# Final Report & Recommendations

## Building N Greater Sudbury



www.buildingin.ca

## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary	
Background & Context	
Indigenous Peoples	7
From Town to City to Amalgamation	7
Housing in Sudbury	7
Low-rise Neighbourhoods in Greater Sudbury	
Consultation	13
Community Consultation	13
Participant Feedback	
Communication with Sudbury Staff and Councilors	
Communication with Infill Developers / Consultants	
Establishing a Qualifying Area	
Phase 1: Simulations – Evaluating Three Preliminary Scenarios	
Scenario 1 – Business-As-Usual	
Forecasted outcomes	
Alignment with Community Goals	20
Scenario 2: Max 12 Dwelling Units	21
Forecasted Outcomes	
Alignment with community Goals	۲۱ ۲۲
Ecrecested Outcomes	
Alignment with Community Goals	
Phase 1 Key Insights	
Insights from Mapping Scenarios	
Phase 2: Further Scenario Testing	24
Qualifying Area Refinement	24
Refinements of Scenario 3	24
Scenario 4: Max 10 Dwelling Units	25
Forecasted Outcomes	
Scepario 4 Continued: Max 10 Dwelling Units	25
Scenario 4 Continued: Desidential Density Mans	
Dhace 7: Scenario Definement Medalling and In-depth Analysis	20 20
Further Definement to the Qualifying Area	29
Summary of High-Level Outcomes	2 ۲۱
Infilly's Non Infill Crowth	
Pusiness As Usual Scoparia	
BuildingIN Recommended Scenario	
Axonometric Diagrams – New Homes by 2051	
Streetviews	
Residential Density Outcomes	
Expressed in Dwelling Units Per Net Hectare	
Expressed in % Change in Dwelling Units per Net Hectare	42
Residential Diversity Outcomes	
Exclusionary Zoning	
Zoning for Diversity Zoning for Depertable Solutions	
Social Dynamics on Neighbourhood Streets	



Car-Culture and Sterile Facades	42
Animated Facades and Social Dynamics	43
Fiscal Scenario Outcomes	
Expressed in % Change in Annual Average Municipal Revenue per Net Hectare	46
Mapping Emission Outcomes	48
Neighbourhood Parking	50
Street Permit Parking	50
Streets Well Suited for Permit Parking	51
Winter Snow Clearing and Permit Parking	
Example 1: 8m Wide street with a planned future sidewalk.	52 52
Example 3: 10m wide street with two sidewalks	
Front Parking Pads	54
Small Neighbourhood Parking Lots	54
Complete Streets	55
Waste. Recycling and Organics	
Recommended Regulatory Amendments	
Final Qualifying Area	55
Official Plan Amendments Regarding Infill	56
Amendments for Street Permit Parking	59
Site Plan Control Guide	61
Stormwater Storage Management Requirements	62
Fireflow Recommendations	64
Development Charges Bylaw Amendment	65
Proposed Zoning Approach	67
Proposed Additional Zoning Text	67
Conclusion: A Transformative Path to Sudbury's Growth	
A Winning Growth Strategy	79
Key Implementation Mechanisms	
Contact	
Appendices	<b>0</b> 1
Appendix A. Remming the Qualitying Area	סס
Appendix D. Parking Paus	
Appendix C: Summary of Neighbournood Residential Parking Examples In Small TC	wns89
ENG NOTES	91

## **Executive Summary**

Greater Sudbury faces fiscal challenges in maintaining large areas of low-density neighbourhoods and has committed to finding more sustainable patterns of growth. Rental vacancy rates are at a mere 1.6%<sup>1</sup>, underscoring the need for rental housing and options for households with average and below-average incomes. Recent zoning changes are not likely to shift existing patterns of development, prompting the need for more innovative solutions.

#### Objective

BuildingIN aims to support Greater Sudbury in fostering a wave of multi-unit infill housing that is fiscally sustainable for the municipality, environmentally responsible, and aligned with the city's housing goals. By simulating housing market responses under various regulatory scenarios, BuildingIN has identified optimal strategies to enable low-rise infill development that retains the character of older neighbourhoods while addressing affordability and equity concerns.

#### **High-Level Methodology**

The BuildingIN Program was conducted in consultation with community members, city staff, industry stakeholders, and advocacy groups through the following phases:



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CBC News, April 30, 2024, <u>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/sudbury/homes-affordability-units-council-local-government-1.7086051</u>.

#### **Key Findings and Recommendations**

BuildingIN proposes a strategic implementation framework to unlock Sudbury's low-rise infill potential within the final <u>Qualifying Area</u>, which offers a <u>clear</u> <u>advantage over the Business-As-Usual (BAU) scenario</u>:

- Allow up to 10 dwelling units in buildings scaled and designed to be a good fit, using form-based zoning.
- Simplify approval processes and encourage repeatable designs.
- Introduce area-specific parking solutions.
- Streamline permit reviews through planning updates and building code interpretation memos.

This approach is designed to make infill development more feasible, predictable, and responsive to Sudbury's housing needs, while ensuring new growth integrates seamlessly with existing neighbourhoods.

#### **Parking Considerations**

Despite Sudbury's dedication to public transit, the existing urban form, harsh winters and car-dependent culture require new housing approaches with parking solutions.

Neighbourhood parking—including street permit parking, small neighbourhood lots, and front parking pads— is a critical factor in the success of multi-unit infill developments. Without a neighbourhood parking solution, developers fit parking on-site, leading to fewer, larger, and more expensive units (which mirrors Greater Sudbury's current infill housing outcomes). To put it in perspective, each additional on-site parking space can take up about 15% of the building area, depending on the lot and building layout. As more parking is added on-site, the financial viability of multi-unit projects quickly drops— especially beyond one or two parking spaces per lot.

This is why on-site parking needs often undermine the financial viability of multi-unit projects, and lead to fewer, larger and higher-priced units, rather than a diverse mix of housing types and affordable options.

Neighbourhood parking solutions are key to enabling a greater quantity and variety of housing in infill low-rise developments. For the BuildingIN Scenario to be effective, a neighbourhood parking solution must be implemented, including street permit parking (on streets wide enough for parking and snow piling), parking in short driveways, and small neighbourhood parking lots.

## The maximum capacity potential of the BuildingIN Scenario, applied only within the Qualifying Area, are as follows:

- **Fiscal Impact:** a capacity for infill that could generate more than \$750M in municipal revenues by 2051, nearly ten times higher than anticipated for Business-As-Usual.
- Housing Supply: capacity to meet low-rise housing demand with 10,250 infill units, which is 85% of the anticipated increase in Sudbury's households by 2051. (12,010 new households are expected, as per the City of Greater Sudbury's Population Projections high growth scenario.)
- <u>Environmental Benefits</u>: Housing-related emissions have the maximum potential to drop by 8096 tCO2eq/year within the Qualifying Area under the BuildingIN Scenario compared to the maximum potential of 4303 tCO2eq/year under the Business-as-Usual (BAU) Scenario, driven by compact, energy-efficient designs.

This report demonstrates that implementing the BuildingIN recommendations will enable Sudbury to meet its housing targets while fostering vibrant, more complete neighbourhoods, that balance fiscal responsibility with environmental sustainability.



Figure 1. Multi-unit building examples in Ottawa: front-to-back semis with secondary units totaling 8 units (left); two-storey front-to-back semis with 8 units (top right); semi-detached with secondary units totaling 4 units (middle right); and three front-to-back semis with secondary units totaling 12 units (bottom right).

## **Background & Context**

### **Indigenous Peoples**

When Europeans arrived, the region north of Lake Huron and around Lake Superior had already been home to Anishinaabemowin-speaking Indigenous Peoples for centuries. The Sudbury area remains the territory of various Algonquin and Ojibwa communities, including the Atikameksheng Anishnawbek Nation.<sup>2</sup>

Indigenous Peoples in this area now include:

- Atikameksheng Anishnawbek
- Wahnapitae First Nation
- Sagamok Anishinabek
- Ontario Aboriginal Housing Services (OAHS)

- Native People of Sudbury Development Corporation (NPSDC)
- N'Swakamok Native Friendship Centre

### From Town to City to Amalgamation

Greater Sudbury was incorporated as a town in 1893 and later became a city in 1930. Over the years, additional municipalities developed around it, and in 1973, several of these joined to form the Regional Municipality of Sudbury. As a result, Greater Sudbury is a municipality spread over a large geographic area that includes vast wilderness areas. The character of urban places is defined by their context, proximity to natural places, and rocky features. Rock, water, natural and programmed parkland wind throughout the more urban areas, shaping and dividing them.



Figure 1. Historical Image of Donovan Subdivision 1915

The area initially hosted a temporary workers' camp in 1883-84 during the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. However, the discovery of copper- and nickel-rich ores spurred the growth of a permanent settlement. Sudbury eventually emerged as Canada's leading mining hub, with much of its population working in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> O.W. Saarinen. (2012). *Sudbury*. The Canadian Encyclopedia. <u>https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/sudbury-greater</u>

the mining industry.<sup>3</sup> As a result of these industrial roots, many of Sudbury's low-rise residential areas have light industrial uses within or immediately abutting them. Unlike other municipalities, this does not significantly impact residential real estate values but is seen as a normal part of a residential area.

Sudbury's population was 2,027 in 1901 but doubled in the following three censuses (1911, 1921, and 1931). A major amalgamation and annexation in 1960 increased the population to 80,120 by 1961. Further expansion in 1973 brought the population to 91,829 by 1981. The City of Greater Sudbury was formed on January 1, 2001, through amalgamation of the former Regional Municipality of Sudbury and seven incorporated municipalities. These municipalities included Sudbury, Capreol, Nickel Centre, Onaping Falls, Rayside-Balfour, Valley East, and Walden. Additionally, several unincorporated townships also became part of the new city. By 2021, the population had grown to 166,004. Sudbury's growth has naturally followed cycles of boom and bust, driven by shifts in global demand for nickel.<sup>4</sup>

As a result of the growth of residential neighbourhoods before 1980, Sudbury now has a wealth of developed land that is well suited to infill redevelopment. At the same time, the city faces the challenge of maintaining infrastructure in very lowdensity aging neighbourhoods, without the fiscal benefit of rapid population growth.

### Housing in Sudbury

Housing in Greater Sudbury is a mix of singles, semis, townhouses, and apartments.



Figure 2. Proportion of Dwellings by Type – Comparison Between Greater Sudbury and Canada (2021 Census).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Encyclopedia Britannica. (2025). *Sudbury*. <u>https://www.britannica.com/place/Sudbury-Ontario</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ibid.

### Low-rise Neighbourhoods in Greater Sudbury

Residential densities in Sudbury's low-rise neighbourhoods are very low, as shown on the map below. Areas in yellow are a significant fiscal drain on the municipality.



Figure 3. Current Residential Density of Low-Rise Zones in Greater Sudbury.

Many of the older neighbourhoods in Greater Sudbury are characterized by small simple homes. Front setbacks vary by neighbourhood, with some areas having smaller front yards, others characterized by large front yards, and others by variety in front setbacks together with dramatic grade changes. 67% of existing homes predate 1980 (StatsCan, 2021). Assuming 93% are low-rise, that amounts to about 66,400 low-rise homes. These older neighbourhoods are well suited to receive a very small percentage of infill redevelopment each year, provided that water and wastewater servicing can support these small increases.



Figure 4. Pre-1980 Suburb.



Figure 5. Post-1980 Suburb.

Around the 1980s, the patterns of neighbourhood development changed, and developers began to subdivide lots more economically and build larger homes more closely together. These newer neighbourhoods are unlikely candidates for infill development, as the homes are well built and too valuable for it to make business sense to tear down and rebuild.



Figure 6. Low-Rise Zones in Greater Sudbury, as per Zoning By-Law 2010-100Z.

Recent zoning changes permit low-rise infill housing with 4 units as-of-right in one lot, which supports a variety of new infill housing design solutions. But zoning requirements and performance standards for on-site parking, effectively limit business development options to the kinds of infill constructed over the past few years. Sudbury is very car-dependent, so space for parking shapes design outcomes. Parking requirements in existing zoning result in preferred lot widths of 11m. As a result, the kinds of low-rise infill that developers are looking to build in coming years, remain the usual offering of singles, semis and towns, on 11m wide properties. These homes are high-end, a demographic that does not particularly value basement units for rental income, so ADU's may not be built, or if constructed, may not be rented.



Figure 7. Lot Widths of Low-Rise Residential Lots, Greater Sudbury



Figure 8. Lot Depths of Low-Rise Residential Lots, Greater Sudbury

Residential lots in Sudbury's older neighbourhoods are typical of Canadian residential development patterns in shape (mostly rectangular) and size. There is a high proportion of lots that are 30'-65' wide and 100'-140' deep. Many lots require some rock removal before development or redevelopment, but this is just part of the regular work plan in Sudbury and is not considered an additional cost or a barrier.



Figure 9. Lot Dimensions of Parcels in Low-Rise Residential Areas.

#### **Transportation in Greater Sudbury**

Approximately 90% of residents in Sudbury use a private vehicle for their daily trips<sup>5</sup>. Living in Sudbury without a car isn't a very comfortable lifestyle, and most residents agree, "You need a car in Sudbury".

Public transit ridership is low, but the network is comprehensive despite the complex geography (rock outcroppings and lakes). Additionally, there have been recent initiatives which have contributed to significant increases in ridership,<sup>6</sup> including increasing GOVA Transit service hours, modernizing fleets, developing three major mobility hubs, introducing real-time vehicle information, and implementing electronic fare payment systems.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Clarke, T. (2024, May 1). https://www.sudbury.com/local-news/at-62m-rides-public-transit-hits-a-new-record-ingreater-sudbury-9969873



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Statistics Canada, 2021 Census of the Population for <u>Greater Sudbury</u>.

## Consultation

Our recommended solution has been designed and refined through collaboration with the community, city staff, industry, and a variety of advocacy groups.

### **Community Consultation**

The BuildingIN Program in Sudbury included three consultation workshops that were held on-line. Phone calls and some in-person meetings were also undertaken to share similar content and receive input from interested residents who did not attend the on-line session.

- 1. Consultation 1: Discovery & Direction
- 2. Consultation 2: Trade-Offs and Simulations
- 3. Consultation 3: Refining a Solution

December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2024 January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025

February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025

### **Participant Feedback**

In Consultation 1, participants shared their goals, hopes, frustrations and fears about the future of their older neighbourhoods, and then clearly articulated a shared vision. The word art below depicts Sudbury resident priorities, with the size of each word corresponding to the frequency each idea/word was mentioned during consultation.

parking flood-mitigation safety walkability a-traffic reducing-emissions visual-fit schools community-dynamic greenspace housing-options small-shops diversity gardens natural-features shade climate-resilience affordable-housing tree-canop astructure

Figure 10. Word Art of community priorities drawn from community documents and resident feedback.



Figure 11. Infill elements that would make neighbourhoods better.

In Consultation 2, BuildingIN presented four different growth scenarios and participants were asked to consider the pros and cons, given the priorities identified in Consultation 1. Scenario 2 and 3 garnered the most support.



Figure 12. Participants' responses to the questions were as follows: "Which scenario do you think is the best path forward for your community?"

In Consultation 3, a variation of Scenario 2 and 3 was presented (Scenario 4), together with fiscal and emission outcomes. To understand top priorities for neighbourhood upgrades, participants were asked the following question. See participant responses in Figure 13.

#### Survey question:

"Imagine Greater Sudbury has proceeded with Scenario 4. A handful of multi-unit infill developments are now under construction in the Qualifying Area, and more are expected in the coming years. This is increasing tax revenue for the town but isn't significantly increasing municipal costs because these new homes are on existing roads and connect to existing water and sewer pipes. There is a bit more traffic and demand for services, so Sudbury is using some of the tax revenue from multi-unit infill housing



toward necessary upgrades, but there's money left over. How would you prioritize other investments in these neighbourhoods? Choose up to 3 items that you think are of the highest priority."



Figure 13. Community investment priorities

### **Communication with Sudbury Staff and Councilors**

The BuildingIN team engaged with Sudbury planning staff and councilors to ensure that priorities were aligned with departmental needs and that the analysis was sensitive to local context. Key insights and challenges emerged during these discussions:

- **Needed Housing.** Staff highlighted the need for rental housing in low-rise neighbourhoods, as well as a greater diversity of housing options in neighbourhoods. Population growth in Sudbury is slow, so there isn't a volume issue, but have a shortage of housing for smaller households and lower incomes.
- **Underground Infrastructure:** Sudbury faces a significant amount of infrastructure upgrades over the coming years, and assessing these needs is very complicated. The geographic extent of the municipality is a challenge.

- Infill Neighbourhoods with New Infrastructure: Sudbury's low-rise housing often takes the form of new subdivisions in relatively central locations, built in areas that were not previously developed due to their challenging terrain. This kind of development comes with servicing challenges, sometimes water pressure issues, and meets the needs of only high-end purchasers.
- Shorelines and Flood Plains: Sudbury has a lot of waterfronts and floodsusceptible areas. The extent of areas in which development should be restricted continues to be reviewed.
- **Fiscally Sustainable Growth:** Sudbury's growth has been at very low densities, and over vast areas. Residents now demand high levels of service throughout this large area, which isn't realistic.
- **Snow Removal:** Snow removal is a big part of winter in Sudbury, and public expectations for road clearing are very high.

Date	Meeting description
March 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	Infill Catalyst Program (Stage 1) – Municipality participation discovery call.
September 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2024	Start-Up: Established goals and priorities, as well as communications logistics.
October 9th, 2024	Client Kick-off: Including a review of the Program Schedule, Community Consultation Plan, Communications Strategy, and meeting plan with the Committee of Councilors.
November 15, 2024	Client meeting to discuss schedule and next steps for first virtual consultation with the community.
November 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	Over To You Sudbury, a training session with the communications team.
November 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	A brief discussion with the client about the proposed design and rezoning for modular construction.
December 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	Client meeting and Committee of Councilors meeting: Presentation of materials for first community consultation. Input provided by councilors was used to refine the consultation plan.
December 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	Final planning meeting to review materials and logistics for our first virtual consultation.
January 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	Meeting with the client to discuss possible site examples.
January 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	Rosaline Hill presented BuildingIN scenario options and met with a select group of staff/experts to discuss them further.
January 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	Continued discussion with city staff re. BuildingIN scenario options and discussing upcoming consultation 2 considerations.

#### Table 1. Meetings with Sudbury city staff and Councilors

February 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	Prior to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> consultation session, Rosaline met with members of the development community who have a specific interest in infill to discuss overlay zoning regulations to remove barriers to low-rise multi-unit infill housing.
February 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	Client meeting and Committee of Councilors meeting: Presentation of materials from our second community consultation. Input provided by councilors was used to refine the consultation plan.
February 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2025	Rosaline met with the engineering department to discuss barriers.
March 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2025	Client meeting and Committee of Councilors meeting: Presentation of materials from our third community consultation. Input provided by councilors was used to refine the consultation plan.
March 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	GIS meeting to discuss road layers to qualifying neighbourhoods.
April 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	BuildingIN work session with Building Services to discuss our proposed recommendation and building memos to help simplify the process of approvals.
April 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	BuildingIN work session with the planning department to review and refine our final report, final recommendations and suggestions.
April 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	BuildingIN work session with the engineering department to review Stormwater management and infrastructure concerns for future development and to review our final report.

### Communication with Infill Developers / Consultants

On February 19, 2025, Rosaline Hill met with members of the local development industry at Tom Davies Square in Sudbury and delivered a presentation about BuildingIN's proposed infill program. There were 15 people in attendance, with 28 participants invited. The meeting led to three follow-up calls and 1 virtual meeting.

Developers and real estate agents challenged and tested the ideas (even running some proforma numbers) and asked lots of questions. There was overall positive feedback about the potential for implementing the BuildingIN scenario. These discussions validated the BuildingIN methodology in establishing the Qualifying Area and confirmed key assumptions about infill business models specific to Sudbury.

## **Establishing a Qualifying Area**

Multi-unit low-rise infill housing isn't a good fit everywhere. Some lots don't allow for a viable business development model because of their dimensions, grading, location or sales price. In some areas, redevelopment isn't a good fit because existing municipal services are insufficient. The process of identifying areas ideal for infill was iterative. Initially, the following criteria was used to identify the areas ideal for lowrise multi-unit infill development:

- Low-rise residential areas as per the Zoning By-Law (see Figure 6)
- Lots previously developed before 1980 based on built permit data

After filtering, the quantity of lots in the area vastly exceeded housing needs through infill development. The Qualifying Area was, therefore, reduced to the light blue area shown in the rectangle below. This smaller area still contained redevelopment capacity vastly exceeding housing need.



Figure 14. Phase 1 – Qualifying Area

## Phase 1: Simulations – Evaluating Three Preliminary Scenarios

BuildingIN developed three scenarios to forecast potential housing industry responses through 2031. The scenarios illustrate possible trajectories of housing development and the impacts of different policies and market conditions. They aim to provide insights into potential outcomes for addressing housing supply challenges to help guide decision-making processes. Table 2 lays out the framework for each scenario.

	Scenario 1: Business-as- Usual	Scenario 2: BuildingIN	Scenario 3: BuildingIN Alternate
Number of dwellings	Singles, semis, towns	Up to 12	Up to 10
Maximum storey height	3	2	2
Complexity of approvals	Moderate	Simple	Simple
Parking location	On-site	Neighbourhood	Neighbourhood
Dedicated entrances	Mostly dedicated entrances	Mostly dedicated entrances	Only dedicated entrances

#### Table 2. Scenario descriptions.

In the following section, we'll dive deeper into each scenario maximum potential outcome, and present:

- 1) Forecasted outcomes for qualifying neighbourhoods, including new housing types, effects on municipal finances, and parking considerations.
- Community aspirations analysis: An analysis that visualizes scenario alignment with resident aspirations, based on Consultation 1 feedback. Word art is used to visualize whether each scenario meets or does not meet resident ideas.
- 3) 3D visualizations of expected massing, spacing, windows, doors, porches, rooflines, and social dynamism. The styles shown are only examples, as style and materials are not regulated in any of the scenarios.



Figure 15. Example of a neighbourhood street, similar to an older existing neighbourhood in Sudbury

### Scenario 1 - Business-As-Usual

Scenario 1 demonstrates the anticipated housing industry response under a framework that includes existing zoning requirements. It illustrates likely housing responses up to 2031 if development follows a 'business as usual' trajectory.

#### Forecasted outcomes

Neighbourhoods in the qualifying areas are anticipated to experience the following changes:

- **New housing types:** Small amounts of high-end custom infill in singles, semis, and rowhouses. Many of these new homes wouldn't 'fit' with the existing context due to large garage doors facing the streets, lack of animation (windows and porches), and overall large building size.
- **Municipal finances:** Continue to be highly strained due to the extent of very lowdensity development throughout the municipality. This leaves a minimal budget for the maintenance of existing infrastructure, sidewalks, or neighbourhood upgrades.
- Parking: New homes would have a driveway and attached garage parking.

### Alignment with Community

#### Goals

Scenario 1 falls short of meeting community goals, as shown by the word art from Consultation 1, where unmet aspirations have been greyed out. parking safety Walkability managing-traffic reducing-emissions biologity visual-fit school community-dynamic orenspic housing-options small-shops withornigations hatural-features area tree-canopy affordable-housing wind-treeker infrastructure



Figure 16. Scenario 1 - 3D Visualizations.

### Scenario 2: Max 12 Dwelling Units

Scenario 2 demonstrates the maximum capacity potential housing industry response until 2031, under a framework that includes a 12-unit cap, form-based zoning, standardized stormwater management and application requirements.

#### Forecasted Outcomes

Neighbourhoods in the qualifying area are anticipated to experience the following changes:

- **New housing types:** 6 to 12-unit buildings. They are scaled to fit their context and have animated facades with large porches. Unit types vary in size and tenure.
- **Municipal finances:** With most new housing in older neighbourhoods, municipal finances will be strengthened. However, the distribution of infill will be spread over large areas, and since infrastructure capacity and condition can vary significantly from one location to another, this could add unforeseen costs or complications.
- **Parking:** Neighbourhood parking is included in this scenario, though the solution street permit parking or neighbourhood parking lots — was not yet finalized. Note: The simulation also tested Scenario 2 with an added on-site parking requirement, which yielded results similar to Scenario 1. Even with increased unit permissions, without neighbourhood parking, developers will prioritize on-site parking and driveways over additional dwelling units, which limits density.

#### Alignment with

#### **Community Goals**

Scenario 2 is addressing community goals, as shown by the word art from Consultation 1, where unmet aspirations have been greyed out. parking safety walkability managing-traffic reducing-emissions visual-fit schools community-dynamic groups and schools community-dynamic groups small-shops wetcoming-traffic infrastructure



Figure 17. Scenario 2 - 3D Visualizations.



### Scenario 3: Max 10 Dwelling Units

Scenario 3 demonstrates the maximum capacity potential housing industry response until 2031, within a framework that closely resembles Scenario 2, but with some key distinctions: It imposes a 10-unit cap on developments and requires that each new dwelling must have its own dedicated entrance (no shared entrances and exits, no small apartments).

#### Forecasted Outcomes

Neighbourhoods in the qualifying area are anticipated to experience the following changes:

- New housing types: 6 to 10-unit buildings. They are scaled to fit their context and have animated facades with large porches. Unit types vary in size and tenure. Each unit has its own entry door on the front, side or rear of the building, which facilitates more social cohesion in the neighbourhood.
- **Municipal finances:** With most new housing in older neighbourhoods, municipal finances will be strengthened. However, the distribution of infill will be spread over large areas, and since infrastructure capacity and condition can vary significantly from one location to another, this could add unforeseen costs or complications.
- **Parking:** Neighbourhood parking is included in this scenario, though the solution street permit parking or neighbourhood parking lots was not yet finalized. Note: The simulation also tested Scenario 3 with an added on-site parking requirement, which yielded results similar to Scenario 1. Even with increased unit permissions, without neighbourhood parking, developers will prioritize on-site parking and driveways over additional dwelling units, which limits density.

## Alignment with Community

#### Goals

Scenario 3 is addresses community goals, as shown by the word art from Consultation 1, where unmet aspirations have been greyed out. parking safety Walkability managing-traffic reducing-emissions visual-fit store community-dynamic becoming stores in a tural-features store tree-canopy affordable-housing without with a tural for the store infrastructure



Figure 18. Scenario 3 - 3D Visualizations.



### Phase 1 Key Insights

#### Insights from Mapping Scenarios

#### • Scenario 1: Business-As-Usual

Our analysis showed that Scenario 1 would have an insignificant impact on residential densities in older low-rise neighbourhoods. The density increases were so minimal that they didn't even register on maps. This scenario is not a recommended path forward for Sudbury.

#### • Scenario 2: Max 12 Units

Scenario 2 opened up development opportunities vastly in excess of housing need, but highlighted where the simulation needed refinement, particularly the need for more geographic focus to the intervention.

• Scenario 3: Max 10 Units (Selected for further refinement) Scenario 3 achieved housing targets and staff identified it to be a better 'fit' within the neighbourhood context.

#### Focusing on the Qualifying Area

In reviewing the Figure 14 map with city planning staff, we identified that the Qualifying Area was unnecessarily large. Due to the need for infrastructure studies and anticipated upgrade costs, it was decided that infill should be focused only near nodes and corridors to achieve higher density increases in smaller areas that are either well serviced or already identified as high priority for servicing upgrades.

## **Phase 2: Further Scenario Testing**

### **Qualifying Area Refinement**

The Qualifying Area was reduced from the previous subset to areas within a 400m walking distance of corridors.



Figure 19. Phase 2 - Qualifying Area

### Refinements of Scenario 3

Based on feedback from Consultation 2, city staff directed the BuildingIN team to test **Scenario 3** with some refinements, in a more restricted Qualifying Area, and until 2051 (a significantly longer planning horizon). The assumptions of Scenario 3 were favoured for the following reasons:

- 10 maximum dwelling units per building aligns with other municipal initiatives
- Dedicated entrances will likely be favoured by residents, compared to apartment-style buildings with shared entrances and exits

### Scenario 4: Max 10 Dwelling Units

This scenario is a refinement of Scenario 3, and demonstrates the maximum capacity potential housing industry response until 2051, based on a framework that includes a 10-unit cap on developments, BuildingIN's additions to zoning, simple permit submission, dedicated entrances required, maximum building heights of 2 storeys, street permit parking, and 33% of units in multi-unit buildings subject to development charges.

#### Forecasted Outcomes

Neighbourhoods in the qualifying area are anticipated to experience the following changes:

- **New housing types:** 6 to 10-unit buildings. They are scaled to fit their context and have animated facades with large porches. Unit types vary in size and tenure. Each unit has its own entry door on the front, side or rear of the building, which facilitates more social cohesion in the neighbourhood.
- **Municipal finances** will be somewhat strengthened, by concentrating development within existing older neighbourhoods and in areas that are well-serviced.
- **Parking:** Neighbourhood parking is included in this scenario, though the solution street permit parking or neighbourhood parking lots was not yet finalized.

Note: The simulation also tested Scenario 4 with an added on-site parking requirement, which yielded results similar to Scenario 1. Even with increased unit permissions, without neighbourhood parking, developers will prioritize on-site parking and driveways over additional dwelling units, which limits density.

## Alignment with Community

Goals

Scenario 4 addresses community goals, as shown by the word art from Consultation 1, where unmet aspirations have been greyed out. parking safety Walkability managing-traffic reducing-emissions visual-fit choos community-dynamic prenape housing-options small-shops welcoming attractions in tural-features choos tree-canpy affordable-housing wind treet infrastructure



Figure 14. Scenario 4 3D Visualizations.



### Scenario 4 Continued: Max 10 Dwelling Units

This scenario effectively shifts development into the Quantifying Area, and opens up redevelopment potential in excess of housing demand. Expansion growth (new homes on newly serviced land, often called 'green field development') would still be expected, as some households will prefer this type of housing. However new infill housing options would become the most significant source of new housing as these developments would be fast and profitable.

### **Simulating Outcomes – Housing 2051**



Figure 15. Phase 2 Combined Outcomes Housing, Fiscal, Environmental.

### Scenario 4 Continued: Residential Density Maps

The following density maps show existing and potential new residential densities throughout the Qualifying Area, as anticipated for the BuildingIN scenario.



Figure 17. Phase 2 - Existing Residential Density, Expressed in Dwelling Units per Net Hectare



Figure 18. Phase 2 - Scenario 4 (BuildingIN) Estimated Residential Density in 2051, Expressed in Dwelling Units per Net Hectare



 Figure 19.
 Phase 2 - Scenario 4 (BuildingIN), Percent Change in Residential Density Compared
 28

 to the Existing.
 28

## Phase 3: Scenario Refinement, Modelling and In-depth Analysis

Based on the success of Scenario 4, work continued with similar scenario assumptions. In Phase 3, we further refined the QA, conducted a more in-depth analysis of parking solutions, and prepared fiscal and emissions simulations to complement the forecasted housing outcomes. We also updated Scenario 1 (Business-As-Usual) simulations using the refined Qualifying Area.

### Further Refinement to the Qualifying Area

Based on ongoing discussions with city staff, we further refined the Qualifying Area (Figure 20) based on the following criteria:

- No large apartment buildings
- No floodplain
- No fronting/backing on water
- No blocks bounded entirely by roads too skinny (< 8m) for street permit parking on all sides and/or roads otherwise not appropriate for street permit parking -- defined as highway, arterial (primary), arterial (secondary), ramp, lane or private road.
- Only blocks where the average value as per 2016 census tract data is under \$400,000 were included.

See <u>Appendix A</u> for intermediary maps and methodology.

To ensure clarity, the refined versions have been renamed and will be referred to consistently throughout the remainder of this report:

- Scenario I became "Business-As-Usual Scenario"
- Scenario 4 became "BuildingIN Scenario"

The following sections provide an in-depth analysis of the Business-As-Usual Scenario vs the BuildingIN Scenario for:

- <u>Summary of high-level</u> outcomes
- Infill vs non-infill growth
- <u>Axonometric diagrams of new</u> <u>homes</u>
- <u>Streetviews</u>
- <u>Residential density outcomes</u>
- <u>Residential diversity outcomes</u>

- <u>Social dynamics on</u>
   <u>neighbourhood streets</u>
- Fiscal scenario outcomes
- Emission outcomes



Figure 20. Phase 3 – Final Qualifying Area.

### **Summary of High-Level Outcomes**

The table below summarizes key maximum capacity potential outcomes for the "Businessas-Usual Scenario" and "BuildingIN Scenario", forecasting the housing industry response through 2051.

	Business-As-Usual Scenario	BuildingIN Recommended Scenario
Modeling parameters for housing industry response	Assumes existing zoning, approvals, and on-site parking requirements.	Allows up to 10 units/building, implements simpler standardized approvals, uses form- based zoning, requires dedicated entrances, and incorporates neighbourhood parking solutions.
Maximum capacity potential cumulative tax and development charge uplift	\$99,562,006 Tax uplift from infill could help to pay for much-needed maintenance of existing services. Growth in expansion lands would also generate tax uplift, but not in proportion to the cost of long-term servicing of these areas.	\$755,867,622 Tax uplift from infill would provide a substantial fiscal advantage, supporting much-needed maintenance and long-term financial health.
Maximum capacity potential change in residential density maps See <u>Residential</u> <u>Density section</u> for enlarged maps.	1419 total new infill dwelling units9% net dwelling unit increase9% onet dwelling unit increase9% one dwelling unit increase&lt;	10,252 total new infill dwelling units 104% net dwelling unit increase
3D Visualizations See <u>Streetview</u> <u>section</u> for enlarged images.		





### Infill vs Non-Infill Growth

As discussed in the Background section of this report, Sudbury is forecasted to have 12,010 new households by 2051 as per the City's population projections. Here is a breakdown of how each scenario meets that demand.

#### **Business-As-Usual Scenario**

This scenario represents the current development trajectory, which falls significantly short of meeting Sudbury's housing needs through infill development.

- Falls short of housing targets by 11,216 units
- Only 12% of new housing would be infill in the well-serviced Qualifying Area (1419 dwelling units)
- 88% of new housing would have to be built outside of the Qualifying area, mainly on expansion lands.

The Business-As-Usual approach would necessitate substantial greenfield development, as it fails to utilize existing urban areas efficiently for new housing, and provides housing only for a limited household demographic.

### **BuildingIN Recommended Scenario**

This scenario proposes policy changes to dramatically increase infill development quantities and variety within well-serviced existing urban areas.

- The BuildingIN Scenario could attract up to 10,252 new infill dwellings
- Infill housing would meet demand for a diversity of unit sizes, tenures and price points
- Expansion growth (new homes on newly serviced land, often called 'green field development') would slow

The BuildingIN Scenario could allow qualifying neighbourhoods to double or triple in density, significantly curbing demand for expansion growth and promoting more sustainable urban development patterns.



Figure 21. Scenario Outcomes for Meeting Housing Target.

### Axonometric Diagrams – New Homes by 2051

#### Scenario 1 – Existing Zoning

Infill developments in this scenario would include small numbers of high-end singles and semis, and occasional additional dwelling units added to existing homes.



#### Scenario 4 – BuildingIN

Infill developments in this scenario would include 2-10 units per building and would be undertaken on scattered lots throughout the Qualifying Areas.



### **Streetviews**

3D visualizations of the scenario outcomes allow comparison of the expected massing, spacing, windows, doors, porches, rooflines, social dynamism and much more. Style and materials are not regulated in any of the scenarios, so architectural styles are provided as examples only.

#### Scenario 1, Example 1

Note: Scenarios 2 & 3 without neighbourhood parking also produce this outcome.



Figure 22. Scenario 1 – Streetview Example 1

In this scenario, due to the market demand for parking, together with zoning and site grading limitations on parking, single-family homes with garages are a good infill development option.

#### Scenario 1, Example 2

Note: Scenarios 2 & 3 without neighbourhood parking also produce this outcome.



Figure 23. Scenario 1 – Streetview Example 2

Townhouses or semis are also viable in this scenario, also providing parking on-site. Secondary dwelling units would sometimes be included in the basement, with a parking space provided beside the primary unit's parking in the front yard. Lot widths of over 11m would be required per primary unit, to meet parking and landscaping requirements for two parked cars.
#### Scenario 4, Example 1



Figure 25. Scenario 4 - Streetview Example 1

The BuildingIN scenario would result in multi-unit buildings like this, where lots are 130' or more in-depth and 60' or more in frontage, with walkways leading to townhouses. Parking would be provided nearby in the neighbourhood, allowing for as many as 10 units in a single infill building. The example above shows two triplexes facing the street and an attached row of 3 towns going back into the lot. All units in this example have dedicated entrances.

#### Scenario 4, Example 2



Figure 26. Scenario 4 - Streetview Example 2

The BuildingIN scenario would result in a multi-unit building like this, where lots are less than 130' and 50' in frontage. This example includes 8 units, each with dedicated entrances (4 front and 4 at the rear).

### **Residential Density Outcomes**

#### Expressed in Dwelling Units Per Net Hectare

The maps below illustrate expected residential densities by 2051, expressed in dwelling units per net hectare, factoring in lot sizes and other variables that would inform a developers' decision about what to build and where. Yellow-marked areas indicate critically low densities, falling short of fiscal sustainability thresholds. In these areas, long-term costs significantly outweigh property tax revenues.



Figure 27. Existing Residential Density Expressed in Dwelling Units Per Net Hectare



Figure 28. Business-as-Usual Scenario - Residential Density Outcomes Expressed in Dwelling Units Per Net Hectare



Figure 29. BuildingIN Scenario - Residential Density Outcomes Expressed in Dwelling Units Per Net Hectare



Figure 30. Business-as-Usual Scenario – Percent Change in Residential Density Outcomes Compared to the Existing Density



Figure 31. BuildingIN Scenario – Percent Change in Residential Density Outcomes Compared to the Existing Density



### Expressed in % Change in Dwelling Units per Net Hectare

The maps on the previous page illustrate projected % increases in dwelling units through 2051. The "Business-as-Usual Scenario" shows minimal density growth, maintaining fiscally unsustainable levels. In contrast, the "BuildingIN Scenario" demonstrates substantial density increases while preserving most existing homes.

### **Residential Diversity Outcomes**

### Exclusionary Zoning

The Business-As-Usual Scenario results in small amounts of high-end custom infill in singles and semis, and some conversions that add additional apartments to existing homes. This amounts to a slow loss of more moderately priced housing and a slow increase in high-end housing. Existing zoning was not intended to exclude various housing options from existing neighbourhoods, but in today's housing market, some households are being effectively zoned out.

### Zoning for Diversity

The BuildingIN Scenario results in a much greater mix of housing within the Qualifying Areas. New multi-unit low-rise buildings will provide dwelling units for a variety of household sizes, from 1 to 3-bedroom units. Some new dwellings will be rentals, some condos, some freehold, and some pairs or triplets of dwellings will be freehold. Most of these new dwellings will depend on street permit parking, so rents and purchase prices will be a little lower as a result. Most older homes will remain, so the result will be an increased diversity of housing options, including larger homes and very small units. See Figure 33.

### Zoning for Repeatable Solutions

The BuildingIN zoning recommendations are designed to make repeatable and modular designs work well, even on infill lots that are all a little different from one to the next. This facilitates more cost-effective construction, rather than custom designs.

### Social Dynamics on Neighbourhood Streets

### Car-Culture and Sterile Facades

The Business-As-Usual Scenario impact on neighbourhood streets is a lessening of social interaction, with infill that has garage doors facing the street, fewer windows into living spaces, and residents who tend to drive rather than walk.



Figure 32. Business-As-Usual, Custom Semi 3D Visualization

### Animated Facades and Social Dynamics

The BuildingIN Scenario would result in infill housing with facades animated with porches and windows, and new residents who walk to their car parked down the street or choose to walk to local destinations.



Figure 33. BuildingIN Recommendation Scenario 3D Visualization

### **Fiscal Scenario Outcomes**

The map below illustrates the estimated municipal revenue accrued in 2025 from property taxes.<sup>i</sup>

Figures 34, 35 and 36 offer a visual comparison of the maximum capacity potential average annual municipal revenue uplift generated from property taxes and development charges under two scenarios. The "Business-As-Usual Scenario" projects an annual municipal revenue uplift of up to **\$99,562,006** from 2026 to 2051. In contrast, the BuildingIN Scenario projects an annual municipal revenue uplift of up to **\$755,867,622** over the same period. Overall, the BuildingIN Scenario has the potential to generate nearly nine times more annual municipal revenue compared to the Business-As-Usual approach.



Figure 34. Existing Condition – Estimated Municipal Revenue from Property Taxes in 2025, Expressed in Dollars per Net Hectare.



Figure 35. Business-As-Usual – Estimated Average Annual Municipal Revenue from Property Taxes and Development Charges Through 2051, Expressed in Dollars per Net Hectare



Figure 36. BuildingIN Scenario – Estimated Average Annual Municipal Revenue from Property Taxes and Development Charges Through 2051, Expressed in Dollars per Net Hectare

# Expressed in % Change in Annual Average Municipal Revenue per Net Hectare

The maps below illustrate projected percentage increases in average annual municipal revenue through 2051. The "Business-as-Usual Scenario" shows minimal density growth, maintaining fiscally unsustainable levels. In contrast, the "BuildingIN Recommended Scenario" demonstrates substantial annual revenue increases.



Figure 37. Business-as-Usual – Percent Change in Average Annual Municipal Revenue Through 2051 from the Estimated 2025 Baseline



Figure 38. BuildingIN Scenario - Percent Change in Average Annual Municipal Revenue Through 2051 from the Estimated 2025 Baseline

### **Mapping Emission Outcomes**

The analysis shows differences in emission reductions between scenarios. From 2025 to 2051, housing-related emissions are projected to drop by up to 711 tCO2eq/yr under the BAU scenario. However, the BuildingIN Scenario projects a reduction of up to 951 tCO2eq/yr, primarily due to more compact housing designs with shared walls, floors, and ceilings, emphasizing their environmental benefits.



Figure 39. Business-as-Usual - Percent Change in Average Annual Housing-Related Emissions Through 2051 Compared to the Estimated 2025 Baseline



Figure 40. BuildingIN Scenario - Percent Change in Average Annual Housing-Related Emissions Through 2051 Compared to the Estimated 2025 Baseline

## **Neighbourhood Parking**

The BuildingIN Scenario proposes neighbourhood parking—including street permit parking, small neighbourhood lots, and front parking pads—rather than providing parking beside buildings on development sites. Eliminating neighbourhood parking from the recommended scenario shifts industry response and results in cumulative results comparable to the Business-As-Usual scenario.

A neighbourhood parking solution is essential to the BuildingIN recommendations for several key reasons:

• Supports a strong business model for multi-unit developments:

Most buyers and renters expect convenient parking, making it critical for sales and occupancy. Multi-unit buildings with smaller units are more profitable for developers, offering a repeatable and scalable business model. By eliminating on-site parking requirements, developers also avoid the added complexity and cost of designing stormwater drainage and filtration for each lot-an expense that can make infill projects unfeasible.

• Maximizes municipal infrastructure efficiency: Removing the need for on-site parking allows more land to be used for housing, making better use of existing infrastructure and increasing the number of units that can be built.

### Increases housing diversity and affordability:

Requiring all parking on-site limits the number of units and drives up costs. Neighbourhood parking solutions enable a wider range of unit sizes and more affordable options, supporting greater housing diversity.

Recommended neighbourhood parking solutions for Sudbury include:

- <u>Street Permit Parking</u>
- <u>Small Neighbourhood Parking Lots</u>
- Front Parking Pads

### **Street Permit Parking**

Street permit parking is an off-site parking alternative with the following advantages:

- No increase in hard surfaces or overland stormwater flow
- No reduction in soft landscaping or trees
- No construction cost (lower total construction costs for infill housing)
- Cost-neutral for the municipality

Street permit parking is a good complement to multi-unit low-rise infill proposed within the Qualifying Area, because within these areas the streets aren't arterial roads and are wide enough for parking and snow management.

See Appendix C: Summary of Neighbourhood Residential Parking Examples in Small Towns.

Note: Street permit parking passes should only be available to residents in nearby new housing units that do not have on-site parking. 4-hour short-term parking permissions would remain. Permit or short-term street parking would be permitted on only one side of the street in Qualifying Areas. Outside of the Qualifying Areas, there would be no change to street parking rules.

### Streets Well Suited for Permit Parking

To allow space for street permit parking during the winter, the following space is required:

- 5.4m width for two traffic lanes (one in each direction)
- 2.6m wide parking lane one side only
- 3m wide snow pile where there is no abutting sidewalk, piled up as snowplows pass this pile can be assumed to be entirely beyond the edge of the pavement
- 2m wide snow pile between a useable roadway and a sidewalk, where a plow passes first and then a bobcat clears the sidewalk

Based on the above dimensions, we recommend that street permits for parking for infill residents be provided only on streets that:

- Have no sidewalks and a pavement width of at least 8m,
- Have a sidewalk on only one side and a pavement width of at least 10m,
- Have sidewalks on both sides and the space between sidewalks exceeds 13m.

Infill developments will be undertaken incrementally. Demand for street permit parking will increase over time, together with transit use and people walking. The city should plan new sidewalks within the Qualifying Area, and locate them 3m from the road edge, to facilitate permit parking and snow removal. This will increase the number of streets suitable for street permit parking.

Note: The extent of the Qualifying Area has been refined to exclude areas where the majority of streets are not wide enough to support street permit parking.

### Winter Snow Clearing and Permit Parking

After snowfall, drivers with street parking permits should be required to move their vehicles to the 'other' side of the street (for a day) for a second pass of snowplows. This additional snow clearing would only be required where there are street parking permits within the Qualifying Area.

Where streets have a sidewalk on one side, it is important that permit parking be located on the same side as the sidewalk. After a snowfall, the first plows to pass would push the majority of the snow away from the line of park cars and would not plow snow over the sidewalk. Permit holders would then be asked to switch sides, allowing for a second pass of the plows, which would pile snow on the side of the road, but not over the sidewalk. See Example 2 below.

#### Example 1: 8m wide street with a planned future sidewalk.

Roads as narrow as 8m in Sudbury typically do not have sidewalks, which means that in the winter, snow can be pushed entirely off the width of the road and onto the right-of-way. Roads without sidewalks generally have a small gravel shoulder that can be kept clear in the winter for pedestrians.

In the future, a sidewalk can be established on one side of the street. However, to ensure adequate space for snow piling, the sidewalk should be located at least 3m from the street edge.



Figure 41. Street permit parking on one side of an 8m wide street and a future sidewalk.

NOTE: Property parcels shown are 50' wide.

#### Example 2:10m wide street with a sidewalk

10m-wide streets in Sudbury typically have at least one sidewalk on one side of the road. However, these sidewalks are often too close to the edge of the road for snow to be stored in between the sidewalk and the road. In these instances, the non-sidewalk side of the street is better suited to snow piling, and snowbanks are often 3m in the right-of-way. On the street side next to the sidewalk, a snowbank can be piled on the street, leaving the sidewalk clear – a snowbank about 2m wide.



Figure 42. Street permit parking on one side of a 10m wide street with one sidewalk.

NOTE: Property parcels shown are 50' wide.

Over time, as street work is undertaken in areas with street permit parking, sidewalks should be constructed 3m from the road to ensure adequate storage space for snowbanks between the street and the sidewalk.

#### Example 3: 10m wide street with two sidewalks.

Some streets in Sudbury are 10m wide and have sidewalks on both sides, and in most cases, these sidewalks are close to or abutting the street edge, with no space for snow piling. These streets are not suitable for street permit parking in the winter, as there is no way to clear and pile the snow without either reducing the street to a single traffic lane or covering a sidewalk with a snowbank. We do not propose street permit parking for streets with sidewalks on both sides unless the space between sidewalks exceeds 13m -- allowing for snow, driving and parking.



Figure 43. Street permit parking on one side of a 10m wide street with two sidewalks, not recommended at this time, but only after new sidewalks are constructed.

NOTE: Property parcels shown are 50' wide.

### **Front Parking Pads**

In consultation with development industry members and real estate agents, it was evident that there would be a greater industry response if some parking was provided on-site with infill housing, as well as neighbourhood parking.

Front parking pads allow some on-site parking, but with the smallest possible amount of paving. A front parking pad is a short driveway used for parking. Part of the vehicle may be on the road allowance, so long as it does not interfere with traffic, pedestrians or snow clearing – now or in the future if new sidewalks are constructed.

For more information on front parking pads including details and diagrams, see Appendix B: Front Parking Pads.

### Small Neighbourhood Parking Lots

Neighbourhood parking lots for residential areas are off-street parking facilities specifically intended to serve residents and their guests within a neighbourhood. Permitting new parking lots creates opportunities for developers who own multiple properties within a neighbourhood. Some properties could be developed as multi-unit homes, close to a property used by residents for parking. Over time, these parking lots may also be redeveloped into additional housing if the need for parking declines.

Neighbourhood parking lots would be managed by their owners — municipalities, private landlords, or housing condominiums.

It's important that neighbourhood parking lots are well-integrated into the community, so zoning regulations should require wood board fencing at side lot lines and tree planting at the front and back.

Neighbourhood parking lots are a good choice in neighbourhoods where properties and/or streets are too narrow for street permit parking. See the Sudbury Memos: Neighbourhood Parking Solutions (separate attachment) for more details.

### **Complete Streets**

Sudbury's planning staff have recently prepared recommendations for Complete Streets, and reviewed this material with our team. This is an important policy document that identifies an ideal outcome after the reconstruction of a street. As with most municipalities, Sudbury's streets are diverse in their existing condition, with a variety of pavement widths and sidewalk locations. A tailored approach for any street renovation will be necessary, and can be guided by the Complete Streets document. Within the Qualifying Areas, contextual design considerations for street reconstruction must including the location of street permit parking permissions.

## Waste, Recycling and Organics

In discussions with Sudbury's waste management staff, our team has determined that many of the developments anticipated as a result of the BuildingIN recommendations would qualify for municipal curbside pickup. Developments of 7-10 dwelling units that are located on interior lots may require private pick-up under the existing waste management arrangements. It is important that all low-rise multi-unit buildings provide space within each dwelling unit for sorting and storage of waste, recycling and organics, as well as shared storage outside of dwelling units.

## Recommended Regulatory Amendments

### **Final Qualifying Area**

If the council moves ahead with the BuildingIN Scenario, various regulations and bylaws must be amended. These changes are limited in scope and impact, carefully targeted only to qualifying areas (see Figure 44), and are designed to trigger the desired market responses documented in the BuildingIN Recommended Scenario outcomes.



Figure 44. Final Qualifying Areas

### **Official Plan Amendments Regarding Infill**

The Official Plan supports infill development and future growth and development that is focused on existing neighbourhoods, through intensification and redevelopment. The plan provides flexibility in terms of density, with a focus on servicing capacity. The Official Plan supports the development patterns that will be made possible by implementing BuildingIN recommended regulations and investments. "Looking ahead, the key will be to direct this growth to reinforce the existing urban structure and improve the efficiency of the urban form, as well infrastructure and service provision. Also key will be to continue to allow a range of residential living opportunities to meet housing needs." (Greater Sudbury Official Plan, pg. 13)

The BuildingIN Qualifying Area is mostly placed within a 400m walking distance of nodes and corridors in existing older neighbourhoods, in keeping with The Official Plan's emphasis on nodes and corridors for development.

The Official Plan states in section 2.2.3 Intensification, Programs (pg. 23):

"1. The City will monitor progress towards the residential intensification target outlined in this Plan. The City will review and, if necessary, adjust its policies and programs, including amending this Plan, to ensure that continued progress towards this target is made."

Even though intensification is well described in the Official Plan, it is appropriate to adjust the Official Plan to more closely reflect this refined approach.

#### **Proposed Amendments to the Official Plan**

To eliminate perceived contradictions with the BuildingIN recommendations, the following minor changes to the Official Plan are recommended:

All proposed revisions/additions are shown in green.

Section 2.3.1 Objectives (Greater Sudbury Official Plan, pg. 19)

It is the objective of the Reinforcing the Urban Structure policies to provide a growth management policy framework that:

a. provides an adequate land supply to meet long term needs;

b. establishes and maintains an urban growth boundary;

c. directs the majority of future growth and development to the settlement area;

d. encourages a mix of uses within the settlement area;

e. establishes and maintains a built boundary;

f. encourages context sensitive intensification and development within the built boundary; and,

g. identifies strategic core areas, and nodes and corridors that will be the focus of more intensive forms of mixed use development, active transportation and transit supportive development.



h. encourages low-rise multi-unit residential intensification close to nodes and corridors, in older neighbourhoods that are transit-served.

#### Section 3.2 Living Area Designations, General Policies for Living Areas

- Low density housing is permitted in all Living Area designations. Consistent with the prevailing built form, only single detached dwellings are allowed in Living Area II.
- 2. Medium density housing is permitted in all Living Area I designations where full municipal services are available. High density housing is permitted only in the community of Sudbury. Low-rise multi-unit residential, up to three storeys, is permitted close to nodes and corridors, in older neighbourhoods that are transit-served.

Greater Sudbury Official Plan (pg. 30), section 3.2.1 Living Area I - Communities

Communities will absorb the majority of new residential development over the plan period. The Living Area I designation has <del>three</del> four density levels that will be recognized in the implementing Zoning By-law: low, medium and high density residential as well as the low-rise multi-unit residential.

#### Policies

- 1. Low density development permits single detached dwellings, semidetached dwellings, duplexes and townhouses to a maximum net density of 36 units per hectare. In order to maintain existing neighbourhood character, the Zoning By-law may establish lower densities in certain areas of the City.
- 2. Medium density housing is permitted in all Living Area I designations where full municipal services are available.
- 3. New residential development must be compatible with the existing physical character of established neighbourhoods, with consideration given to the size and configuration of lots, predominant built form, building setbacks, building heights and other provisions applied to nearby properties under the Zoning By-law.
- 4. Low-rise multi-unit residential infill development in close proximity to node and corridors is permitted up to 10 units per building, with building heights of three storeys and no required off-street parking. An alternate section of zoning provisions shall regulate these low-rise multi-unit developments and shall:
  - a) Include a map of qualifying areas

b) Include form-based zoning to maintain existing neighbourhood character, and support healthy social dynamics and compatibility in built form.

#### **Additional Recommendation**

The Official Plan could also be amended to include a map of the Qualifying Area and a short description of the development intended in this area.

### **Amendments for Street Permit Parking**

#### **Current Regulatory Context and Challenges**

Neighbourhood parking solutions are crucial for supporting infill development at fiscally sustainable densities. These solutions should include on-street permit parking, small neighbourhood parking lots, parking on municipal land, and small front parking pads.

Off-street parking requirements pose a significant barrier to effective infill development. They take up space that could be used for additional dwelling units, reducing potential density and fiscal sustainability. Extensive on-site parking also creates excessive hard surfaces, leading to stormwater management issues.

#### Proposed Solution: Street Permit Parking, Neighbourhood Parking Lots and Small Front Yard Parking Pads

In the Qualifying Areas, street permit parking is proposed, together permissions for small neighbourhood parking lots, and small front-yard parking pads. This approach allows for some off-street parking, without significant increases in impervious surfaces on infill housing development sites, as well as providing a more affordable parking solution for some households.

The street permit parking program must be expanded to include streets in the Qualifying Area within 6 months of enacting the proposed Section 6.4 in the Zoning By-law. Street parking (both permit parking and 4-hour parking) should be limited to only one side of the street.

#### **Required Amendments to the Official Plan:**

Greater Sudbury Official Plan (pg. 22-23), Section 2.3.3 Intensification

9. The following criteria, amongst other matters, may be used to evaluate applications for intensification:



#### [...]

e. the provision of adequate pedestrian and vehicular ingress/egress, off street parking and loading facilities, and safe and convenient vehicular circulation, or adequate neighbourhood parking where off-street parking is not required or provided;

Greater Sudbury Official Plan (pg. 144), section 11.4 Parking

#### Policies

- 1. New developments generally must provide an adequate supply of parking to meet anticipated demands.
- 2. Based on a review of parking standards for various land uses in the City, parking requirements may be reduced in those areas that have sufficient capacity, such as the Downtown and other major Employment Areas.
- 3. To support low-rise intensification in older neighbourhoods close to nodes and corridors street permit parking could be implemented, and no minimum requirements for on-site parking should be imposed.
- 4. Parking requirements may be reduced where feasible through implementation of the following tools:
  - a. Establishment of minimum and maximum parking standards within the Regional Centre, Secondary Community Nodes and Regional Centres:
  - b. Reducing parking requirements in the Regional Centre, Secondary Community Nodes and Regional Corridors where transit, cycling and pedestrian alternatives exist:
  - c. Provision of shared parking facilities for uses with alternating high peak demand either by virtue of the uses or the time of day, time of week or seasonal demand; and,
  - d. Provision of central, shared parking facilities that may result in greater parking and land use efficiencies. This may include small neighbourhood parking lots used by the residents of infill housing near to nodes and corridors.

#### **Required Amendment to Consolidated Bylaw 2010-1**

Part III Parking and Stopping

Parking Prohibited 4.-(1) No person shall, at any time, park a vehicle in any of the following places: [...] (m) on any roadway for a longer period than four consecutive hours, except on Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Day; unless the vehicle has a valid Street Parking Permit.

(5) Where a highway or part of a highway has been designated as a permit parking zone in Schedule "Y", an eligible applicant may apply for a parking permit on the designated highway.

(a) Within neighbourhoods close to nodes and corridors, street permit parking permits will be made available to residents of new infill housing.

#### **Other Recommended Actions regarding Parking**

The street permit parking program should be expanded to include the Qualifying Area as described in this report, complete with signs posted to indicate the sides of streets designated for parking. A neighbourhood street parking map should be published (in keeping with the mapped area being added to the zoning bylaw) with yearly or monthly fees for Neighbourhood Resident Street Parking Permits.

Infill developments will be undertaken incrementally. Demand for street permit parking will increase over time, together with transit use and people walking. Many streets in the Qualifying Area do not have sidewalks. The city should plan new sidewalks for one side of these streets, and locate them 3m from the road edge as per the diagrams in the street parking section in this report, to facilitate permit parking and snow removal.

Additional snow removal costs as described in the Neighbourhood Parking section in this report should be included in future city budgets, gradually increasing the plowing required in the Qualifying Area as street permit parking slowly increases. No immediate additional cost for snow removal will be incurred.

### Site Plan Control Guide

The current Site Plan requirements do not require site plan approval for multiple dwellings not exceeding 10 units, therefore, no site plan approvals will be required for infill made possible by the recommended changes. However, some clarity is needed in the Site Plan Control Guide. The proposed changes are shown in green below.

## Recommended Amendments to the Site Plan Control Guide (January 13, 2022)

Section 1.0 Site Plan Authority (City of Greater Sudbury Site Plan Control Guide, January 13, 2022)

- A. Excluded Zoned Areas:
  - $\cdot$  lands zoned R1, Low Density Residential One
  - · lands zoned R2-1 and R2-2, Low Density Residential Two

• lands identified on Schedule XX in the Zoning By-law, using only the zoning provisions in Section 6.4 of the Zoning By-law

...

- B. Notwithstanding the above, the following classes of development are excluded from Site Plan Control:
  - $\cdot$  single detached dwellings
  - $\cdot$  semi-detached dwellings, linked dwellings or duplex dwellings
  - multiple dwelling not exceeding four units

multiple dwellings not exceeding 10 units located on lands identified on
Schedule XX in the Zoning By-law, using only the zoning provisions in Section
6.4 of the Zoning By-law

- seasonal dwellings;
- $\cdot$  buildings accessory to the above four uses

### **Stormwater Storage Management Requirements**

#### **Current Regulatory Context and Opportunity for Streamlining**

Properties located within the Qualifying Area are not along shorelines and are not subject to stormwater review by other regulatory agencies. The total increase in hard surfaces in intensifying areas is anticipated to be approximately 0.08% per year. This represents a very low impact on existing municipal stormwater systems. No increase in overland flow from a redevelopment site to neighbouring properties will be permitted (without a Site Plan Approval).

This lower-risk status provides an opportunity to simplify the approval process for infill development in these areas, generally eliminating the need for Site Plan Approval.

#### **Proposed Solution**

To attract more developers to build multi-unit infill developments in the Qualifying Areas, a streamlined approval process is necessary. Infill developments within the Qualifying Area should be exempt from Site Plan or Development Agreement processes. Instead, developers should be required to submit standardized overland flow diagrams as part of their permit application, ensuring simplicity, better coordination of civil and architectural drawings, and effective stormwater management.

The zoning regulations will mandate a minimum of 30% soft, absorptive surfaces. With clear requirements for overland flow management and a standardized submission format, permit applications can be reviewed efficiently.

See the Sudbury Memos: Grading and Drainage (separate attachment).

#### Required Amendments to the Stormwater Management Guide 2023-04-18

2.15 Exemptions for small sites

Subject to the City's discretion, a small site is any development with impervious surface areas (excluding the building) less than 0.085Ha (approx. 25 parking/queuing spaces) and building net floor areas less than 500sq.m and does not include developments where drainage within the site flows through or from an adjacent private property.

Exemptions for small sites will also include residential development sites constructed under Section 6.4 of the Zoning By-Law. These developments will not have off-street parking areas that contaminate overland flow, except for small parking pads close to, and draining toward the road. They are anticipated to cumulatively increase the amount of hard surface in neighbourhoods by very small amounts, and are therefore exempt from requirements to control of the quantity of run-off, including requirements to retain, filter or detain run-off, but they are required to:

- match or reduce pre to post overland flow to side and rear neighbouring properties,
- direct stormwater to the municipal storm system,
- include a topographical survey and lot grading plan with permit applications,
- provide a site diagram with permit applications showing hard surface areas and their flow directions pre and post development, as well as any significant overland flows located on or off a registered easement and

retaining these flows. See attached BuildingIN Memo: Grading & Drainage.

#### **Required Council Commitment**

It is important that the Council commit to study the impacts of anticipated small increases in overland flow that would result from infill in the Qualifying Areas, and plan Stormwater Management upgrades if/when needed.

### **Fireflow Recommendations**

#### **Current Regulatory Context and Challenges**

Documenting water supply and satisfying fireflow submission requirements for small multi-unit buildings is time-consuming, costly and confusing. The need to satisfy fireflow requirements introduces a level of uncertainty, enough to entirely deter some developers from building infill housing.

The Fire Underwriters have recommended these fireflow provisions in order to improve the likelihood of retaining buildings and to reduce the cost of repairs after fire events. Fireflow upgrades are not intended to save lives – building code requirements effectively ensure life safety.

Compared to homes built before 1980, every new building constructed under today's building code is significantly less likely to burn and would have significantly lower repair costs if exposed to fire. When an older home is replaced by a new infill building, the life safety from fire is dramatically improved by our building code, and building safety has also greatly improved, even if the building isn't designed to meet fire flow requirements.

#### **Proposed Solution**

To encourage multi-unit infill development, we propose eliminating additional fireflow documentation, submission, and upgrade requirements for developments in the qualifying area. All new buildings will be required to meet fire standards in the building code, but no fireflow documentation, submission and upgrade requirements would be applicable. No upgrades to water supply, improvements to water flow, or building upgrades for fire resistance (above building code standards) would be applicable.

#### **Required Council Commitment**

An engineering report should be commissioned to review fireflow levels within the qualifying area, along with municipal costing for recommended upgrades. Tax



revenue uplift from infill should be dedicated to this upgrade work, which will benefit not just new homes, but all the existing homes in the area.

### **Development Charges Bylaw Amendment**

#### **Current Regulatory Context and Challenges**

Current Development Charges Bylaw 2024-105 exempts residential buildings with 30 dwelling units or less from development charges until June 30, 2027. (Bylaw 2024-105, page 12<sup>7</sup>). Bylaw 2024-105 (section 7, pg. 14) exempts second and third dwelling units in new buildings (single detached, semi-detached and rowhouses) from development charges. The bylaw also credits 50% of development charges if the plot is along nodes or within 100 m of corridors, as set out in the Official Plan.

Some of the low-rise multi-unit buildings that will be constructed as a result of the BuildingIN Program will not fall neatly into the definitions of primary, second and third dwelling units. This will cause confusion and uncertainty in the application of development charges.

#### Proposed Amendments to the Development Charges Bylaw

Development or redevelopment within the Qualifying Area under Section 6.4 of the Zoning By-law will be subject to Development Charges for no more than one-third of the new dwelling units, with credits for existing units being demolished.

#### Amendments Required to Development Charge Bylaw

A definition for *Small Multi-Unit Residential Building* should be added to the Development Charge Bylaw 2024-105:

"Residential Use" means the land, Buildings or Structures or portions thereof used,

designed or intended to be used as living accommodation for one or more individuals, but does not include hotel or hotel suite or such temporary accommodation, and "Residential" has a similar meaning;

"Rowhouse Dwelling" has the same meaning as Row Dwelling in the Zoning By-law;

"Semi-Detached Dwelling" has the same meaning as defined in the Zoning By-law;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup><u>https://www.greatersudbury.ca/live/building-and-renovating/development-charges-pdfs/dc-bylaw-2024-105/</u>



- "Services" (or "Service") means those Services designated in Schedule "A" to this By-Law or specified in an agreement made under section 44 of the Act;
- "Single Detached Dwelling" has the same meaning as defined in the Zoning By-law;
- "Small Residential Unit Single Detached" means a Single Detached Dwelling with a Gross Floor Area of less than 1,200 square feet, but does not include a private garage, or a basement as those terms are defined in the Zoning By-law;
- "Small Residential Unit Semi-Detached" means a Semi-Detached Dwelling with a Gross Floor Area of less than 1,200 square feet, but does not include a private garage, or a basement as those terms are defined in the Zoning By-law;
- "Small Multi-Unit Residential Building" means a building with 2-10 dwelling units, constructed under Section 6.4 of the Zoning By-law.

Section 7, Bylaw 2024-105, pg. 14

Rules With Respect to Exemptions for Intensification of Housing 7, -(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of this By-law, and in accordance with sections 2(3),

2(3.1), 2(3.2) and 2(3.2) of the Act and any amendments thereof, each of the following shall be

exempt from Development Charges:

(d) (iiii) In Small Multi-Unit Residential Buildings constructed under Section 6.4 of the Zoning By-law, no more than one third of units shall be subject to development charges, and a credit of one Development Charge shall be applied for each dwelling unit demolished.

#### **Additional Recommended Amendments**

Eliminating development charges for multi-unit housing within the Qualifying Area would provide a further incentive to this intensification. It could also be seen as an acknowledgement of the long-term municipal cost benefit represented by this type of development, similar to the exemption in proximity to Nodes and Corridors. Section 5 of Bylaw 2024-105 could be amended by adding the following:

Small Multi-Unit Residential Buildings constructed under Section 6.4 of the Zoning By-law shall be exempt from Development Charges.

### **Proposed Zoning Approach**

BuildingIN has reverse-engineered additional zoning to match the BuildingIN Scenario within the Qualifying Area. This additional zoning (see below) will attract infill that is a good fit, scaled to suit existing streetscapes, setbacks to complement existing homes, and animated with porches and street-facing features.

The proposed new zoning would be an addition to Section 6 of the existing bylaw, and would become Section 6.4. This new section would function like an overlay or patch, allowing developers to apply existing zoning, **or** the new performance standards set out in Section 6.4.

The new text states the intention of this section to be implemented in its entirety, discouraging variance applications that would propose a mix of performance standards from Section 6.4 and other sections.

Residential developments built under Section 6.4 of the Zoning Bylaw without any variances will not need to control the quality of stormwater run-off, unless there is significant overland flow onto the site, because they will not have off-street parking areas that contaminate overland flow. They will also not need to retain or detain stormwater, because these developments will increase the total amount of hard surface (paving and roofs) in neighbourhoods by very small amounts (about 0.12% each year). See *Sudbury Memos: Grading and Drainage* (attached separately). This will significantly discourage developers from requesting variances, to avoid the need to meet higher standards of stormwater management.

### **Proposed Additional Zoning Text**

### 6.4 BUILDINGIN ALTERNATE ZONING

#### 6.4.1 APPLICATION OF SECTION 6.4

The following provisions may be applied within the area designated on Schedule X of the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-Law No. 2010-100Z, and can only be applied in full, not in part, as alternate provisions to Sections 2-6.3 of the City of Greater Sudbury Zoning By-Law No. 2010-100Z, except where otherwise stated in this section. Development shall also comply with *Part 11: Exceptions*.

In order to maintain the integrity of Section 6.4 below, it is intended to be implemented as written/approved by council in its entirety, and independently from Sections 2-6.3.

Sections 2-6.3 may be applied to *lots* within the area designated on Schedule X, only if Section 6.4 is not applied.

Despite transition clauses herein, the following Section 6.4 will be in full effect beginning the day that it is approved by council.

#### 6.4.2 **DEFINITIONS**

accessory = as defined herein.

- *building depth* = the depth of the *main* building measured parallel to the to the *side lot lines* at the deepest point of the of the building.
- *building width* = the width of the *main* building measured parallel to the *front lot line* at the widest point of the building.

dwelling unit = One or more inter-connected rooms which:

- a) Is used or intended for *use* in common by one or more *persons* as a single, distinct and self-contained housekeeping establishment;
- b) Contains kitchen and bathroom facilities for the exclusive common *use* of the occupants thereof; and,
- c) Is not a recreation vehicle or any vehicle, as defined herein.
- d) A dwelling unit does not include any of the following uses:
  - 1) A Shared Housing, as defined herein,
  - 2) A Rooming House, as defined herein.

edge of the sidewalk = the edge of the sidewalk closest to the nearest lot line.

*edge of the street =* the pavement edge of the street closest to the nearest *lot line*.

finished grade = as defined herein.

*floor area* = The space on any storey of a building measured from the exterior face of exterior walls, including exits, vertical service spaces and their enclosing assemblies.

*home occupation* = as defined herein.

*lot* = An area of land under one ownership, other than a road, which may be used as the site of one or more *main* buildings, structures or *uses*, together with any building, structures or *uses accessory* thereto.



*lot, corner* = as defined herein.

*lot, interior* = as defined herein.

*lot, through* = as defined herein.

*lot area* = as defined herein.

*lot depth* = as defined herein.

*lot frontage* = The length of the *front lot line* measured along the right-of-way to a public road, and in the case of a *corner lot*, not including the curved portion.

*lot line* = as defined herein.

*lot line, front* = as defined herein.

*lot line, interior side* = as defined herein.

*lot line, rear* = as defined herein.

neighbourhood parking lot = a parking area containing 3 or more off-street parking spaces that constitutes the main use on the lot, providing parking for residents of infill constructed after this section of the bylaw has been enacted.

off-street parking space = as defined herein.

*parking pad* = paved area for up to two *off-street parking spaces* abutting the *front* or *corner side lot lines*, with vehicles oriented perpendicular to the road or lane.

parking pad, head = that edge of a parking pad furthest to the edge of the street.

- setback = The distance between a *lot line* and the nearest *main* wall of any building or structure not including permitted encroachments.
- *street exposed façade* = exterior building walls visible from the street, including permitted projections.

*street line* = as defined herein.

use = as defined herein.

use, main = as defined herein.

yard = as defined herein.

yard, corner side = as defined herein, not including permitted encroachments.

yard, front = as defined herein, not including permitted encroachments.

yard, interior side = as defined herein, not including permitted encroachments.

yard, rear = as defined herein, not including permitted encroachments.

#### 6.4.3 APPLICABLE PART 4: GENERAL PROVISIONS

The following sections of Part 4: General Provisions of this By-Law <u>do apply</u> to development established under this section.

- a) 4.2.4 Home Occupation
- b) 4.33 Services Required
- c) 4.35 Sight Triangles
- d) 4.37.2. Railroads, Special Setbacks

#### 6.4.4 USE AND LOT SIZE

- a) Any configuration of *dwelling units* within a building is permitted, at any *dwelling unit* count to a maximum of 10 *dwelling units* per building, on a *lot* of any *lot area*.
- b) A maximum of one main building is permitted on a lot. Other permitted uses:
  - i. *Home occupation*, as defined herein, including a private home daycare
  - ii. Neighbourhood parking lot
  - iii. Bed and Breakfast Establishment, as defined herein
  - iv. Group Home, as defined herein
  - v. Accessory guest room, as defined herein
- c) A minimum *lot frontage* of 5.0 m is required, except in the case where a single building is severed into multiple ownerships, in which case one of the *lot frontages* is permitted a minimum width of 1.8 m.



- d) A building that includes *dwelling units* (multiple townhouses, triplexes or other configurations) abutting each other in any configuration shall be considered one building on one *lot* for zoning purposes.
- e) The *building width* shall not exceed 13.0 m. The *building depth* shall not exceed 28.0 m.
- f) A minimum of 25% of the *dwelling units* in a building shall contain 2 or more bedrooms, rounded as per Section 1.16.
- g) Direct access to each *dwelling unit* shall be provided by a swing door leading directly to the one *dwelling unit* from outdoors, which is not shared with any other *dwelling unit*.
- h) A condominium is permitted to include buildings that are not on contiguous *lots*, provided they are within 1.0 km of each other, of similar sizes, and built of similar materials.
i) Buildings on interior lots, with 7-10 dwelling units, shall provide an outdoor solid waste shed in the rear yard. The solid waste shed shall comply with Section 8.0. The solid waste shed shall have a paved path with a minimum width of 1.5 m, clear of any obstructions from the shed to the street, allowing for private pickup. NOTE: In all other cases, new developments will receive roadside pick-up from the City of Greater Sudbury, and a garbage shed is not

required. Should the City's garbage program change to allow curbside pickup from 7-10 unit buildings, the provision of a shed would no longer be required.

 j) Each dwelling unit shall have a vented indoor storage closet with a minimum size of 1.2 m x 0.6 m for recycling and household waste. Storage for organics shall be provided in the kitchen.



#### 6.4.5 SETBACKS, FLOOR AREAS AND BUILDING HEIGHT (ZONING ENVELOPE)

- a) The maximum *floor area* of each floor of the *main* building, measured to the exterior face of exterior walls, shall not exceed 45% of the lot area.
- b) *Rear yard* and *interior side yard setbacks* shall comply with one of the following two options:
  - i. Rear yard setback shall be a minimum of 25% of the lot depth measured from the rear lot line, the rear yard area shall be a minimum of 25% of the lot area, and the combined width of the interior side yards shall be 17% of the lot frontage with no interior side yard less than 6% of the lot frontage, measured from the interior side lot line(s). On a corner lot, the interior side yard setback shall be a minimum of 6% of the lot frontage and the corner side yead setback shall be as per 6.4.5.c.
  - ii. Rear yard setback shall be a minimum of 6.0 m measured from the rear lot line, and the combined width of the interior side yards shall be 45% of the lot frontage with no interior side yard less than 15% of the lot frontage, measured from the interior side lot line(s). On a corner lot, the interior side yard setback shall be a minimum of 15% of the lot frontage and the corner side yead setback shall be as per 6.4.5.c.
- c) The location of the front or corner side walls of the *main* building, not including permitted encroachments, shall be as follows:

- i. Within 1.2 m of the average of the *front* or *corner side yard setback* of the immediate neighbours on either side, or within 1.2 m of its single neighbour if there is only one.
- ii. Regardless of the above, the front or corner side wall of the *main* building shall be no closer than 3.0 m and no further than 8.0 m from the *edge of the street* or *edge of sidewalk* (whichever is closer).
- iii. Where the average of the neighbours minus 1.2 m exceeds 8.0m from the edge of the street or edge of the sidewalk, the front or corner side wall of the main building shall be 8.0 m from the edge of the street or edge of the sidewalk (whichever is closer).
- iv. In no case shall the *front* or *corner side yard setback* be less than 1.2 m.
- d) Maximum *main* building height shall not exceed 11.0 m:
  - i. In the case of a flat roof, measured vertically from the *finished grade* at the base of the building wall facing the *front lot line* to the highest point of the roof membrane, and not including rooftop mechanical equipment or solar collectors.
  - ii. In the case of a roof sloped more than 3/12, measured vertically from *finished grade* at the base of the building wall facing the *front lot line* to the midpoint between the main eave and the topmost peak.
- e) Permitted encroachments into required yards must comply with *Part 4, Table 4.1,* <u>except</u> as follows:
  - i. A porch, deck, patio, terrace or balcony, with or without steps, at *finished grade* or within 6.0 m of *finished grade* is permitted to project up to 2.2 m into any *yard*, but shall be no closer than 1.2 m from any *lot line*.
  - ii. In an *interior side yard*, a porch, deck, patio, terrace, balcony or steps within 1.5 m of *finished grade* may be within 0.0 m of a *side lot line* if a woodboard fence is provided.
  - iii. A balcony 6.0 m above *finished grade* is permitted to project up to 1.2 m into any *yard*, but shall be no closer than 1.2 m from any *lot line*.

## 6.4.6 SOFT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS

- a) A minimum of 30% of the *lot* shall be soft landscaped, of which a maximum of 5% may be board deck on piles or blocks with mulch below.
- b) Minimum requirements for soft landscaping in *front*, *corner side* and *rear yards* are as follows:

- i. 50%, which may include board decks on piles or blocks with mulch below.
- c) Areas that are less than 0.6m in width shall not be included in calculations of soft landscaping.
- d) Surface treatments that may be included in the soft landscaped area include: grass, plants, shrubs, trees, mulch, planter boxes, sculptures, retaining walls, wooden decks on piles or blocks with mulch below, upper tiers of window wells if they contain soil and plants artificial grass on a granular base, and permeable pavers provided that only the permeable area is included in the calculation.
- e) Surface treatments that shall not be included in the soft landscaped area include: gravel, paving, stone, artificial grass not on a granular base, and any other materials outlined in Section 5.2.5.
- f) Parking prohibitors shall be provided in the *front* and *corner side yards* located within 1.2 m of the property line, and spaced no more than 3.0 m apart. Parking prohibitors include trees, walkways to more than one dwelling unit, boulders, bushes, planter boxes, retaining walls, bicycle racks, benches, bollards, ornamental fences or garden walls, and planting beds that are mounded to more than 0.4 m above adjacent ground level.

## 6.4.7 OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES ON PARKING PADS AND IN NEIGHBOURHOOD PARKING LOTS

- a) No off-street parking space(s) are required. Off-street parking is permitted only where it does not compromise soft landscaping requirements in Section 6.4.6. Conventional parking options regulated under *Part 5: Parking and Loading Provisions* are not permitted in conjunction with Section 6.4.
- b) No more than 50% of any street line shall be paved for parking.
- c) Off-street parking is permitted on *parking pads* and in *neighbourhood parking lots*.
- d) A maximum of 2 off-street parking spaces are permitted on a parking pad.
- e) A minimum of 3.0 m of soft landscaping (as per Section 6.4.6(d) is required between *parking pads*.



- f) Dimensions for *parking pads* are as follows:
  - i. A minimum of 3.0 m long, measured from the *lot line* to the head of the *parking pad*
  - ii. A minimum of 2.75 m and maximum of 3.0 m wide for a single space
  - iii. A minimum and maximum of 3.0 m wide if abutting a wall or barrier for a single space
  - iv. A minimum 5.5 m and a maximum of 6.0 m wide for a pair of spaces
  - v. A minimum and maximum of 6.0m wide for a pair of spaces if abutting a wall or barrier.
- g) The *head of the parking pad* shall be at least 10.5 m from the *edge of the street,* except in the cases described below,
  - i. Where the pavement of the street is 10.0 m 13.0 m wide, the *head of the parking pad* shall be at least 6.0 m from the *edge of the sidewalk* or at least 9 m from the *edge of the street* if there is no sidewalk.
  - ii. Where the pavement of the street is more than 13.0 m wide, the *head* of the parking pad shall be at least 6.0 m from the *edge of the sidewalk* or at least 7.7 m from the *edge of the street* if there is no sidewalk.
- h) Requirements for *Neighbourhood parking lots* as follows:
  - i. shall only be used by residents of *dwelling units* constructed within the area identified on Schedule X after the date that Section 6.4 has been enacted.
  - ii. shall have all parked vehicles display the owner's address in the front window, as well as the name, address and phone number of the property owner or manager.
  - iii. are only permitted on *interior lots* that have a minimum *lot frontage* of 13.5 m, and do not contain a *main* building or *accessory* building.
  - iv. shall have a maximum of 14 off-street parking spaces.
  - v. shall have a minimum aisle width of 6.0 m.
  - vi. shall have parking spaces dimensions as in Section 5.2.3.1.
  - vii. shall only be permitted on *lots* that have a minimum of 30% soft landscaping. Refer to Section 6.4.6(d) for surface treatments included in the soft landscaping calculation.
  - viii. shall be *setback* from the *front lot line* equal to the average *front yard setbacks* of the immediate neighbours, or equal to the *front yard setback* of the single neighbour if there is only one.
  - ix. shall have wood board fencing along *rear* and *interior side lot lines*, unless otherwise agreed by the adjacent neighbour(s) in writing. Wood

board fencing shall be *setback* from the *front lot line* as per Section 6.4.7(g)(viii).

i) Surface treatments of *parking pads*, *off-street parking spaces*, *neighbourhood parking lots*, aisles and driveways shall adhere to Section 5.2.5.

## 6.4.8 ACCESSORY STORAGE SHEDS AND GAZEBOS

- a) A maximum of two *accessory* sheds (including garbage sheds) are permitted on a *lot*.
- b) Buildings covered with cloth, plastic or similar flexible material shall be considered *accessory* sheds within this section of the by-law.
- c) Accessory sheds shall comply with the *side yard setback* requirements of the *main* building. Accessory sheds are not permitted in the *front yard* or *corner side yard*.
  - i. In the *rear yard* of an *interior lot*, *accessory* sheds shall be *setback* 0.6 m from any *lot line*.
  - ii. In the rear yard of a *corner lot*, *accessory* sheds shall be *setback* 0.6 m from the *rear lot line* and *interior side lot line* and shall comply with the *corner side yard setback* of the *main* building.
- d) Maximum *accessory* shed height shall not exceed 5.0 m measured to from finished grade to the highest point of the structure.

## 6.4.9 STREET EXPOSED FAÇADE FEATURES

- a) The extent of a *street exposed façade* shall include all walls facing a street, including front and corner side walls.
- b) On *interior lots*, the extent of the *street exposed façade* shall include portions of side walls that are perpendicular or angled to the street but closer to the *street edge* than the *front façade* of the immediately neighbouring building, if they are more than 1.2 m wide.

c) The extent of the street exposed façade shall begin at finished grade, not including window wells or sunken areas, and extend up to the top of parapets or undersides of eaves. In the case of a gable end, the street exposed façade shall be calculated up the underside of the ceiling behind the gable end.



- d) All *street-exposed facades* shall have a minimum of 15% glazing, which may include clear or frosted glazing in windows and doors, but shall not include tinted or mirrored glass. Windows with sills more than 1.2 m above the floor shall not be included in this calculation.
- e) All *street-exposed facades* shall have at least one door leading to a *dwelling unit*. The door may be turned at 90 degrees to the street if it is visible from the street. Facades facing *interior side yards* are not required to have a door, even if they are *street-exposed facades*.
- f) *Street exposed façades* shall have one or more of the following socially dynamic features such that a minimum of 15% of the *street exposed façades* shall be socially animated with these features;
  - i. Porch, deck, patio, terrace or balcony that is covered with a roof or canopy for at least 1.5 m from the building facade, which shall be considered to animate the *street exposed façades* from floor to ceiling of the porch or balcony but shall not include *dwelling unit* entry doors,
  - ii. uncovered porch, deck, patio, terrace or balcony, which shall be considered to animate the *street exposed façade* over an area above the walking surface to a height equal to the depth of the porch or balcony but shall not include *dwelling unit* entry doors,
  - iii. bay window, which shall be considered to animate the *street exposed façade* over the area that is projecting forward of the façade to which the bay window is mounted.

- g) Street exposed façades shall have one or more of the following features, or additional features from Section 6.4.9(f), such that an additional 20% of the street exposed façades are animated with these features;
  - i. permitted encroachments as per Section 6.4.5(e) or exterior walls that are more than 0.6m farther from the street than the *front façade*.



NOTE: All permit applications shall include a diagram showing the proposed *street exposed façades*, percentage glazing, and the area that would be considered to animate these facades. This diagram shall demonstrate compliance with Sections 6.4.9(d), 6.4.9(f) and 6.4.9(g) above.

# Conclusion: A Transformative Path to Sudbury's Growth

The BuildingIN strategy represents a new opportunity for Sudbury—a carefully crafted approach to sustainable urban development that takes advantage of existing infrastructure to allow a more diverse housing supply. This strategic framework offers a nuanced alternative to traditional expansion-based growth.

# A Winning Growth Strategy

The BuildingIN Scenario is a carefully developed growth model that emerged through an extensive collaborative process and iterative scenario testing.

This scenario allows infill developments of up to 10 units per building. The maximum projections for this scenario are compelling. Within the focused area for infill development, the following maximum outcomes are possible, up until 2051:

- Dwelling Units: A 104% net increase, translating to 10,250 new infill dwelling units
- Financial Uplift: Expected cumulative tax and development charge uplift of \$755,868,000, a significant contribution to close the infrastructure funding gap
- Community Transformation: Balanced approach to growth that preserves neighbourhood character and provides a variety of unit sizes and tenures
- Emissions: A 20% average annual drop in housing-related emissions due to the number of new homes that would share walls, floors and ceilings.

The scenario outcomes are best visualized by comparing housing, fiscal and emissions outcomes between the existing condition, the Business-As-Usual Scenario and the BuildingIN Recommended Scenario.





The success of this approach hinges on several critical implementation strategies:

- Targeted Additions to Zoning: Precise geographical mapping to guide contextually appropriate infill development
- Regulatory Streamlining: Amendments to existing bylaws and development processes to encourage and expedite infill projects
- Parking Solutions: Innovative approaches to neighbourhood parking that support increased density without compromising urban livability

# Forward-Looking Perspective

The BuildingIN recommendations represent a proactive, holistic strategy that positions the City of Greater Sudbury as a forward-thinking community prepared to grow sustainably. By embracing this innovative approach, Sudbury can transform its growth trajectory, creating a more resilient, vibrant, and fiscally responsible community for generations to come.

## Contact

For questions, further discussion, or to explore collaboration options, please contact:

Ian Morrow, Project Manager: ian@buildingin.ca

# Appendices

# Appendix A. Refining the Qualifying Area

The first step was isolating existing low-rise residential areas. This was accomplished by first only selecting Low-Density Residential One, Low-Density Residential Two and Medium Density Residential Zones as per the current Zoning By-Law (see Figure 6). Then, non-urban settlements were excluded as per the current Official Plan. These included Vermillion Lake, Whitefish, Blezard Valley, McCrea Heights, Old Skead Road, Skead, Long Lake (East End), Wanup and Richard-McFarlene Lake Flats.

Of the remaining lands, we selected those blocks where the majority of parcels had been developed pre-1980, based on building permit data provided by the municipality. This is because in the last four decades, most Canadian residential developers began to construct significantly larger homes than before and to maximize lot coverage. These neighbourhoods rarely contain much potential for redevelopment or infill development. Infill developers generally purchase small older homes, properties that are valued for their land rather than the building on it. Then, the house is demolished to make way for infill housing.



#### Figure A1. Older Low-Rise Neighbourhoods.

The areas in light blue above vastly exceeded Sudbury's need for infill housing. As a result, the area was narrowed down to be more central, while still excluding blocks where the majority of parcels were developed after 1980. Simulations from Phase 1 were conducted using this Qualifying Area.





This area above still vastly exceeded Sudbury's need, so the area was refined further below to only include older blocks within a 400m walking distance of 'Corridors' as per the Official Plan.

Simulations for Phase 2 were conducted using this Qualifying Area.



Figure A3. Phase 2 - Refining the Qualifying Area Based on Proximity to Corridors

For Phase 3, we incorporated considerations of a street permit solution into refining the Qualifying Area by excluding blocks that were not suitable for street permit parking. These included blocks that were bound by roads under 8m in width, or that were otherwise inappropriate (i.e. highways, arterials).

Municipal staff have expressed that Chelmsford should have been included in the Qualifying Area. In the map, you can see that a large part of Chelmsford was removed as a result of the narrow streets, which would not be able to support street parking. The municipality can ultimately still include these areas in the overlay, knowing that a neighbourhood parking solution would have to be established. In the meantime, this part of Chelmsford was not included in the Qualifying Area and subsequent simulation exercises.





Blocks within census tracts where the average dwelling value exceeded \$400,000 were also excluded since developers were likely to avoid these areas in favour of cheaper land elsewhere.

These blocks are circled in red below.





Finally, we excluded portions of blocks that contained large empty block centers with no buildings. Parcels were also removed, which seemed to already have apartment buildings. Blocks were removed where the majority of existing development was row housing, unlikely to be redeveloped as infill. Parcels impacted by the floodplain were removed, as well as heritage properties.



Figure A6. Phase 3 – Final Refinement of the Qualifying Area.

# **Appendix B: Parking Pads**

The following diagrams show front parking pads (on the left side of the image), and the critical dimensions required. These dimensions have been used in preparing the recommended zoning language that would make this parking solution possible within the Qualifying Area.





## Front Parking Pads on a 10m wide street with a sidewalk





# Front Parking Pads on a 10m wide street with sidewalks

Front Parking Pads on an 13m wide street



# Appendix C: Summary of Neighbourhood Residential Parking Examples in Small Towns

### • Niagara-on-the-Lake, ON

- Yearly permit (\$35/year) for heritage district allowing residents to park 3 hours without meter payment (meter hours 10am–8pm).
- Overnight parking ban from 2am to 6am; no parking longer than 12 hours.
- Niagara-on-the-Green suburban neighbourhood has permits allowing parking 8am–5pm.
- Residents pushing for 24-hour street permit system in 2025.
- Stratford, ON
  - Monthly permits (\$100/month) for urban lots; free permits on Coopers lot for downtown residents.
  - Permits valid for 6 months; allow parking up to 72 hours without moving.
  - Overnight parking ban on streets and paid lots from 2am to 6am.

## • Georgina, ON

- Beach parking passes (up to 4 per unit) available to all residents.
- Winter parking allowed at Rayners Boat Launch and Glenwoods Parkette.

## • Saint Catharines, ON

- Annual residential parking permits (\$55/year) for streets with parking limits.
- Cars must be moved every 12 hours.
- Downtown exempt from winter parking ban during snow events.
- Alternatives during snow bans: exempted areas, parking garages, neighbor driveways.
- Cobourg, ON
  - Downtown parking permits for municipal lots (\$105/90 days), no overnight parking.
  - East Beach area allows residential parking with overnight parking; summer permit \$20.
- Caledon, ON
  - Up to 16 temporary parking passes per vehicle per year.
  - Additional 7 passes for driveway improvements or construction obstruction.
  - Passes invalid during winter weather events with snow clearing.
- Tiny, ON (Georgian Bay)



- Residential and seasonal resident permits.
- First permit free; second permit \$30/year (max 2 per household).
- Cambridge, ON
  - Monthly 24-hour residential permits for downtown residents in designated lots.
  - Fees range from \$64 to \$96 per month.
- Milton, ON
  - 25 visitor parking permits per year per household.
  - 5-hour max parking town-wide.
  - Residents can apply for 15-hour parking zones if 51% of homeowners agree.
  - Street permits suspended during snowstorms; residents can park in designated lots for up to 48 hours during suspension.
- Prescott, ON
  - Parking permits for municipal lots: \$325/year for residents.
  - Winter parking restrictions Nov 1 to Mar 31; vehicles off street 12am-7am.
  - Gravel lot monthly rate \$30 + HST; paved lot monthly \$50 + HST.
- King, ON
  - 12 visitor permits per household per year.
  - No overnight parking during snow events.
- Shelburne, ON
  - Monthly residential parking permits for municipal lots (\$40/month or \$480/year).
  - Lot permits have no winter restrictions.
  - Overnight parking permits available during winter parking bans.
- Riverview, NB
  - Overnight parking allowed on most streets except during snowclearing and ice removal.
  - Residents responsible for monitoring parking bans.
- Thorold, ON
  - 12-hour street parking permitted on most streets.
  - Restrictions during snowfall events.
  - Monthly parking permits available for municipal lots.
- Saint John, NB (Population ~73,000)
  - Resident street parking permits (\$75/year) only for those without onsite parking.
  - Alternate side parking: odd side 1st-15th of month, even side 16th-end.
  - Changeover between sides occurs evenings of 15th and last day of month.
  - Alternate side parking in effect Dec 1 to May 31 in specific areas.

- King Street East has alternate side parking Dec 1–Mar 31; both sides allowed Apr 1–Nov 30.
- Ongoing parking study shows generally good availability.

# **End Notes**

<sup>i</sup> Fiscal outcomes are estimated from assumed assessed values of existing singlefamily homes versus multi-unit buildings and their associated property tax rates and development charges on new buildings. The table below outlines the assumptions used for Scenario 1a (Business as Usual) and Scenario 2a (BuildingIN).

#### Fiscal Assumptions for Business-as-Usual and BuildingIN Scenarios.

Market & Tax Lookup	Business as Usual	BuildingIN
Average assessed value of a single-family home	\$260,000	\$260,000
in target area		
Multi-unit building assessed value per ft <sup>2</sup>	\$500	\$500
Property tax rate	1.3%	1.3%
Development Charge	\$13,270.5	\$10,227
Share of units subject to development charge	75%	33%

### Average value of an existing single:

Originally, we had estimated this to be \$500,000, but since then we had looked at the census data for average value of occupied dwellings in the qualifying area in order to exclude higher value neighbourhoods (circled in red, see Appendix A, Figure A5). As a result, the value was updated the average value of the remaining blocks in the Qualifying Area, which is \$260,000.

### Multi-unit dwelling estimated value per square foot: \$500

#### Property tax rate: 1.3%

As per the 2025 Tax Rates for Residential/New Multi-res buildings.

### **Development Charges:**

We understand that there is a freeze/moratorium on DCs for the next 3 years. Our model projects 26 years into the future (2026-2051 inclusive), so only 2 years would be impacted. As a result, the model does not account for this.

• The BAU scenario includes new singles (5%), semis (61%) and multis (34%).

- The <u>DC rate summary for July 1, 2024</u> applies a charge of \$22,162 for singles
- The rate for a semi is \$14,238 and the rate for a dwelling in a small multi building is \$10,227 as per <u>by-law 2019-100</u>.
- A weighted average of **\$13,270.5** was applied.
- The BuildingIN scenario includes 99.6% dwellings in small multi-unit buildings, so a charge of **\$10,227** was applied as per <u>by-law 2019-100</u>.

#### Share of units subject to the Development Charge:

- BAU: **75%**, estimating 25% of new units will be exempt.
- BuildingIN: **33%**, as the program is recommending that only 1/3 of new units in a development be subject to DCs.