

To: [Clerks@richmondhill.ca](mailto:Clerks@richmondhill.ca)

From Pat Pollock

Re: ARU Item 13.6 Staff report on Additional Residential Units  
Council Meeting February 24, 2021

I have read over the staff report after making a submission when this item was at Council the last time, and I still have a number of concerns. Some of my previous concerns have been addressed but not to my satisfaction, and some have not been addressed at all. These are important concerns for our neighbourhood since we do have a number of ARUs in our community and they are causing problems in the area. I would like these to be addressed completely so that the situations are resolved, not sidestepped, to be dealt with at another time or totally ignored.

**Guidelines for implementation** are NOT acceptable – they are guidelines only and are not implementable. We need solutions that will be implemented so that existing problems are solved. I can point to other guidelines this City has that are ignored and never enforced for example: the Urban Design Guidelines and the Residential Project Guidelines.

a) if there is already more than **one ARU in a house**, what are the regulations about decreasing the number to the current City recommendation of one ARU per house? I agree that one unit per household is adequate in an existing neighbourhood, however if there is more than one in a house, it should not be grandfathered.

b) there is a statement in the staff report that **units must follow building codes, fire regulations and must be permitted**. However, how is this policed? Are the current units that do not follow this process exempt? How can the occupants (renters) be sure they are safe? There needs to be a mechanism such as registration, to make sure that building codes and fire regulations are followed so that tenants are safe. We are aware of units in our area that have not followed the permitting process, thus may not follow building codes nor fire regulations.

c) it is stated that **one parking space per unit is allowed**. How does one accommodate a couple who use 2 cars? Does the extra car get parked on the street? Please inform as to proper process. This situation needs to be addressed.

d) it is stated that the "Planning Act as amended by Bill 108, the More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019, and subject to specific criteria, OPA 23 would authorize up to three dwelling units on a lot where a ground-related dwelling is permitted", yet **Richmond Hill staff is allowing one in the dwelling and one as an ancillary unit**. Which is to be followed (the Planning Act or Richmond Hill regulations)? If Richmond Hill legislation takes priority, it needs to be stated as such.

e) it is stated that "Only properties which meet the applicable zoning provisions would be permitted additional residential units. Further, properties which meet the applicable zoning

provisions continue to be subject to other applicable requirements such as the **Ontario Building Code**". How will this be policed? Residents who currently do not follow the permitting process need to conform.

f) it is stated that the "City staff has commenced internal discussions with regards to **public education and ongoing tracking and monitoring strategies**". When will these be publicly available? Will these strategies be incorporated into the by-law/be mandatory? Education is necessary. But also, residents must be encouraged to follow the procedure so that building code, fire regulations and the permitting process are all followed.

g) **as minor variance requests** are made to COA and some of the requests for ADUs may request a minor variance, how are these to be handled by COA? If a minor variance request has previously been granted for 35% lot coverage and the ZBL is for 30% lot coverage, can an additional 5% or even 8% be added on to this 35% for an ancillary building? That would mean the lot coverage of 40 to 43% or even higher!! How is this situation to be handled? This needs to be documented and followed through as part of the policy.

h) it is stated in the staff report that residents can **purchase yellow tags for extra garbage to put out on garbage days**. We know that this DOES NOT work. We have complained multiple times because of household garbage being dumped at Tannery and Carrville Parks and asked for the garbage cans to be emptied. We have seen residents dump kitchen garbage in those park garbage cans. In our community we have had ARU owners dump garbage bags on nearby properties. It is naïve to think that yellow garbage tags will be purchased. I doubt any resident has been fined or prosecuted for dumping garbage. So what's the incentive to buy tags? More rigid mechanisms must be in place to catch these offenders. The City needs to come up with another strategy to deal with waste in ARUs.

### **Conclusion:**

I hope you will reconsider some of these concerns. I have tried to explain how they impact on neighbours and other residents in a community. To me, solutions need to be found to these ongoing problems.

Please do NOT come up with GUIDELINES that are UNENFORCEABLE. The solutions you find MUST BE included in the document so that they become enforceable by-laws. That is the only way that this policy on ARUs will work to the benefit of all – residents, staff and neighbourhoods.

Pat Pollock  
Chair, Mayvern Area Residents Association  
67 Drumern Crescent