



## SECONDARY DWELLING UNITS VIRTUAL CONSULTATION PUBLIC FEEDBACK REPORT

### ABOUT THIS REPORT

The City of Hamilton is completing Zoning By-Law No. 05-200 in stages; the Residential Zone project is the last major component. It focuses mainly on the Urban Area of Hamilton. The project is being undertaken in three stages. As part of the stage considering low density residential zoning, secondary dwelling units were identified as an important topic and separate virtual consultations took place between mid-October and mid-November 2020.

The purpose of the Secondary Dwelling Units (SDUs) project is to implement Provincial requirements through Bill 108 More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019, and Hamilton is required to update its Official Plans and Zoning By-laws to permit Secondary Dwelling Units as part of the Residential Zones Project.

A Discussion Paper outlining the proposed regulations and considered options, along with an accompanied Brochure and Options Summary, was available through Engage Hamilton.

Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, all consultations within the City are being held virtually to protect the health and safety of Hamilton residents and staff.

This report, prepared by Facilitator Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming+Company, provides a summary with the verbatim public input that resulted from the virtual consultation including public comments and questions from the Stakeholder Workshops and Live Information Meetings. City Staff are also reviewing comments received through the Engage Hamilton website and feedback received as part of the Urban and Rural survey. All feedback is being considered.

### CONTENTS

1. How the Virtual Consultation was Organized .....	3
2. General Themes and Key Messages Heard .....	4
3. Next Steps .....	10

### APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Industry Stakeholder Meeting Feedback (November 9) .....	12
Appendix 2: Neighbourhood Associations Stakeholder Meeting Feedback (November 9) ....	17
Appendix 3: Live Information Meeting Feedback (November 12).....	21
Appendix 4: Live Information Meeting Feedback (November 16).....	25

## 1. HOW THE VIRTUAL CONSULTATION WAS ORGANIZED

The purpose of the virtual consultations was to provide information to the public on the background for the Secondary Dwelling Units (SDUs) project, to present the proposed regulations and considered options, to hear comments and provide responses. The Secondary Dwelling Unit (SDUs) consultations were held virtually and provided the following ways for individuals to participate and provide comments:

<p><i>By joining and participating in one of <b>two LIVE Information meetings</b> held on <b>November 12, 2020</b> from 7:00 pm to 8:30 p.m. and <b>November 16, 2020</b> from 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.</i></p>	<p>The information meetings were hosted on WebEx Events and included a live presentation followed by facilitated question and discussion. Residents registered for the meeting through the Engage Hamilton Site.</p>
<p><i>By <b>reviewing online material anytime</b> between October 26, 2020 to November 23, 2020. The material was available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Individuals could fill in the <b>Urban and Rural Survey</b> found in the Engage Hamilton Portal.</i></p>	<p>Available online material included a Discussion Paper, Brochure, Options Summary, Information Panels and Video and Survey. The survey asked questions about options and considerations.</p>
<p><i>By participating in an invited <b>stakeholder workshop</b> held with representatives from <b>Industry</b> on <b>November 9, 2020</b> from 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.</i></p>	<p>The format included a live presentation by City Staff, followed by a facilitated discussion. Participants shared ideas and questions orally and through the WebEx chat function.</p>
<p><i>By Participating in an invited <b>stakeholder workshop</b> held with representatives from <b>Neighbourhood Associations</b> on <b>November 9, 2020</b> from 7:00 pm to 8:30 p.m..</i></p>	<p>The format included a live presentation by City Staff, followed by a facilitated discussion. Participants shared ideas and questions orally and through the WebEx chat function.</p>

The Live Information meetings were advertised in the Hamilton Spectator on October 29, 2020 and on the city’s website. Residents registered for the meeting via WebEx. The format included a live presentation by Timothy Lee, Senior Planner, Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton followed by a facilitated question and answer period. Questions were typed into the Q and A bar for the meeting and read aloud by the facilitator. The presentation portion of the Live Information Meeting held on November 12, 2020 was recorded and posted on the project website for viewing a few days after the meeting.

The two stakeholder meetings were both held on November 9, 2020 with the Industry in the morning and Neighbourhood Associations in the evening. Invitation to participate in the industry meeting was sent to architects, planners, homebuilders, and real estate professionals. The West End Homebuilders Association assisted in identifying contacts for the meeting. Invitation for the Neighbourhood Associations meeting was sent to 50 neighbourhood associations listed on the 2018 City Planning list. Three notices were sent by email for both meetings with the first being a save the date eblast sent on October 26, 2020, followed by additional notices on October 29 and November 4, 2020. RSVPs were requested and information on how to join the meeting via WebEx was provided in advance.

The format for the stakeholder meetings included a live presentation by Timothy Lee, Senior Planner, Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton followed by a facilitated discussion. Participants shared ideas and discussed the proposed regulations and considered options by speaking at the meetings and through typing questions and ideas through the WebEx chat function.

The Secondary Dwelling Unit virtual consultation meetings were facilitated by Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company. City Staff who participated in the virtual consultations included the following:

- Joanne Hickey-Evans, Planning Policy and Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton
- Timothy Lee, Planning Policy and Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton
- Alana Fulford, Planning Policy and Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton
- Madeleine Giroux, Planning Policy and Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton
- Kirsten Maxwell, Healthy and Safe Communities Department, City of Hamilton
- James O'Brien, Healthy and Safe Communities Department City of Hamilton
- Peter De Boer, Healthy and Safe Communities Department City of Hamilton

82 individuals participated in the four virtual consultation events. Over 300 questions and comments were responded to.

Virtual Consultation Meetings Held	Number of Attendees
Industry Stakeholder Session held November 9 (morning)	12
Neighbourhood Association Session held November 9 (evening)	10
Live Information Meeting held November 12 (evening)	30
Live Information Meeting held November 16 (afternoon)	30

The City is committed to ensuring that there is full transparency in reporting on what was heard to ensure that the public feedback received is widely known and considered in the development of the proposed regulation and policy options. All feedback is being considered by City staff.

This feedback report has been prepared by the Facilitator. It incorporates an upfront section on the general themes and key messages heard together with verbatim input from each of the meetings in Appendices 1 through 4. It is important that the synthesis of what was heard be read in conjunction with the detailed meeting feedback contained in these appendices.

## 2. GENERAL THEMES AND KEY MESSAGES HEARD

The virtual consultations enabled city staff to provide an overview of the proposed regulations and considered options for permitting and regulating Secondary Dwelling Units (SDUs) and to host a discussion on considerations for permitting SDUs. The discussion also included an emphasis on addressing neighbourhood character. Several questions were posed to meeting participants to seek input on various proposed options.

Each of the four different meetings involved a different discussion with many viewpoints and opinions being heard. The meetings were important for clarifying information on Secondary Dwelling Units and for answering questions on regulations proposed for detached and internal SDUs in the Urban Area.

There were many questions on the process of how these would be rolled out over the city with individuals commenting that they appreciated the complexity of putting into place appropriate regulations. One overarching theme was the importance of addressing potential hurdles or barriers for creating SDUs to minimize where possible requirements for obtaining minor variances. It was noted too many hurdles and additional costs could deter the creation of units. Questions were raised by industry representatives about whether the city is contemplating Site Plan Control as a requirement noting that while it may provide some control over design, it would add time, costs and be an additional hurdle.

There was interest in understanding what is happening with existing SDUs that currently do not comply with the zoning by-law (illegal SDUs). There is an understanding that it is possible that some illegal units will be able to be legalized as an outcome of the SDU zoning which is seen as a good thing.

To facilitate detached SDUs in the Urban Area, the following suggestions were noted for the City to consider:

- Reducing delays in processing of applications by ensuring more information sharing and better understanding of new zoning regulation across city departments and facilitating better coordination with city departments particularly Development Engineering pertaining to existing site drainage conditions.
- Publishing a list of resources on built form for detached SDUs with example floor plans.
- Establishing a process for “validating” existing SDU units.
- Establishing loans/grants for SDU creation to assist homeowners create new units potentially tied to having new rents set at affordable levels.
- Considering reduced parking for seniors’ units.

There were concerns raised about how the City would be addressing existing student housing issues in areas near McMaster and Mohawk which were noted to be experiencing illegal units, too many students in one house and absentee landlords. While the principal of having SDUs is not objectionable, it was noted that allowing new internal and detached SDUs in these areas would exacerbate this problem and could add 4 to 5 more students/people to a single lot. While there is an understanding that the proposed SDU regulations do not address these issues, there continues to be problems in these areas that need to be remedied.

There were concerns noted about the inability to require owner-occupied units and potential for investors to buy up houses to put in detached SDUs in rear yards. It is understood that zoning does not regulate ownership. There were questions about how overlook from detached SDUs would be managed along with other concerns about how new units could impact the existing neighbourhood character. Both Ancaster and Waterdown were cited as specific areas of concern given the larger lots that exist in these areas and ongoing infill development pressure.

Of further note is how the new SDU permissions would be interpreted in the Heritage Districts (e.g., Waterdown Mill Street Heritage District) with concerns about ensuring that the existing heritage conservation is not affected by the new zoning regulations.

Questions and comments arose about specific proposed regulations for gross floor area (GFA), lot coverage, setbacks, and parking requirements. There was interest in better understanding the functionality of detached SDUs with respect to mail delivery, garbage collection, emergency service, etc. It was noted that some individuals are of the opinion that the proposed maximum GFA, lot coverage, setbacks, and parking requirements as proposed will likely necessitate minor variance applications which will deter uptake. Some individuals commented that there should be consideration of a more area specific focus to address unique existing conditions (lot size, character, parking etc.) in different parts of the city.

While many seem to support the idea of a maximum of 2 SDUs internal to the principal dwelling and 1 detached SDU being considered, others would like the City to consider up to four units on one lot. This could be in the form of a second detached SDU or more internal units.

There is interest in permitting detached SDUs in rural areas. There were a number of comment and questions at the resident virtual town halls about how to create SDUs in the rural area and clarification about process and what is permitted.

**Figure 2** is a high-level synthesis prepared by the Facilitator of the comments and questions raised through the virtual consultation events. It is organized by the general themes and key messages noted. While this is not a transcript of the meetings, it includes verbatim comments. It is important that this synthesis of key messages heard be read in conjunction with the verbatim comments found in Appendices 1 to 4 of this Feedback report.

**Figure 2 General Themes and Key Messages Heard through the Virtual Consultations**

General Theme	Key Messages Heard
<p><b>Importance of maintaining one street facing entrance vs. enabling two front doors</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depending on where they are in the City, participants either strongly support maintaining one street facing entrance or do not feel that it is important.</li> <li>• Protecting neighbourhood character based on what exists was noted as an important reason to maintain one front door.</li> <li>• Some residents feel that maintaining one front door is especially important.</li> <li>• In some areas of the lower City especially in the north end, it was noted that this may not be as important because there are already areas that have two street fronting entrances.</li> </ul>

General Theme	Key Messages Heard
<p><b>Clarification of how GFA is applied</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification was sought on how 50 square metres would apply within the unit. It was confirmed that the 50 square meters would be the maximum within the building which could be organized over two floors.</li> <li>• On the question of the GFA including the basement: the question was noted about what happens in Westdale where the by-law specifically includes the basement – in this case to deter conversion of homes into student housing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Detached SDU Gross Floor Area (GFA)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maximum GFA of 50 square metres is seen as too small and is expected to result in minor variance applications for most of the units. It was noted that the typical SDU applied for between 2016-18 (as per City’s report) was 76 square metres. It was noted that the size restriction of 50 square metres is too small for what most people are looking for.</li> <li>• The City should consider a maximum of 70 to 80 square metres which is seen as being more consistent with requirements established in other municipalities and allows for more than a one room or one bedroom unit. A higher number that allows for modest 2 bedroom units would likely allow for more “as of right” applications.</li> <li>• It was further noted that, in most cases, 50 square metres will trigger a minor variance application.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Proposed regulations for lot coverage and setbacks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed maximum lot coverage of 25% was noted to be workable for scale in some areas of the city where there are 40 to 50 foot frontages. For other areas, especially in the Lower City, 25% is seen to be too restrictive and 35% is seen as more realistic.</li> <li>• Given the variety of lot sizes and configuration across the City, there is a desire to move away from a one size fits all scenario with standardized regulations preferring a more dimensional approach that establishes setbacks based on lot size. Industry representatives commented that the “one number fits all approach” does not work and that a matrix table with frontage, lot depth, and percentage of coverage should fall out of the specifics of the lot that you are dealing with.</li> <li>• It was noted that there needs to be flexibility to adapt to different situations in different Wards which may have smaller lots, laneways and different conditions for garages and back gardens.</li> <li>• Would like to see side yard setbacks eliminated on one side noting that there are other ways to address visual overlook and spatial separation for fire. It was noted that there are ways to address fire separation including having fire rated dry-wall or concrete block. Could have windows fenestration on one side</li> </ul>

<b>General Theme</b>	<b>Key Messages Heard</b>
<b>Proposed regulations for lot coverage and setbacks (continued)</b>	<p>with the other side that abuts against neighbouring yard with no windows e.g., 0 and 2 metres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some noted that they agree with the regulations for balconies and existing stairs. There needs to be something built in for flexibility in design. The example of having second floor balconies on a laneway could be a good design solution that puts life on the laneway.</li> <li>• The distance from the principle dwelling of 7.5 metres to the detached SDU is too large. There are many backyards that will not be able to maintain this distance and will lead to minor variance applications. It would be great to come up with a more reasonable distance.</li> </ul>
<b>Considerations to address overlook for detached SDUs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For detached SDUs unassociated with a laneway concerns were raised about overlook and how these can be accommodated on different lots sizes protecting privacy and use of yards.</li> <li>• It was noted that there will be significant pushback if allow SDUs in a backyard. This was noted to potentially be a significant issue in some areas of the City particularly in Ancaster where SDUs in backyards would create new overlook with new units looking into the backyards of abutting residences. Would like to see more regulations to address overlook and privacy.</li> <li>• Industry representatives asked for reconsideration of minimum setbacks suggested to address overlook from second floor windows that overlook adjacent backyards instead of having the requirement for no windows on three of the four facades. It was noted that having no windows is not practical or reasonable to request for most projects. If necessary, perhaps having a translucent film on the lower portion of the second floor windows to mitigate overlook would be reasonable.</li> </ul>
<b>Requirements for parking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are different opinions on the requirement of one parking space for SDUs based on where in the city the SDU would be located.</li> <li>• One parking space per unit is supported and seen as necessary and sufficient in many areas.</li> <li>• Residents at the virtual town halls noted that requiring 1 parking spot for an SDU could disqualify a lot of properties in the older area and in the Lower City e.g., North End and neighbourhoods on Hamilton Mountain. They expressed concern that the 1.0 parking rule per SDU is going to be the biggest hindrance to encouraging homeowners to building SDUs on the Mountain. It was stated that this may encourage homeowners to build SDUs without involving the City at all.</li> </ul>

General Theme	Key Messages Heard
<p><b>Requirements for parking (continued)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For areas in the Inner City and North End where there are small driveways, it was noted that it is not possible to add a parking spot unless you remove the front lawn, which is against the bylaw.</li> <li>• Regarding parking outside of the Downtown, many of the existing residential neighbourhoods already have 2 car wide driveways and residents question the need to add an additional parking space requirement.</li> <li>• Others note that many areas have a real problem with parking currently and the contemplation for no parking for SDUs in Lower Hamilton would be problematic e.g., in the East Central City.</li> <li>• With respect to encouraging aging in place, seniors housing and granny units, questions were noted as to whether these would be considered SDUs and therefore require 1 parking space.</li> <li>• Residents ask - if parking is required city wide, can a parking reduction through a minor variance be considered on a case-by-case basis so that parking can be evaluated as SDUs are constructed.</li> <li>• If there is laneway access to a lot can the parking for the SDU be in the backyard.</li> <li>• Will the City waive parking requirements for the following where a where a SDU is being created for a senior/family member/in law suite who does not drive?</li> <li>• Will the City waive parking requirements where the principal house is on a transit route which would encourage density in a good place for it along transit routes and in places where cars would be less needed?</li> <li>• Concerns were noted about the impact of the requirement for parking on front yard landscaping. Hardscaping was noted to be an issue that could affect character with front yards being used for parking. More consideration of greenscaping and less impervious surfaces are recommended.</li> <li>• Parking is an ongoing issue in many areas of the city. In areas where there are a number of illegal apartments and student housing it was noted that parking is a problem with some houses have multiple cars using on street parking.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tandem Parking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While many understand that tandem parking is not ideal for an attached SDU, there is concern that by not allowing tandem parking, this will negate the opportunity for many SDUs and trigger minor variance applications for parking.</li> <li>• Disallowing tandem parking should be reconsidered as it will limit the number of homes that can create secondary dwellings</li> </ul>



General Theme	Key Messages Heard
<p><b>Tandem Parking (continued)</b></p>	<p>in the City. Many homes in Hamilton, detached and otherwise, only have an option for tandem parking currently as parking is fit between two homes or the driveway is shared with another home. The question was raised as to what the options would be for these homes regarding parking requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St. Catherines, Welland, Brantford, and London were identified as municipalities that all allow tandem parking already.</li> <li>• It was noted that usually homeowners will figure out solutions where occupants will not be obstructing each other. (e.g., in Toronto’s laneway policy, no parking is required at all, but homeowners usually create at least 2 spaces that are much smaller than what is required if it was enforced in the parking bylaws.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Implications for Front yard landscaping in relation to parking requirements</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern noted that parking requirements may lead to more parking in front yards taking away landscaping.</li> <li>• It was noted that the definition and permission for what is allowed for front yard landscaping includes hardscaping (paving stones) and this should be reconsidered to ensure that a certain percentage is maintained green.</li> <li>• Hardscaping was noted to be an issue that could affect character with front yard being used for parking.</li> <li>• More consideration of greenscaping and less impervious surfaces are recommended to address urban heat islands, more severe weather events and climate change considerations</li> </ul>
<p><b>Fire access and regulations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that the fire escape projection of 1 metre is difficult to comply with when design to the Ontario Building Code especially for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor fire escapes. Any effort to increase this projection noting that this is not relating to the clear path for fire personnel.</li> <li>• Concerns were noted about side yard setback requirements and how these would impact the potential for creating laneway housing. It was noted that lots that typically have access to laneways may not be able to meet the City’s minimum due to narrow lot size.</li> <li>• Questions arose about whether the City would be allowing sprinkler protection in lieu of 40 metres fire access. (Reference to BCC ruling about fire access for laneway housing and Toronto Ruling 19-31-1551).</li> </ul>

### 3. NEXT STEPS

The feedback received from the virtual consultations is being considered together with input from the completed Urban and Rural Survey and input received from residents through commenting on Engage Hamilton. City Staff will be making recommendations to Council on proposed regulations and considered options for their review and adoption in 2021.

Information will continue to be made available through Engage Hamilton.

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1: Industry Stakeholder Meeting Feedback (November 9) .....	12
Appendix 2: Neighbourhood Associations Stakeholder Meeting Feedback (November 9) .....	17
Appendix 3: Live Information Meeting Feedback (November 12).....	21
Appendix 4: Live Information Meeting Feedback (November 16).....	25

## Appendix 1

### Feedback from Industry Stakeholder Meeting held on November 9, 2020

A stakeholder meeting was held with representatives from Industry from 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on November 9, 2020. Invitation for the meeting was sent to architects, homebuilders, planners, and real estate professionals. The West End Home Builders Association assisted in identifying contacts. Notices were sent by email with the first e-blast (save the date) on October 26, followed by additional notices on October 29 and November 4, 2020. RSVPs were requested and information on how to join the meeting via WebEx was provided in advance.

The format included a live presentation by Timothy Lee, Senior Planner, Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton followed by a facilitated discussion. Participants shared ideas and questions orally and through the WebEx chat function. The virtual consultation meetings were facilitated by Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company.

The city would like to thank the following organizations for their participation.

- James Webb Planning Consultants (1 representative)
- Hamilton and District Apartments Association (2 representatives)
- MTE Consultants Inc. (1 representative)
- Realtors Association of Hamilton-Burlington (2 representatives)
- Suite Additions (1 representative)
- T. Johns Consulting (1 representative)
- Toms + McNally Design (1 representative)
- West End Home Builders Association (3 representatives)

This Appendix (Appendix 1) includes the verbatim feedback and questions noted through the meeting discussion. City staff provided responses and clarification to the questions noted at the meeting. Responses are not included in this Appendix. The following comments are organized by key themes. Each bullet point represents a different individual's comment.

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<p><b>General comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many laneway houses permits have been issued to date since the pilot zoning?</li> <li>• Appreciate the complexity of rolling these out over the City.</li> <li>• Hats off to City Staff as the more we are learning about this, the more complex as situation is seems.</li> <li>• Compliments to old City By-law Section 19 conversion policies are an excellent blueprint and have been effective in permitting second dwellings.</li> <li>• The intention is to get people to build and to legalize. If it becomes a process where a minor variance is required, this will deter new units due to too many hurdles.</li> </ul>

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<b>General comments (continued)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed maximum GFA, lot coverage, setback and parking requirements will likely necessitate minor variance applications which will deter uptake.</li> <li>• There should be consideration of a more area specific focus to address unique existing conditions (lot size, character, etc.) in different parts of the City.</li> <li>• If we are looking to create affordable housing, additional costs to create e.g., Committee of Adjustment should be avoided if possible.</li> <li>• Coordination with other City departments – development engineering, site drainage (gets very tricky) as existing conditions are not perfect. Sometimes we have to jump through hoops for things that are unreasonable. For this to work there need to be a good understanding amongst different departments of how SDUs are being permitted.</li> <li>• Would like to see a City Staff leadership role taken to coordinate departmental input.</li> <li>• Important to operationalize and encourage and not put too many hurdles in place.</li> <li>• Thank you! I can't wait to have more of these permits submitted and dwelling units built to provide more housing options in our City.</li> </ul>
<b>Detached Units in the Urban Area</b>	<p><b>Clarification of what would be permitted – number of dwelling units:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are these detached SDUs available as 3<sup>rd</sup> units to meet the requirements of Bill 108? For example, a property with a primary unit, a basement unit, and a detached SDU in the back? In other words, a main house with 2 SDUs.</li> <li>• Other municipalities are allowing up to 4 units/lot – using a combination of units in the main dwelling and detached structure.</li> <li>• Would the City consider allowing up to 4 units per lot – 2 in the first dwelling and 2 SDUs in a detached house allowing up to 4 units per lot. This could be a consideration for Hamilton.</li> <li>• SDUs in primary dwelling: would the City consider having 2 SDUs in a detached house? I think this is important to legalize the many affordable dwellings already in our downtown building fabric.</li> <li>• Would the regulation apply to new development? Could a SDU be considered when putting in new detached dwelling or new attached dwelling.</li> <li>• It is difficult to put in place regulations in a one size fits all approach. There needs to be flexibility to address different existing situations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed GFA regulation of maximum 50 square metres:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was wondering if the 50 sq m is footprint of the detached SDU or total floor space inside of the building (e.g., basement or second storey)?</li> <li>• Why is there a max GFA of 50m<sup>2</sup>, since the typical SDU applied for between 2016-18 (as per City Staff's report) was 76m<sup>2</sup>. 50m<sup>2</sup> is too</li> </ul>

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<b>Detached Units in the Urban Area (continued)</b>	<p>small for what most people are looking for. If this is not enlarged, most people will still need to go for a variance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limiting GFA to 50M2 is too small for most applications. Slightly bigger 50 to 80 metre range is more realistic.</li> <li>• I agree that the 50 square metres is too small and, in most cases, triggers a minor variance application. A higher number that allows for modest 2 bedroom units would likely allow for more “as of right” applications.</li> <li>• 50M2 is the single biggest think – as won’t be able to build anything more than a one small bedroom unit – if increase to 75M2 would allow a second bedroom.</li> <li>• Washington, Oregon, and California have experience in larger dwelling units that have been done successfully.</li> <li>• Maximum 50M2 is going to be a challenge – three other municipalities in the GTA have maximums of 70 to 74M2 and are still experiencing minor variance applications.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed regulation of maximum 25% lot coverage and setbacks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot coverage 25% is an excellent starting point for scale.</li> <li>• 35% coverage is more realistic – 25% too low especially in Lower City. Likely fine for new lots 40 to 50 wide.</li> <li>• For the Downtown, the 25% would mean that they can’t fit existing house and accessory dwelling on the lot - too small will not be able to fit on the lot.</li> <li>• Would recommend taking more of a dimensional approach for setback and lot area. One number fits all doesn’t work for percentage lot area, matrix table with frontage, lot depth, % should fall out of the specifics of the lot that you are dealing with.</li> <li>• Anything more than 2.6M will not allow any 35’ lot in the City to avoid committee of adjustments for 4’ to satisfy the 50% front yard coverage - that is a great majority of our downtown urban area.</li> <li>• Would recommend eliminating one of the side yards. When there are – garages and back gardens there is space on both sides. Aside from spatial setback, the side yard setback for decks is forgotten space. Should make it 0 on one side. This would still allow for access between the garden and shed.</li> <li>• If the intention is to get people to build and to legalize. If it becomes a process where a minor variance is required, this will deter new units – too many hurdles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed regulations and overlook:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would suggest that there be a minimum setback for second floor windows that overlook adjacent backyards, and not having a requirement for no windows on these three facades. That is not practical or reasonable to request for most projects. If necessary,</li> </ul>

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<b>Detached Units in the Urban Area (continued)</b>	<p>perhaps having a translucent film on the lower portion of the second-floor windows to mitigate overlook would be reasonable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For SDU unassociated with a laneway – e.g., Ancaster – going to get significant pushback if allow SDU in backyard. Could have neighbours overlooking from SDU as well. Should have different standards to address different situations.</li> <li>• Wall ultimately fire rated dry-wall or concrete block. Windows fenestration on one side. Other side butts up against neighbouring with no windows – 0 and something usable 2</li> <li>• Balconies and existing stairs – agree but allow something for flexibility in design – getting you to second floor balconies and allow puts life on the laneway.</li> </ul> <p><b>Feedback on fire access and regulations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of fire access, can you remind me what will the minimum side yard requirement be? Wondering how this will affect potential laneway housing as lots that typically have access to laneways may not be able to meet this minimum due to narrow lot size.</li> <li>• Would the City allow putting a sprinkler system in detached SDUs.? Still have setback because some will not have sprinkler or cladding.</li> <li>• In lieu of 40m fire access, laneway houses could have sprinkler protection. Should look at BCC ruling and Toronto ruling for fire access for laneway houses (Ruling 19-31-1551).</li> <li>• If we assume that the City gives enough pressure – big question – 40 metres - how long does sprinkler system run – 30 minutes – is there enough water and pressure to get out of SDU in reasonable time frame. ¾ inch standard and feed new system - not enough water pressure may have to increase to 1 inch – water services from street can branch out /splitting line to each dwelling – development engineering and building would need to figure this out.</li> <li>• I can ask for a cost estimate for a sprinkler system from one of my contractors if that would be helpful.</li> <li>• One of options is to have buildings with cladding to protect the new structure from old structure. Then use rated drywall inside the building to stop fire from spreading from one to another.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments on whether Site Plan Approval should be used:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it the city contemplating Site Plan Control (SPC) for detached SDUs as a requirement?</li> <li>• Is there contemplation for site plan approval for new construction outside.</li> <li>• The proposed regulations would be reviewed at Building Permit. Don't see the necessity of SPC.</li> <li>• I would encourage the city not to require SPC on detached SDUs. It will be simply another barrier for adding additional units.</li> </ul>

<b>General Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Verbatim Comments Noted</b>
<b>Internal SDUs in the Urban Area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would love to see the City allow 2 SDUs in primary dwelling because so many are in the Downtown.</li> <li>• There are many houses with two accessory units already within main dwelling and to be able to legalize these would be good for City.</li> <li>• More units are better for providing housing in our City and making this legal would be a fantastic thing.</li> <li>• Does the maximum GFA include the entire internal floor space?</li> <li>• If have two story SDU then can you only have 25 M2 on each floor or is it about the total of 50M2 and you can organize it on each floor.</li> <li>• Does the square footage for lot coverage include basement square footage?</li> <li>• On the question of the GFA including the basement: what happens in the Westdale neighbourhood where the By-law specifically includes the basement to deter conversion of homes into student housing?</li> </ul>
<b>SDUs in Rural Area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comments Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking</b>	<p><b>Size of parking spaces:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will the required parking space width be? By-Law 05-200 requires 2.8m to 3.0m width and 5.0 m in length. Could vary across the city.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments on tandem parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree that tandem parking is not ideal for a detached SDU. Only issue is that enforcing that in the By-Law will likely require minor variances as it is hard to meet all the requirements of 18A for parking. Usually, homeowners will figure out solutions where occupants won't be obstructing each other. (e.g., In Toronto's laneway policy, no parking is required at all, but homeowners usually create at least 2 spaces that are much smaller than what is required if it was enforced in the parking bylaws)</li> <li>• I worry tandem parking will limit the number of homes that can create secondary dwellings in the City, many homes in Hamilton, detached and otherwise, only have an option for tandem parking currently as parking is fit between two homes or the driveway is shared with another home. What would be the options for these homes regarding parking requirements?</li> <li>• Layby parking would have been an effective solution – flip side is that instead of using driveway for second car, instead use front yard landscaping and eats into front yard and impacts neighbourhood character.</li> </ul>



## Appendix 2

### Feedback from Stakeholder Meeting held with Neighbourhood Associations on November 9, 2020

A stakeholder meeting was held with representatives from Neighbourhood Associations within the City from 7:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. on November 9, 2020. Invitation for the Neighbourhood Associations meeting was sent to 50 neighbourhood associations. Notices were sent by email with the first e-blast (save the date) on October 26, followed by additional notices on October 29 and November 4, 2020. RSVPs were requested and information on how to join the meeting via WebEx was provided in advance.

The format included a live presentation by Timothy Lee, Senior Planner, Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton followed by a facilitated discussion. Participants shared ideas and questions orally and through the WebEx chat function. The virtual consultation meetings were facilitated by Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company.

The city would like to thank the following associations for their participation.

- Ainslie Wood Community Association
- Ancaster Village Heritage Community
- Delta West Community Association
- Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association
- Lucy Day Group (within the Sherman Hub Neighbourhood)
- North End Neighbours
- Rosedale Community Council
- The Friends of Gage Park
- Waterdown/Mill Street Heritage Committee
- Environment Hamilton

This Appendix (Appendix 2) includes the verbatim feedback and questions noted through the meeting discussion. City staff provided responses and clarification to the questions noted at the meeting. Responses are not included in this Appendix. The following comments are organized by key themes. Each bullet point represents a different individual’s comment.

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<b>General comments</b>	<p><b>Clarification on the process for permitting SDUs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be public neighbourhood consultation as with planning applications for external new or renovated SDU’s?</li> <li>• What kind of controls will there be on SDUs – detached external buildings especially. Will there be consultation with the neighbourhoods? Will the planning department sieve these things for those that may be outrageous to make sure they don’t get through? What would the process be? What would staff review?</li> <li>• Should make permitting fees less expensive to get more compliance and to be better able to control the situation.</li> </ul>

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<p><b>General comments (continued)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another individual commented that in their experience it has generally not been particularly expensive to get a permit to convert a dwelling to 2-family (if it complies to zoning bylaw). Still, lots of illegal units out there. I found it was often the perception that it would be expensive and time consuming that led people to create illegal units.</li> <li>• I understand that Air BnB is not part of this study but would like to know if the City will consider in the future.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns noted about permitting SDUs in areas where student housing issues are being experienced:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I heard in the presentation that we were not going to talk about student housing and property standards today. This is big issue for the Ainslie Wood community who live near McMaster and for other areas near Mohawk.</li> <li>• In our area, there are many situations where up to 8 to 12 students are living in a single-family home. By adding a detached unit this could create an additional 4 or more people to the same lot. While we are not against secondary dwelling units and these already exist in our area, we already have a lot of problems and adding new permissions for secondary dwellings will exacerbate what we are already experiencing.</li> <li>• There is a lot of frustration over this continuing situation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns noted about the inability to control owner occupancy (Planning Act does not allow):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am in Rosedale. We do not get the kind of problems that the Ainslie Wood area does but, I am worried about the lack of ability to control owner occupancy as absentee landlords are a problem in our neighbourhoods. The idea of making it easier for homeowners was noted but, with no ability to have input or control on design, we will see more investors coming in and they can do what they want. Section 19 of the zoning has a clause about exterior character being preserved. We understand that rules are overly broad. Are there any clauses where people can have a say on design and impact in neighbourhoods? Appearance on character.</li> <li>• We understand that the Planning Act cannot regulate tenure, but shouldn't people need to live on the property for a number of years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Detached Units in the Urban Area</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will detached SDUs be considered for heritage districts - can a secondary unit be built within a heritage district? There are lots of pieces of pie here, we are in Waterdown, and are part of the Mill Street Heritage District Committee. What protections are being put in place to avoid having this become a problem. We have very large lots here in Waterdown, this new zoning seems to promote people or investors buying up and building new detached units in rear yards.</li> <li>• Very concerned about development pressure and impact of SDUs on the heritage areas in the City.</li> </ul>

<b>General Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Verbatim Comments Noted</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Ancaster, the point of view is similar to Waterdown. We have a lot of heritage properties and don't want to see these impacted. How can we avoid a lot of new units on these properties?</li> <li>The Kirkendall neighbourhood may be very well suited for detached secondary dwelling units. There are a number of laneway houses going up and we have a lot of alleyways. Would the City consider taking over some of these laneways to improve egress and ingress and garbage pickup – e.g., Dundurn South?</li> </ul>
<b>Internal SDUs in Urban Area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For internal units, there may be issues with low ceiling height for basement units that could be a barrier to having people come forward to have these legalized.</li> <li>Quite a few homes have lots of stairs that lead to duplex or basement units and these can be quite ugly. If they are going to be grandfathered would like to see the fixed up.</li> </ul>
<b>SDUs in Rural Area</b>	No Comments noted
<b>Parking</b>  <b>Please read in conjunction with responses to Q2 on page 20</b>	<p><b>Requirements for parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking is a huge issue and must be provided for secondary units.</li> <li>Parking regulation for SDU should be for all of Hamilton. In our area we have a real problem with parking.</li> <li>If the City is trying to promote active transportation and transit (and we do have a lot of work to get more use of these), can we justify no parking in some parts of the City where there is transit and active transportation nearby?</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments on tandem parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking should be required. I do not understand why tandem parking is not okay and yet in some areas secondary dwelling units could be permitted with no parking at all.</li> </ul> <p><b>Front yard landscaping and parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will the parking requirements impact the provision of the minimum front yard landscaping? Some homes in the City are using hardscaping (pavers) and parking on these in front yards.</li> <li>It would be good to provide flexibility with green standards to give property owners the ability to choose better options – e.g., pervious parking surfaces with more greenscaping and less hardscaping while also providing parking.</li> <li>If more impervious surface were put onto a lot – think of urban heat islands, climate change and more severe weather events, we could have more flooding. Are we considering how to ensure more pervious – green landscaping?</li> <li>Given that hardscaping is allowed in front yard landscaping – the City may need to change definition of landscaping – to be green – or to have a certain percentage of green.</li> </ul>

In addition to the general discussion, City Staff asked for specific input to two questions. The two questions and responses received are included in the following tables.

**Question 1: Reflecting about our own community, is maintaining one street-facing entrance per dwelling unit important to you?**

- In the Delta West Community particularly in Crown Point Hub, we mostly have single front door entrance to homes, and it would be important for the area to maintain a single-entry entrance. If adding doors, then it will start to create a different feel for the neighbourhood.
- Yes, maintaining one front door is important.
- One street facing front door is important.
- Our neighbourhood association would be concerned if the city allows changes to the front of homes – one street facing front door is important to maintain the character.
- Like the concept of creating character zones and having building official require adjustments if something is proposed out of character. Would need to hire more by-law officers.
- In the north end, we currently have situations where there are two front doors, but most have one street facing entrance.
- Some areas in the older city may already have two so it may be okay in those areas.
- How does the mail get to a unit, how would delivery work for secondary dwelling units?  
*City staff advised that sometimes a secondary dwelling could have a address by adding ½ to the established number.*

**Question 2: Reflecting about your own community, is 1 parking space per SDU sufficient? Is it too many? Should no parking be required?**

- Any contemplation for no parking for SDUs in lower Hamilton would be terrible. As an example, next door we have a duplex which has five cars and limited on site parking, so the result is that they use all the spaces on the street. It would be horrendous to have secondary dwelling units without parking. Please do not do this.
- One space per unit needs to be provided.
- Make sure at least one if not more for the number of tenants.
- My neighbours would roast me if I told you that it was not an issue. In areas around Locke Street for example, residential parking is a big issue. This is exacerbated by people parking in front of homes who are visiting commercial businesses.
- One parking per unit needs to be enforced.
- At least at least one space per SDU is required.
- One space per unit – but do not require it to be a turnaround – allow it to be a small space.

### Appendix 3

## Feedback from the Live Information Meeting held on November 12, 2020.

Two Live Information meetings were held. This Appendix includes the feedback from the Town Hall held on November 12, 2020 from 7 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. The meetings were advertised in the Hamilton Spectator on October 29, 2020 and on the city’s website.

Residents registered for the meeting via WebEx. The format included a live presentation by Timothy Lee, Senior Planner, Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton followed by a facilitated question and answer period. Questions were typed into the Q and A bar for the meeting and read aloud by the facilitator.

The City would like to thank the 30 individuals who participated in the Live Information Meeting on November 12, 2020.

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<b>General comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you saying that one of the proposals is to have up to 3 units on a property - 2 attached, and one stand alone?</li> <li>• You are talking about 3 residences per lot, e.g., 1 principal and 2 SDUs. But why limit the SDUs to 1 internal and 1 external? Why not 2 internal? Surely that would be a much more common situation?</li> <li>• SDUs will help seniors age in place with the right tenant.</li> <li>• Have you consulted with experts on the needs of seniors for SDU’s?</li> <li>• I hope you have read and are seriously considering my extensive written comments since I do not think the regulations fit the needs of seniors. Is a Granny unit considered a SDU &amp; require 1 parking space?</li> <li>• Second entrances in front of dwellings. Thinking of the old 6593 Regulations where we had people apply for variances because they needed a window well due to the basement SDU. Any discussions on how to regulate character? Or is it better to be hands off?</li> <li>• How will feedback on the draft by-laws be taken? Will there be the ability to apply for an exception to a by-law requirement and do you feel the City will be flexible on allowances? I am thinking specifically about 7.5m between PDU and SDU.</li> <li>• As a homeowner I should be allowed to participate in the second dwelling unit opportunity</li> <li>• For communities such as the old core of Waterdown which has already faced over development without an adequate road infrastructure to deal with the current traffic volumes, will there be anything to protect areas from insufficient road infrastructure.</li> <li>• Are you looking at creating liveable neighbourhoods or just housing?</li> <li>• What is the fee to apply for a variance?</li> <li>• The problem with minor variances is that it is expensive and time consuming - \$3000+ and 2 months, and they always approve it</li> </ul>

<b>General Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Verbatim Comments Noted</b>
<b>General comments (continued)</b>	<p>anyways as it is in line with Official Plan. But this is a hinderance and results in very high minor variance requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the planned regulations in place (especially regarding parking), it sounds like at least 75% of SDU applicants will have to apply for variance exemptions. Is this not a time-consuming process?</li> <li>• Can an application for an SDU that is refused be appealed through LPAT?</li> <li>• Should I wait for the SDU by-law or use the current 6593 residential conversion requirements?</li> <li>• Thank you! This was really informative.</li> <li>• Thank you, very informative.</li> </ul>
<b>Detached Units in the Urban Area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What percentage of Urban Hamilton homes have enough property space that they would qualify over the 25% threshold, i.e. – how many homeowners would likely qualify for an SDU?</li> <li>• Will detached SDUs be required to have services separate from the main dwelling?</li> <li>• I live in an R2. Do I have to apply for R3 or multi-residential to have 3 units?</li> <li>• What will be required for paperwork/permits from the city? How long will this process take? It will be important to not make this process too onerous to incentivize people to implement SDUs.</li> <li>• Explain the justification for the 50 M2 maximum – especially for SDUs in rural areas or for seniors or disabled persons?</li> <li>• You mentioned “validating” existing SDU units. What would be the process for that, what kind of validation/authorization would be required, would there be any limits on this validation?</li> <li>• Could you expand on that reference to Bill 108 and the limit it imposes?</li> <li>• What type of structures are allowed for builds? MMHA outlines Tiny Houses on Wheels as permissible structures, if they meet OBC, CSA certified, and the structure will be affixed to a permanent foundation, will these be structures homeowners can buy?</li> <li>• You mentioned in your presentation that a goal was to ensure that the back yard was not chopped into pieces. Would not having 1 metre side lot setbacks do just this?</li> <li>• Is the maximum of 50 square metres for a detached SDU limited to footprint (e.g., can it be a 2-story dwelling totalling approximately 100 square metres of finished interior living space?).</li> </ul>
<b>Internal SDUs in Urban Areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You are talking about 3 residences per lot, e.g., 1 principal and 2 SDUs. But why limit the SDUs to 1 internal and 1 external? Why not 2 internal? Surely that would be a much more common situation?</li> <li>• What is the potential for having 2 internal SDUs, e.g., principal residence on main floor, SDU on upper level and another SDU in basement?</li> </ul>

<b>General Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Verbatim Comments Noted</b>
<b>SDUs in Rural Areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When will you have completed the research and changes and regulations to allow SDUs in rural area?</li> <li>• Why are rural SDUs not permitted?</li> <li>• Our property is in the country and is also regulated by CH as we are in the flood plain. Would a new garage with an SDU on the second floor be permitted? Our objective is also to gain above ground storage since we do not have a basement.</li> <li>• Do property taxes go up with a rural SDU? And if so, how will cost be determined?</li> </ul>
<b>Parking</b>  <b>Please read in conjunction with responses to Q2 on page 24</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many regulations. Should be no parking requirement!</li> <li>• Assuming we have 3 units (main, basement + detached SDU) are we required to have a total of 3 parking spaces or 4 spaces in total? And would any of the part 18A requirements be relaxed? e.g., Requirements for on-site rear maneuvering?</li> <li>• In suburban areas, especially on Hamilton Mountain, street parking is generally not a major concern in many neighbourhoods. Are you still contemplating mandatory parking space of 1.0 for each SDU in these areas? For many with small driveways, this is major.</li> <li>• The 1.0 parking rule per SDU is going to be the biggest hindrance to encouraging homeowners to building SDUs on the Mountain. It may encourage homeowners to build SDUs without involving the city at all.</li> <li>• No additional parking should be required for the SDU because homeowners will create smaller parking spaces as needed. To comply with parking space by laws 2.6x6, its hard to maintain 50% landscaping with 3 units in total.</li> <li>• Are the any other ways to reduce the impacts of parking in areas that end up requiring parking besides a minimum landscaping requirement?</li> <li>• For many small driveway-homes, it is not possible to add a parking spot unless you remove the front lawn, which is against bylaw.</li> <li>• Are there any other ways to reduce the impacts of parking in areas that end up requiring parking besides a minimum landscaping requirement?</li> <li>• Parking should be required as it is a problem in my neighbourhood. We want to encourage community!</li> <li>• Parking is not a requirement.</li> <li>• Has there been consideration to how side lot setback of 1m would impact parking, particularly garage (secure spaces)?</li> <li>• Parking is not necessary.</li> <li>• Parking is not needed in 2020.</li> <li>• Regarding parking outside of downtown, many of the existing residential neighbourhoods already have 2 car wide driveways. Why do you feel the need to add an additional parking space requirement?</li> <li>• Parking doesn't accommodate the need.</li> </ul>

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<p><b>Parking (continued)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring 1 parking spot for an SDU will disqualify a lot of properties in older neighbourhoods on the Mountain.</li> <li>• We fully support SDUs. No parking should be required.</li> <li>• If parking is required City wide, can a parking reduction through a minor variance be considered on a case-by-case basis so that parking can be evaluated as SDUs are constructed?</li> <li>• If there is laneway access to a lot can the parking for the SDU be in the backyard?</li> <li>• Parking is a problem across the East Central City.</li> <li>• Bike lanes have taken up 35 parking spaces in my area, causing a parking problem.</li> </ul>

In addition to the general discussion, City Staff asked for specific input to two questions. These two questions and responses received are included in the following tables.

<p><b>Question 1: Reflecting about our own community, is maintaining one street-facing entrance per dwelling unit important to you?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes to 1 front facing.</li> <li>• Answer to question 1 – one facing door does not currently exist in my neighbourhood (North End).</li> <li>• Door facing is very outdated. We need to rethink things different in how communities are designed.</li> <li>• Not important.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Question 2: Reflecting about your own community, is 1 parking space per SDU sufficient? Is it too many? Should no parking be required?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not think that parking is necessary. Parking is a privilege and subjective to the homeowner and a possible tenant.</li> <li>• There should be a minimum of 1 space per dwelling and 1 per SDU.</li> <li>• We are in the inner city and strongly support the view that no additional parking should be required per SDU.</li> <li>• 1 parking space may not be necessary in my neighbourhood – North End.</li> </ul>



## Appendix 4

### Feedback from the Live Information Meeting held on November 16, 2020

Two Live Information meetings were held. This Appendix includes the feedback from the Town Hall held on November 16, 2020 from 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. The meetings were advertised in the Hamilton Spectator on October 29, 2020 and on the city’s website.

Residents registered for the meeting via WebEx. The format included a live presentation by Timothy Lee, Senior Planner, Zoning By-Law Reform, City of Hamilton followed by a facilitated question and answer period. Questions were typed into the Q and A bar for the meeting and read aloud by the facilitator.

The City would like to thank the 30 individuals who participated in the Live Information Meeting on November 16, 2020.

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<b>General comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My property is situated in Zoning District C Urban Protected Residential – is the SDU allowed at this time?</li> <li>• Shouldn’t medium density be considered at the same time as low density? There is a growing desire to allow greater density within low-density residential areas to meet housing needs without expanding urban boundaries to keep up with population and services.</li> <li>• Does the City have an inventory of existing buildings on which an SDU can be accommodated?</li> <li>• Will the process be accessed through a development permit or existing building permit process?</li> <li>• Do we know what the costs will be to apply?</li> <li>• Is the basement of a house considered an SDU? What needs to be done to the basement to make it compliant to SDU?</li> <li>• Are these new requirements going to replace Section 19 under 6593 or just apply to 05-200?</li> <li>• Is the City considering loans/grants for SDU creation to encourage them? is so, could loans/grants be conditional on rents set at levels designed to be affordable?</li> <li>• The City should have some sort of examples for parking and other regulations regarding SDUs after just completing the process successfully myself – examples would have been helpful.</li> <li>• It would be beneficial for the applicant, through a Development Permit to determine whether it is possible to place an SDU on their property before applying for a building permit.</li> <li>• Is there a list of contact information for the people at Hamilton City Hall concerned with SDUs?</li> <li>• Is it proposed that after 2021, that all areas of the City of Hamilton will be opened to SDUs in all zones?</li> </ul>

<b>General Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Verbatim Comments Noted</b>
<b>General comments (continued)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is happening with existing SDUs that currently do not comply with the zoning by-laws (that is technically illegal SDUs)? Will some of them become conforming (and legal) because of the new regulations?</li> <li>• Is the Binbrook fairgrounds rural or urban?</li> <li>• Great job on these new regulations. We look forward to seeing them implemented.</li> </ul>
<b>Detached Units in the Urban Area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detached must not take up more than 25% of the lot area but that should correlation between the size of the size of the living area.</li> <li>• What is the reason that only 50 square metres can be upgraded?</li> <li>• 50 square metres is a fairly small unit. Unlikely, for instance to work for a family. Why limit the possibilities to accommodate people by this floor space limit?</li> <li>• The distance from the principle dwelling of 7.5 metres to the detached SDU is too large. There are many backyards that will not be able to maintain this distance and will lead to Committee of Adjustment applications. It would be great to come up with a more reasonable distance.</li> <li>• Would it be possible for the City to publish a list of resources for detached SDUs with floor plans as well as possible lot plans?</li> <li>• Will there be any requirements for building detached SDUs for energy efficiency?</li> <li>• If an existing detached dwelling already contains second floor windows, will those windows be permitted to remain, or will they need to be removed?</li> <li>• What is the Ontario Building Code reference for the fire regulation for the fire regulation for the maximum distance of 40 metres?</li> <li>• Just a comment – the fire escape projection of 1 metre is very difficult to comply with when design to the Ontario Building Code especially for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor fire escapes. Any effort to increase this projection? This is not relating to the clear path for fire personnel.</li> </ul>
<b>Internal SDUs in Urban Areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The internal SDU max unit size of 50 square metres is too small. Under Section 19, the current minimum unit size is 65 square metres. Is there serious consideration to increasing this size? It will lead to numerous COA applications if not.</li> <li>• There is not a maximum size for an SDU within a house, right?</li> <li>• I do have a separate entrance to the basement. It is a walk-up style with stairs and basement windows and 7-foot ceiling height with one furnace. How do I create the fire separation from the main floor? Can fire spray on the joists be accepted – it would work. How do I install separate ductwork to main and basement as they are one unit in the basement with one furnace?</li> </ul>

General Theme/Topic	Verbatim Comments Noted
<b>SDUs in Rural Areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For clarity, are no SDUs allowed in the rural areas of Hamilton-Wentworth? – specifically Ward 11 – zone A1 Agricultural?</li> <li>• For clarification, is Rural considered “Low Density”?</li> <li>• What is the process for building a free-standing garden suite in the rural area? what tis the size limit? How is the 20-year limit enforced?</li> <li>• In rural, why is Detached SDU being addressed as a separate item and not at the same time as reviewing attached SDU bylaw revisions?</li> <li>• If I need to create an SDU in the rural area, what is the process? What is an Official Plan Amendment? What is a zoning by-law amendment?</li> <li>• What is the minimum/maximum size allowance of garden suites?</li> </ul>
<b>Parking</b>  <b>Please read in conjunction with responses to Q2 on page 28</b>	<p><b>Requirements for parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am a single senior and want my daughter and son-in law to build a SDU for me. Do we still need a parking space even if I do not have a driver’s licence/vehicle?</li> <li>• Zoning cannot govern who lives in a unit. Would that prevent permitting an SUD without an extra parking space if it can be leased only to people who do not own a car?</li> <li>• Is it possible to waive the parking requirement for an SDU if the principal house is on a transit route? That would encourage density in a good place for it along transit routes and in places where cars would be less needed.</li> <li>• There are numerous COA applications in the lower city for parking already that are in most instances “rubber stamped”. These variances are expensive for homeowners and increase the length of time to implement SDUs. It is vital to ease this burden.</li> <li>• There is already a residential boulevard parking program to allow parking over the lot line. Could the city incorporate these requirements into the parking regulations? Allow the parking between the front building face and the sidewalk – not the lot line.</li> </ul> <p><b>Tandem Parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St. Catherine’s, Welland, Brantford, and London all allow tandem parking already.</li> <li>• Tandem parking must be seriously considered in the lower city for all the SDUs on the lot. It is already hard enough to get 2 parking spaces. In the upper city, it will also be difficult to get 3 spaces without allowing for Tandem parking.</li> <li>• Tandem parking should be allowed. Let potential tenants determine whether they are okay with the potential inconvenience of sometimes being the inner car.</li> </ul>

In addition to the general discussion, City Staff asked for specific input to two questions. These two questions and responses received are included in the following tables.

**Question 1: Reflecting about our own community, is maintain one street-facing entrance per dwelling unit important to you?**

- I agree with having 2 front doors is not suitable in every neighbourhood. Many downtown century homes could easily accommodate 2 front doors though and look totally acceptable.
- Not important me.
- if the SDU faces the driveway and the applicant does not mind looking at car in the driveway.
- No.

**Question 2: Reflecting about your own community, is 1 parking space per SDU sufficient? Is it too many? Should no parking be required?**

- 1 parking space for SDU is sufficient.
- 1 is adequate.