> <p>The zoning regulations proposed in this study will allow for increased density in specific locations, such as major streets and corner lots, but also include new regulations to control new development in such a way that important community characteristics identified in the study, such as Westboro’s built form and landscaped yards, continue to be recognized as the neighbourhood grows.</p>
Density	<p>Strong concerns about the blanket R4 zoning of Churchill, and 5 blocks of Dovercourt and 4 blocks of Byron – this action seemingly would ignore the great number of family homes that co-exist and have co-existed for years with multiple unit dwellings and small commercial outlets. What really needs to change in this successful neighbourhood?</p>	<p>Dovercourt Avenue is no longer proposed to be rezoned in the same manner as Byron Avenue, as was originally proposed in the zoning circulation. As such, Dovercourt Avenue is now proposed to be rezoned in the same manner as any other local street.</p>
Density	<p>Support the proposals; they address many of the publicly expressed concerns while still putting into place the ability to have the density that the city must achieve.</p>	<p>Staff acknowledge this comment.</p>
Housing Affordability	<p>Infill development in Westboro has not been affordable and regardless of what is in the area, will</p>	<p>Staff recognize that the cost of new units in Westboro have been high and have not in recent years been necessarily affordable to a wide range</p>

	<p>continue to be unaffordable.</p>	<p>of residents. For example, new infill detached and semi-detached dwellings developed in the area have sold for as much as over \$1 million per unit. Average rental prices within the study area, as per data from CMHC, have consistently increased over the past five years.</p> <p>The City of Ottawa is currently experiencing a housing crisis, and one of the driving factors behind this crisis is the scarcity of available housing units relative to demand.</p> <p>Staff acknowledge, and have previously acknowledged through previous zoning studies such as the R4 Zoning Review, that zoning changes cannot on their own make housing affordable, but zoning can be a factor in making housing unnecessarily expensive.</p> <p>The City cannot directly control rents or sale prices of housing, nor can it directly influence the price of land. Among other things, allowing a lower number of residential units within each building does not itself result in a significant reduction of land or development costs associated with new construction – in other words, the same land and development costs will be spread across a smaller number of units, increasing the overall cost per unit.</p> <p>Lower density zoning will not stop redevelopment or replacement of housing stock in the neighbourhood, but would ensure that the resulting new buildings comprise a smaller number of larger and consequently more expensive units (as we see reflected in the sale prices of</p>
--	-------------------------------------	--

		<p>detached and semi-detached dwellings in Westboro). This would be in lieu of a greater number of units that, while not guaranteed to be within the range of “deeply affordable” costs, could potentially be within the reach of a greater range of demographics.</p> <p>With this in mind, it is Staff’s position that limiting the permitted density in zoning to predominantly low-density forms, such as single and semi-detached dwellings, will most likely ensure that any new units will continue to be increasingly expensive, given the current sale and rental prices of these types of dwellings in Westboro, and will further contribute to limited affordability within the neighbourhood.</p>
<p>New Official Plan</p>	<p>Although there is recognition that “the direction in the Official Plan under development is to regulate development based on its form rather than on the number of units within the building”, the actual proposals still zone density by unit type, rather than defining a buildable area using setback and height. (GOHBA)</p>	<p>Staff note that most of the standards proposed to be introduced via this zoning amendment are intended to apply equally to all dwelling types, regardless of the number of units contained within the building, such that the built form and other requirements are as consistent as possible regardless of dwelling type. This is consistent with the direction cited.</p> <p>This includes the minimum lot width and area provisions, minimum setback and maximum building height regulations, as well as the landscaping and parking provisions intended to apply through this amendment. The only exception to this is in the case of semi-detached and townhouse dwellings, where minimum lot width and area apply to each unit of the building.</p> <p>With that in mind, Staff recognize that there are limits to which the present</p>

		<p>City of Ottawa Zoning By-law is capable of avoiding regulation “by unit type”. The present Zoning By-law fundamentally regulates residential development in this manner, such that it is difficult to avoid doing so entirely while operating within the framework of the present By-law.</p> <p>Once the new Official Plan is adopted by Council and comes into full force, it will be necessary to develop a new Comprehensive Zoning By-law that is consistent with the new Plan. This will include a By-law that puts the form of development as the primary consideration over the number of dwelling units in the building.</p>
Building Height	Allowing a taller height for pitched roofs on local streets is not an appropriate solution to the “boxiness” of new infills.	Building height, as defined in the Zoning By-law, measures the height of a pitched roof building to the midpoint between the peak and the eaves. This has the effect of discouraging pitched roof developments, as the storeys of the building must generally be accommodated below the bottom of the roof pitch (unless dormers are provided, however dormers can impact how the building height is measured).
Building Height	Allowing three-storey development on corner lots is excessive and will overwhelm existing single detached homes.	Staff have revised the proposed regulations for corner lots and “transition zones” to be the same as for interior lots on local streets; i.e. a maximum height limit of 8.5 metres which can only be increased in the case of a pitch roof with minimum 1:2 slope.
Building Height	Extending the 3-story limits to the entire block as a lot fronting onto a major street would in fact make most of the neighborhood subject to the (relaxed) three story limit. My suggestion would be to limit this provision to the lot	Staff have revised the proposed regulations for corner lots and “transition zones” to be the same as for interior lots on local streets; i.e. a maximum height limit of 8.5 metres which can only be increased in the case of a pitch roof with minimum 1:2 slope.

	adjacent to the corner lot, and to group the remainder of the block with "all other cases", providing an incentive for builders and developers to maintain the pitched roofs that are characteristic of the neighborhood.	
Committee of Adjustment	There must be some assurance from the Committee of Adjustment that they will respect the new regulations developed by local planners and residents. (WCA)	<p>A property owner has the right under the <i>Planning Act</i> to apply to the Committee of Adjustment for a Minor Variance for zoning rules. Should a variance be determined to meet the four tests under Section 45 of the <i>Planning Act</i>, that variance can be approved by the Committee.</p> <p>That being said, Staff appreciate the concern with respect to the use of Minor Variances in a wide range of development applications within the study area prior to this study.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed zoning standards is to emphasize the importance of compatible built form in infill development, regardless of the number of units within the building. As such, variances to the new standards would be required to demonstrate that they will not result in a built form or design that is incompatible with the surrounding neighbourhood context. This means that Staff will not take a favourable position towards variance applications that result in a departure from the built form pattern intended via this zoning amendment, as noted in the section of this report titled "Guidance for Committee of Adjustment Applications".</p>
Process Concerns	Why is this study taking place during a pandemic? It is difficult to engage residents and prompt responses in such a situation.	Staff recognize that the COVID-19 pandemic is a major concern and has created difficulties with respect to public consultation.

		<p>However, Staff note that the Interim Control By-law, and the Westboro Infill Study, commenced well before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, including supporting consultation measures such as the December 2019 open house, which was well-attended by residents. The full range of consultation activities are noted earlier in this report.</p> <p>The <i>Planning Act</i> mandates strict timelines for the applicability of Interim Control By-laws, requiring that a report and recommendation be made within no more than two years from the date of its adoption. While the COVID-19 pandemic and associated provincial emergency orders had the effect of extending this timeline for an additional three months, it is necessary to provide recommendations at this time. Staff are of the opinion that the proposed zoning changes are appropriate within the context of the current Official Plan and the proposed directions set out in the new Draft Official Plan.</p> <p>Staff note that a number of consultation measures were shifted online in order to ensure that residents could involve themselves and provide comments on the proposals and material in support of the study.</p>
<p>Parking</p>	<p>People in Westboro generally drive cars, and most infill has been developed with cars. It is unreasonable to expect development to not include space for parking.</p>	<p>Staff have maintained that it is appropriate for parking to not be required for residential buildings containing twelve or fewer dwelling units. This allows for development options that do not include on-site parking, to promote walkability and alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>While some of the proposed regulations are intended to restrict and</p>

		<p>regulate how parking areas may be designed and where on a site they may be provided, it is still possible to provide parking on-site in a wide range of development proposals. The key principle relating to parking is that it should be provided only after necessary functional and neighbourhood characteristics, such as appropriate built form and intensive soft landscaping, have been addressed.</p> <p>The only explicit blanket prohibition against on-site parking that is proposed is for low-rise apartment buildings on lots less than 15 metres in width, consistent with what was introduced via the R4 zoning review.</p>
<p>Parking</p>	<p>If on site parking for new development is minimized, parking pressures will spill over onto the street affecting all residents and businesses.</p>	<p>On-street parking is not regulated by the Zoning By-law and is not within the purview of this study.</p> <p>That being said, Staff note that there are regulations restricting on-site parking to limited timeframes subject to the Traffic and Parking By-law. Enforcement of this By-law would be addressed via By-law Services.</p> <p>Where on-street parking is a concern, one potential solution to be considered is the use of a permit parking program, which is presently not in use for any street within the study area. However, as noted above, the question of on-street parking is beyond the purview of the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Staff would also note that for developments subject to Site Plan Control approval, such as apartment buildings of four units or more, that contain reduced or no on-site parking, a condition of Site Plan approval in</p>

		such cases is to ensure that sale or rental agreements note that on-site parking may not be available, and that it is the tenant/owner's responsibility to find arrangements for legal parking.
Parking	Support efforts to limit paved parking lots and require permeable/porous materials.	Staff acknowledge this comment.
Parking	No need to prohibit on-site parking for apartment buildings on small lots. Parking can work on narrow lots, as long as the parking solution minimizes the amount of pavement and vegetation is given a priority over parking.	As originally noted in the R4 Zoning Review report, on-site parking takes up a significant amount of space on a lot, when factoring in the supporting driveways and hard surfacing associated with such areas. On lots less than 15 metres in width, this makes it difficult to ensure that other design and functional needs, such as landscaped area, amenity area, and waste management, are adequately met and do not cause adverse negative impacts. These functional needs represent a key component of compatibility, and relate directly to some of the neighbourhood characteristics, such as greenspace and the mature tree canopy, that residents wish to see maintained and enhanced with new development.
Rear Yards	Rear yards with infill are too small for any activities and if trees are planted there they will be too close to the building and their roots will start attacking the foundations within a few years. This is all simply another way for to deny tenants in those triplexes parking spaces.	<p>The intent of requiring rear yard landscaped area is to ensure that area for greenspace and trees is emphasized in these areas, especially given that a significant portion of the mature tree canopy is found in rear yard areas.</p> <p>Parking may still be provided outside of the required landscaped buffers and areas, but in no case may provided parking take precedence over this landscaped area. In some cases, a builder that wishes to provide parking may need to trade off other elements of the proposal (e.g. some of the buildable floor area, to permit garages for parking).</p>

Rear Yards	<p>There is concern that the requirement for a soft landscaped buffer of 3m for Areas A and B and 4.5m for Areas C and D will impede any opportunity for coach houses and/or detached garages in the rear yard. (GOHBA)</p>	<p>Staff acknowledge this comment, and have proposed that as an alternative, the equivalent area required for a landscape buffer may be provided elsewhere abutting the rear lot line, as an alternative to allow more flexibility for the placement of accessory buildings and/or coach houses.</p> <p>The required landscaping must abut at least 50% of the rear lot line, to ensure that the general intent of the landscaping requirement, to provide landscaped area that can support trees</p>
Setbacks / Rear Yards	<p>It is unnecessary to impose a 1.5m interior side yard setback for all building types, and that necessary infrastructure can be accommodated with a 1.2m setback except in the case of low-rise apartments, which need a 1.5m setback on one side in order to accommodate movement of garbage bins if they are stored in the rear yard.</p> <p>Rear yard setbacks were sufficiently addressed in Infill 2. It is completely unnecessary to impose new provisions with respect to rear yards including maximum building depth.</p> <p>The combined effect of these provisions is to reduce the buildable area on an individual lot at the same time when there is a desire to increase density. (GOHBA)</p>	<p>As noted in the report, the key principle behind this zoning amendment is to establish a consistent set of zoning and built form standards regardless of the specific dwelling type proposed.</p> <p>Staff would note that the maximum building depth of 24 metres from the front lot line would only have an effect on lots that are approximately 35 metres in depth or deeper, where the rear yard setback requirement alone would actually result in a building that is deeper than 24 m from the front. As such, lots that are less than 35 m in depth, which covers lots on most blocks within the neighbourhood, will be unaffected by that provision.</p> <p>In addition, this requirement is proposed to apply only where fewer than 6 dwelling units are proposed to be provided, as it is appropriate to allow additional floor area where it is used in support of additional dwelling units (as opposed to for larger units for a lower-density use).</p>
Setbacks	To encourage and promote walkability, there must be adequate front setbacks and	Staff acknowledge that consistent streetscape character and adequate landscaped area represent the intent

	<p>green space.</p>	<p>behind front yard setback requirements.</p> <p>On local streets, the minimum front yard setback requirement, presently 6 metres, will not change. However, it is appropriate on major streets to provide for increased pedestrian interaction with the streetscape while maintaining adequate space for intensive landscaping, hence why it is proposed to allow a front yard setback requirement of no greater than 4.5 metres on major streets.</p> <p>It should be noted that where the average front yard setback of abutting properties is lower than the setback requirement, a property may develop to that average setback. This is appropriate as it allows for a consistent street wall to be maintained.</p>
<p>Setbacks/ Articulation</p>	<p>It is not clear what the end goal is for the 20% articulation requirement, or why that qualifies as a “well-designed façade”.</p> <p>If the city wants to encourage interaction with the street it needs to focus on the ground plane - not the building - and providing areas that allow things like spontaneous conversations between neighbors. (GOHBA)</p>	<p>This requirement was previously introduced via the R4 Zoning Review to low-rise apartment buildings in inner-urban R4 zones, to avoid overly “boxy” designs and ensure connectivity between the built form and the existing streetscape. Staff are of the opinion that it is appropriate to apply in other residential zones beyond those covered in the R4 Review.</p>
<p>Trees</p>	<p>While space for mature trees is addressed as one of the underlying principles in the proposal, there is a lack of confidence the city is able to preserve mature trees during the redevelopment process.</p>	<p>The Zoning By-law cannot directly mandate that trees must be provided, however can ensure that space is available for either existing or new trees on an infill site.</p> <p>In addition to this, the revised Urban Tree By-law is intended to come into full force on January 1, 2021. This By-law includes stronger rules for tree</p>

		protection, with a greater focus on tree retention specifically within the context of infill development.
Waste Management	Concerns with respect to waste management, particularly in support of long semi-detached, triplex and other multi-unit dwelling forms. Without some sort of controls for waste management introduced in conjunction with the rezoning, there is a concern that (in particular) long semi-detached and other similar dwellings will “fall through the cracks”.	Section 143 of the Zoning By-law, originally introduced with Phase 1 of the R4 Zoning Review in 2018, addresses zoning requirements for waste management and storage. For buildings containing more than 3 dwelling units, the Site Plan Control process addresses, among other things, the associated need for adequate waste management in support of a development, including ensuring that the storage area and access to that storage area is functional.
Site Plan Control	Removing the time and costs associated with Site Plan Control protocol in relation to these buildings would make them more affordable and encourage their construction. (GOHBA)	While Staff recognize that there is a need to better align the degree of review and associated costs of infill development with its potential scale and impact, Staff would note that changes to the Site Plan Control By-law are outside the scope of this study and amendment. The purpose of this study is specifically to review and make recommendations on the zoning for the Westboro study area.