

## **Appendix 6 - Summary and Response to Public Comments**

There were two (2) pieces of correspondence that were received from members of the public with respect to the proposed City-Initiated Zoning By-law amendment. Below is a summary of the comments that have been received:

- When a Lodging House is next to your property it brings down the value of your home.
- Will the Zoning By-law amendment bring back our neighbourhoods to “friendly family areas?”
- Smaller single detached residential homes (1,000 square feet) are designed to accommodate small families of up to 4 people. However, they are turned into lodging houses and are being rented to up to 10 lodgers.
- Lodging houses are not well maintained (i.e. grass cutting and snow shovelling) and impact the aesthetic character of the neighbourhood.
- The Zoning By-law requires a minimum separation distance of 305 metres between lodging houses which is a clear violation of the Ontario Human Rights Code.

Response:

The concern that housing values will depreciate as a result of lodging houses in a residential neighbourhood is difficult to prove. A change in property value is not a planning consideration that can be evaluated pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*.

The purpose of the Zoning By-law amendment related to Lodging House is to only align the Zoning By-law definition with the Ontario Building Code and Fire Code, which defines the use as involving more than four (4) lodgers. The amendment is not proposing any changes to the Lodging House provisions (i.e. minimum separation distance, licensing) nor is it adding this use to any other parent zones in the By-law. At present a lodging house is only permitted in a limited number of residential (R2B(1), R4A, R4A(1), R4A(2), R4A(3), R4B) and commercial zones (CRC, DC).

Since lodging houses are only permitted in a single detached dwelling, it would be difficult to distinguish these types of uses from other buildings by appearance, unless they were poorly maintained. In terms of maintenance, the City has by-laws in place, such as the Property Standards By-law, which are intended to address poor maintenance, with inspections triggered by complaints and, if necessary, the issuance of compliance orders.

The comment that there are typically fewer people residing in smaller dwellings, may be correct, however, it is important to note that there is no regulation on the maximum number of people that could reside in any residential dwelling type in the Zoning By-law.

Section 35(2) of the *Planning Act* says municipalities may not pass Zoning By-laws that distinguish between people who are related and people who are unrelated in respect of the occupancy or use of a building. Brampton's Zoning By-law does not define a “family”, therefore, in one dwelling, you could have people who are related or unrelated, which makes it more fair and inclusive for all “family” structures and living arrangements.

Section 10.15 (c) of the Zoning By-law does requires a minimum separation distance of 305 metres to be maintained between a lodging houses and any other lodging house. The lodging house amendment does not propose any changes to this minimum separation distance requirement. The comment that this requirement violates the Ontario Human Rights Code will be explored further through the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review process.