

4.6 Public Comments

Staff received 80 survey responses and six formal letters. The following tables summarizes survey results and comments in letters.

Missing Middle Survey Results

Survey Result	Staff Comments
<p>Respondents were asked whether a greater range of housing options were needed in Town. 31.25% thought that a much greater range of housing options were needed and 26.25 % thought that some additional housing options were needed. 37.5% thought the current range of housing options was adequate.</p>	<p>The recommendation to allow a variety of building typologies as-of-right on all lots in the Town will give permissions for a range of housing options across the Town. Permissions will have requirements similar to present single detached dwellings permissions in our established neighbourhoods in effort to maintain setbacks and scale of present day permission.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked what is most important when considering increased housing opportunities and more density in the Town. While the responses received were varied, four responses stood out among the rest. 57.5% thought maintaining local character was significant, 52.5% thought building height and scale that are compatible with neighbouring properties was significant, 43.75% thought maintain landscaped areas, trees, and greenspace was significant, and 42.5% thought appropriate lot sizes and separation between houses was significant. The areas of least concern were largely focused around parking requirements, with 18.75% selecting proximity to transit, shops, services, and community facilities, 21.25% selecting minimizing parking and traffic impacts, and 26.25% selecting parking availability. Note that respondents</p>	<p>The main concern of respondents was having missing middle housing fit into existing neighbourhoods by maintaining lot sizes and setbacks, massing, and maintaining landscaped areas and trees. New missing middle housing will be required to meet the same zoning provisions as the existing ARU provisions and will not have new provisions for allowing larger built forms. The exception to this is for fourplexes and low-rise apartments. Fourplexes will require larger lots to ensure that these built forms meet setback and lot coverage requirements and will have minimal impact on the existing character. Small scale apartments will be examined through the next phase of this project. These concerns of respondents will also be addressed in the Urban Design Guidelines for missing middle housing which will be prepared as a part of this project. These Guidelines will provide</p>

<p>were directed to select their top 3 choices.</p>	<p>more granular details for ensuring that the existing character is maintained with infill development.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked which housing types they would like to see more of in the Town's existing neighbourhoods and to select all that apply. The responses received were greatly varied with the most supported housing forms being detached homes at 49.37%, semi-detached homes at 40.51%, and small-scale apartments at 37.97%. The least supported were fourplexes at 25.32%, townhouses at 27.85%, and triplexes at 29.11%. 3.8% supported no new housing in existing neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>The forms most supported are those that essentially match the existing built form within established neighbourhoods and may be perceived as the most fitting in with the character of the area. The notable outlier to this is the relatively strong support for low-rise apartments. As stated in response 2, the zoning by-law and urban design guidelines will be crafted to support missing middle housing that will fit in with the established neighbourhoods of the Town.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked if they would support permitting duplexes and triplexes across all residential neighbourhoods. The response was split on this question with 48.65% supporting the existing permissions of only single detached dwellings, 22.97% supporting these forms on specific lots or streets, and 25.68% supporting these forms on all lots. 2.7% of respondents responded unsure.</p>	<p>There was an even split of 48.65% against these forms and 48.65% in favour of these forms in some or all neighbourhoods. Noting that 3 units are already permitted as-of-right on all lots through ARUs, the difference here is not in the number of units permitted but in the name. Any triplexes would be required to follow the same existing zoning provisions as a dwelling with 2 ARUs to maintain the existing character of these neighbourhoods.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked where the most appropriate location for fourplexes in the Town would be and to select all locations which they thought would be suitable. 37.33% of respondents thought this typology was suitable in areas near</p>	<p>The response seemed to generally support this typology provided it is in an appropriate location, that is close to amenities and on the edges of communities. Parking relief would likely direct these forms to these locations.</p>

<p>stores, services, and community amenities, 30.67% thought major roads or corridors at the edge of existing residential neighbourhoods were suitable and 29.33% thought areas close to transit stops or close to major streets were suitable. 33.33% of respondents were against fourplexes in the Town. Some comments received spoke to the importance of good design on fourplexes to ensure that they would fit in with the community and also noted that this typology is a more appropriate fit than some of the larger single detached dwellings that have been constructed.</p>	<p>There were also comments that spoke to these forms being appropriate in residential neighbourhoods provided that the design fits in with the existing character. The proposed changes to the By-law generally support fourplexes provided that they are constructed on specific lots which meet or exceed the requirements of the parent zone. This will limit the lots where they are permitted and limit them to lots that will minimize the impact of the typology on the existing built form.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked where multiplexes and low-rise apartments with five or more dwelling units would be appropriate. The response was generally more in favour of this typology with 36% stating they are appropriate close to transit stops, 32% in areas near stores, services, and community amenities, and 32% on major roads or corridors at the edge of existing residential neighbourhoods. 29.33% thought this typology was not appropriate in Town. Some comments received stated that these are most appropriate on the west end of Town where more transit, amenities, large format commercial, and jobs are located. There was also an emphasis on appropriate and attractive design for these typologies.</p>	<p>Similar to above, there was general support for this typology in appropriate locations in the Town. There was also an emphasis on attractive design for the typology being significant to it fitting in with the community. No decision is being made on low-rise apartments at this time, but they will continue to be looked at in this project to identify appropriate locations and urban design guidelines that will support attractive design.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked whether zoning should allow increased lot coverage or reduced setbacks to allow for more housing opportunities on existing</p>	<p>Multi-unit housing in the form of duplexes and triplexes will be required to meet the existing zoning provisions for lots with multiple units such as a dwelling with 2</p>

<p>residential lots. 54.66% of respondents were against increasing permissions to allow for more housing opportunities. 16% thought all residential areas should allow these increased provisions, 17.33% thought a modest increase would be appropriate and 5.33% thought these provisions would only be appropriate for multi-unit housing.</p>	<p>ARUs. They will not be provided further flexibility for these built forms. Fourplexes are proposed to only be permitted on larger lots with greater frontage and will need to follow the other regulations for dwellings with 2 ARUs.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked if they had concerns about permitting more housing or specific forms of housing options in the Town. Many responses fell into one of three different categories. The first of these categories is that of character with these new typologies having to fit in with the existing character of the area. The second category is that of traffic impacts, that existing roads will not support the increase in traffic and that the Town requires more transit to support this development. The last is concern around the Town missing out on this opportunity to increase housing supply in a comprehensive manner.</p>	<p>Urban Design Guidelines will be developed to support missing middle housing that is compatible with and respectful of the existing neighbourhood character. With respect to traffic and parking impacts, both Town Engineering and York Region were circulated as part of the review process and did not identify any concerns related to traffic operations or parking supply. Regarding transit, parking reductions will only be permitted for properties located within a five-minute walking distance of existing transit services. The Town continues to experience incremental transit improvements and will remain proactive in advocating for further enhancements.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked on their thoughts regarding on-street parking. The response received was relatively split with 18.06% in favour of on-street parking on all streets and 30.56% in favour of on-street parking on some streets for a total of 48.62%. 47.22% were against on street-parking in the Town.</p>	<p>This topic will require additional investigation. Planning staff will continue to work with Public Works to examine this possibility.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked where tandem parking would be appropriate in Town and to select all applicable locations. 30.56%</p>	<p>This permission exists for ARUs. Up to three tandem parking configurations will be permitted in dwelling of up to four</p>

<p>of respondents thought they were appropriate in mid- and high-rise buildings provided the spots were assigned to the same unit, 26.39% thought they were appropriate for low-rise and multi-unit housing and 26.39% thought they were appropriate for all residential neighbourhoods for a total of 83.34% being supportive for some or all neighbourhoods. 25% of responses stated that tandem parking is not appropriate.</p>	<p>dwelling units while for higher density development, tandem spaces will only be permitted when they are assigned to the same unit.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked where a lower number of parking minimums might be applied and to select all applicable answers. Generally, parking reductions were supported in specific locations such as near transit stations or frequent transit routes at 29.17%, along Main Street and corridors at 26.39% and in areas with a mix of housing, shops, and services at 16.67%. 38.39% of respondents did not support any reduction in parking.</p>	<p>Provincial legislation does not allow for more than one parking space per ARU on a property. It is proposed that -plexes follow this same format of parking requirements. Reductions are only being proposed in proximity to transit and amenities.</p>
<p>Respondents were asked whether it is appropriate to reduce parking requirements for mid- to high-rise developments. 11.11% of respondents state there should be no minimum parking requirement and to allow the market to determine parking needs. 20.83% of respondents supported a reduction in parking minimums. 50% of respondents did not support a reduction in parking and 12.5% were unsure what should be done.</p>	<p>Some confusion appears to exist regarding parking requirements, with comments suggesting that no parking would be required for these dwelling units. While Provincial legislation permits the removal of minimum parking requirements within Major Transit Station Areas, this policy does not apply to the remainder of the Town. Accordingly, a minimum of one parking space per unit has been recommended for these apartments in the HAF1 study area (typically along Main Street). This approach aligns with recent urban apartment parking reductions that have</p>

	been approved by Town Council and the Ontario Land Tribunal over the past five years.
<p>Respondents were asked whether it is appropriate to allow taller mid- to high-rise buildings to allow parking to be located on the lower floors instead of underground to reduce construction costs that could be passed on to the purchaser. 20% of respondents supported an increase of at most 3 storeys, 14.29% supported 2 storeys, and 14.29% supported 1 storey. 42.43% were not in support of increased height to allow for above ground parking. Comments received generally supported the increase in height provided that the ground floors maintained active street frontages and architectural quality and also that they were located in areas suitable for this density of development.</p>	<p>This permission would only occur on a site-specific application basis and require the applicant to display to the satisfaction of Staff and Council or Committee of Adjustment that the proposed height and massing is appropriate for a give location. Further Urban Design Guidelines that will be prepared as a part of this project will address many of the concerns around the construction of tall buildings. These will contain guidelines around transition to neighbouring communities, minimizing wind and shadow impacts of tall buildings, and also maintaining active street frontages.</p>

Received Correspondence

Staff have received six pieces of correspondence from residents and interested parties.

Summary of Correspondence	Staff Response
<p>Three of these items supported missing middle housing in all areas of Stouffville. The importance of a variety of housing options was emphasized, as well as the gentle density that these typologies can provide to support walkability, retail, and transit. They also supported reduction of parking to 1 space/unit. This reduction</p>	<p>This aligns with changes recommended by staff.</p>

<p>was especially supported near MTSA's and in areas with access to transit lines, such as Main Street.</p>	
<p>One correspondence provided a number of requests particularly relating to medium to high density project needs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They noted in studies for higher density typologies that 0.25 visitor parking spots/unit exceeds demand for these built forms. Additionally, they recommended providing shared visitor parking rates to provide greater flexibility. 2. They recommended providing concrete parking reduction rates for affordable units and rental would provide more financial certainty to builders. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0.25 visitor parking represent the baseline that staff have comfort for the broad range of medium to high density buildings. Through the course of the larger project staff will need to complete the apartment exercise and will consider this comment. Additionally, staff intend on exploring shared visitor parking for various uses. 2. Staff believe all projects need to be looked at on a case by case basis and requires discussion with staff.
<p>One item of correspondence was concerned with a reduction in parking resulting in more illegal parking, with cars overhanging sidewalks and into the roadway.</p>	<p>When buying/renting it is clear how many parking spaces are obtained. It is the duty and responsibility of the buyer/renter make sure that their homes meet their parking needs. Should a buyer/renter violate Town by-laws they are at risk of receiving an infraction, ticket or car being towed.</p>
<p>One item of correspondence was concerned that a reduction in parking may lead to an increase in on street parking which will limit parking supply downtown and also cause issues for availability of parking for visitors to neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>Presently overnight on-street parking is not permitted in Town. The viability of this topic is being discussed with Public Works as a future component of this project. As part of the larger project the Town will be exploring whether downtown parking supply is adequate to meet present and future needs.</p>