Executive Summary
Executive Summary

The Municipality of Brighton (Municipality) retained D.M. Wills Associates Limited and KMD Community Planning and Consulting Inc. (Consulting Team) to undertake this Mature Neighbourhood Study process in late 2018. The Consulting Team worked with senior staff of the Municipality in preparing this report.

The results of this planning exercise will assist in the creation of policy recommendations that will allow the Municipality to move forward with a clear direction in the development of housing policies in the updates to their Comprehensive Zoning By-law and Official Plan.

The Mature Neighbourhood Study Background Report sets the current context for the Municipality of Brighton and the Study Area, and provides information relevant to understanding the recommendations and strategies presented in the Draft and Final Report.

The following are the four (4) key components covered by this background report:

1. Summary of the input received to date from the community and stakeholders, identifying the elements that define “neighbourhood character”, and the major themes of public consensus and concern;
2. Identification of the historical and physical neighbourhood context;
3. Identification of the changes occurring, and an understanding of the factors influencing change;
4. Summary of the planning process, including a best practice review.
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Introduction
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Study Purpose

The Municipality of Brighton (Municipality) has begun to experience an increase in development pressures and projects, which has raised public concern about the character and integrity of the Municipality’s mature neighbourhoods.

In November 2017, Council passed a resolution that permitted Municipal Planning Staff to undertake a study to determine the potential study areas for a Mature Neighbourhood Study (the Study). In December 2017, Council received the report titled Interim Control By-law/Mature- Established Neighbourhoods. This report detailed staff’s examination of development pressures on eight (8) areas including Downtown Brighton, Midtown, Gosport, Codrington, Hilton, Orland, Smithfield and Presqu’ile Park. It was determined that the downtown area experienced the most development pressures and it was recommended that the Study should be conducted on this area. The boundary of the Study Area was predetermined by Municipal Staff.

In December 2017, Municipal Council passed By-law 127-2017, to “facilitate a study to be undertaken in respect of land use planning policies that should apply to residential intensification in the area designated low density in the “Mature Neighbourhood Study Area.” This by-law shall apply to all lands, buildings, and structures located within the area outlined and identified as the “Mature Neighbourhood Study Area”, which are zoned Urban Residential One (R1), Urban Residential Two (R2), and Urban Residential Three (R3). Within the “Mature Neighbourhood Study Area”, no land use, building or structure shall be used for “Intensified Residential Use” or “Single Detached, Large Scale" as defined in the aforementioned By-law. With exception to a purpose which does not require a building permit and the continued use of land, or building, or structure lawfully existing on the day of passage of this By-law provided such use is permitted on that land or in that building or structure by By-law 140-2002.” Interim Control By-law 127-2017 will remain in effect until December 18, 2019.

In December 2018, the Municipality initiated the Study to address the aforementioned concerns and to gain a better understanding, with community input, of the elements and qualities that contribute to neighbourhood character. This Study assesses whether

Figure 1 - Interim Control By-law 127-2017 Mature Neighbourhood Study Area
the policies of the Official Plan and the regulatory framework of the Municipality’s Zoning By-law are effective in managing development and maintaining the character of the Municipality’s mature neighbourhoods.

The main objectives of this Study include the following:

- Identify and evaluate the unique qualities and characteristics of the mature neighbourhoods within the delineated Study Area;
- Evaluate the key issues regarding the development pressures the community is encountering;
- Detect the information gaps and inform the strategy to identify future growth areas within the Study Area;
- Develop recommendations to maintain and enhance the distinct character of Brighton’s urban mature neighbourhoods; and,
- Incorporate the results of this Study, in the form of proposed amendments, to the Municipality’s comprehensive Zoning By-law 140-2002 and updated Official Plan.

### 1.2 Study Process

Engaging with a diversity of stakeholders within a community is crucial in identifying what is important to a neighbourhood and the community at large. At the core of the Study is community consultation. Throughout the Study process, there were numerous opportunities for the public to participate as illustrated in the Study process below.

**Figure 2 - Study Process Chart**

![Study Process Chart](chart.png)

We are here

The following are the four (4) key components covered by this background report:

1. Summary of the input received to date from the community and stakeholders, identifying the elements that define “neighbourhood character”, and the major themes of public consensus and concern;
2. Identification of the historical and physical neighbourhood context;
3. Identification of the changes occurring and an understanding of the factors influencing change; and,
4. Summary of the planning process, including a best practice review.
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2.0 Neighbourhood Character

2.1 Neighbourhood Character Defined

Neighbourhood Character often refers to the “look and feel” of an area. It is the collective qualities and characteristics that distinguish a particular area or neighbourhood. It is made up of a number of elements that make up a streetscape.

Neighbourhood Character is difficult to define as it is subjective, therefore, a combination of characteristics and physical features can help to define the character of an area. These elements can be building-related (e.g. built form, massing, height, and building materials), property-related (e.g. the size of a lot and its frontage along a street, orientation of the lot, and the natural features common on the lots) or neighbourhood-related (e.g. streetscape, street design, street network, street lighting, street trees, natural features, sidewalks, and trails, parks, community facilities), when combined they define a unique place and character.

Neighbourhood Character can also be described as the cumulative impact of every property, public place and piece of infrastructure in a neighbourhood.

As the characteristics of a neighbourhood are perceived differently by residents, and is shaped by individual values and experiences, to best define the Neighbourhood Character of the Study Area within the urban area of Brighton, this Study involves significant public engagement as is detailed in Section 3.0 of this report.
2.2 Mature Neighbourhood Defined

A neighbourhood could be described as a collection of streets, buildings, and amenities that share common characteristics such as architecture, site layout, landscape, and the public realm (parks, recreation areas).

When determining a mature neighbourhood for the purpose of this Study, Municipal Staff decided that the area must contain predominantly single-dwelling units (low density residential area) that are special or of importance to community members and of an age that merits consideration of protecting its distinctive character. Municipal Staff predetermined that a dwelling that is 40 years or older was considered to have potential cultural heritage value.

It is important to note that neighbourhoods evolve over time and can consist of buildings constructed at various time periods. In some cases, neighbourhoods will consist of older and newer homes. The Study area was chosen as it is an area with a concentration of homes built before 1978 located in an area defined as a neighbourhood (collection of streets sharing similar characteristics).
2.3 Historical Development in the former Town of Brighton

Brighton is an area rich in history. It was part of the lands deeded by the indigenous peoples to Canada in the Gunshot Treaty signed at the Carrying Place in 1797. This tract of land spans from the Bay of Quinte in the east to Etobicoke in the west, stretching north approximately 20 kilometres. The Village of Brighton was formed by amalgamating parts of Cramahe and Brighton Township in 1857, with its’ official incorporation on January 1, 1859. The Town of Brighton later incorporated on December 1, 1980. Brighton was historically primarily an agricultural community, specializing in the farming of apples and production of new apple types. Given the agricultural activity occurring in the area, a canning industry also existed in Brighton for some time.

Within the urban area of Brighton, specifically the area around Main and Ontario Streets, and over to Percy Street, was a place where merchants and blacksmiths established their homes and shops. The source of electricity for the settlement was the water power supplied by Butler Creek. At least two (2) mills were built near the mouth of Butler Creek as early as 1798 by Alexander Chisholm. His step-son, John Singleton, would later inherit property on the east side of Prince Edward Street and the Singleton name would be connected to the development of a cluster of buildings that grew around the corner of Prince Edward and Main Streets, called Singleton’s Corners before Joseph Lockwood gave Brighton its’ name in 1831.
From the earliest times of settlement in the area, the harbour was the key element bringing people to the area to generate business. The waterfront boasted a ship building yard and a grain elevator which were in operation until 1895. The first version of a road from York (Toronto) to Kingston was built around 1800 and went through the central area of what would be later called Brighton Village. The roads and streets of Brighton are named for not only historical figures but also for some of the pioneers of the village. The former CN station was built by the Grand Trunk Railway in 1857 and operated until it was closed in 1962 and remained vacant until 1996 when it was restored and reopened as the Brighton Railway Museum. In its’ early days, the railroad station became an important part of the community as stations were required every few miles along the track to supply the early steam engines with wood and water to operate. Additionally the station also became the social centre of the town.

Prior to the railway, the stagecoach era contributed to the development of the Village of Brighton in terms of its early roads and stagecoach depots as illustrated in Figure 8 above.

Figure 8 - Stagecoach Depot and Former Tavern, Hotel & Coach Stop

2.4 Neighbourhood Character of the Study Area
There are currently 31 properties within the Study Area listed on the Municipal Register of Heritage Properties, which have been identified to have cultural heritage value or interest, as illustrated on Figure 9.
Mature Neighbourhood Study Area
Heritage Listed Properties
Brighton, Ontario

Figure 9 Cultural Heritage Properties within the Study Area
Listed in the Municipal Register
These properties are concentrated on Main Street, Prince Edward Street, Sandford Street, and Young Street. The properties date as far back as 1809 and represent various architectural styles including: Gothic Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, Second Empire, Colonial Revival, Georgian, and Traditional Red Brick.

Within the southern portion (south of Main & Dundas Streets) of the Study Area, the typical streetscape can be defined by: primarily a grid street pattern; sidewalks on one (1) side of the street; mature street trees along boulevards; a mixture of rectangular and square lots; relatively deep rectangular lots; the majority of houses date from the mid 1800’s to the mid 1900’s with some mid 1900’s infill and redevelopment; a mixture of single and two (2) storey houses; and a variety of architectural styles which are consistent with the time period of development.

Within the northern portion of the Study Area, the typical streetscape can be defined by modified street grid pattern including cul-de-sacs and discontinuous streets, variety in age and distribution of street trees; presence of sidewalks from both sides of the street to none at all, a mixture of historical buildings, and a more limited range of architectural styles.

**Figure 10 - Historic Map of the Brighton urban area**

![Historic Map of the Brighton urban area](image)
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This section addresses the number of public consultation activities that were conducted in the early stages of this Study to afford all sectors of the community opportunities to become engaged by providing their opinions at the outset of the Study. Approximately 85 Brighton and area organizations and identified stakeholders were contacted directly via mail and email to participate in the steering committee, take the online survey or to participate in the neighbourhood walking tour and design charrette. This section reports the approach to and results of, these preliminary consultation activities. The community engagement program was launched the week of January 21, 2019 and to date has included the following activities.

3.1 Steering Committee

An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper, The Brighton Independent, as well as on the Municipality’s website encouraging residents to apply for a position on the steering committee. The Consulting Team received two (2) applications from community members and two (2) representatives from Council were appointed to the committee. The role of the committee is to provide comments during the study process, assist with issue identification and resolutions and to liaise with key community stakeholders to promote study awareness. To date, the committee has had one (1) official meeting and attended the neighbourhood walk and design charrette. The Steering Committee receives monthly updates on project process and is scheduled to meet next in August to discuss the draft report and the feedback received from the community at the Public Open House scheduled for August 14, 2019.
3.2 On-line Survey

An on-line survey was created to garner resident’s feedback with respect to what they value in their neighbourhoods and to identify areas of concern and factors contributing to the growth pressures that the Study Area is encountering. The survey was available online via a link posted on the Municipality’s website; an advertisement placed in the local newspaper; and an email sent out to all community groups and identified stakeholders. Additionally, to ensure that those who do not have access to a computer could provide input, print copies of the survey were made available at five (5) locations around the urban area of Brighton, including the two (2) Municipal offices located at 35 Alice Street and 67 Sharp Road, as well as at the King Edward Park Community Centre. The survey was open from February 4, 2019 to May 8, 2019 with media releases from the Municipality announcing its availability through newspaper advertisements, posters and post card advertisements dispersed throughout the Study Area and mail outs to identified community organizations and agencies.

The survey was open to all residents of the Municipality, with a focus on those who reside within the Study Area boundaries. The survey garnered 61 responses. It was not a random survey with a pre-selected number of respondents. The survey responses, therefore, are not statistically significant. They do however, reflect the opinions of those community members who have an interest in, or concern about the Neighbourhood Character of the Study Area. The following summarizes the survey results. For more information, the hardcopy of the survey can be found in Appendix A, with the survey comments attached in Appendix B.

Participants were initially asked to choose the neighbourhood features that best describe Neighbourhood Character. The survey results, as illustrated in the figures below, indicate that respondents felt that street trees (67%), sidewalks (56%), and street lighting (52%) best define a neighbourhoods character.
Participants were then asked to choose the lot and housing features that they felt best define neighbourhood character. The results indicate that trees and landscaping received the highest score of 81.97%, followed by distance between buildings (67.21%), architectural style (57.38%), size of homes (floor area) (40.98%), façade details (39.34%) and building height (37.70%). See Figure 14.

Participants also described in their own words which additional features are important in their neighbourhoods. A common theme that appeared was cleanliness or “pride of ownership”. Several participants feel that “neat and tidy” lots are important to the definition of neighbourhood character. Additionally, several participants indicated that they valued a diversity of architectural styles and façades in a neighbourhood.

One notable response reads: “I love the variety of different houses side by side, built at different times. I definitely dislike the generic cookie cutter houses.” The third most common theme that appeared was with respect to street and road improvements, which influences accessibility, walkability and vehicle/pedestrian interactions. For the full list of comments, see Appendix B.
Which Lot and Housing Features best define neighbourhood character, in your opinion? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TREES AND LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTANCE BETWEEN BUILDINGS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL STYLE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF HOMES (FLOOR AREA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAÇADE DETAILS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION AND PLACEMENT OF DRIVEWAYS AND WALKWAYS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING MATERIALS, COLOURS AND TEXTURES</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING ORIENTATION (FRONT, SIDE AND REAR YARD SETBACKS)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION AND PLACEMENT OF PORCHES AND DECKS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYE, SIZE AND LOCATION OF GARAGES</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING MASSING/ VOLUME</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FENCING</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT COVERAGE</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOFLINE PATTERN</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATION OF CORNER LOTS</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were then asked to rank a list of 22 features in order of importance to gain a better understanding of what the residents of the Municipality truly value about their neighbourhoods and what they believe to be the features that have the strongest impact on neighbourhood character. See Figure 15. Similar to the previous responses, street trees were ranked as the most important feature of a neighbourhood (16.51%). The subsequent top ranked features identified included the lotting pattern/street pattern/ streetscape (14.93%), architectural style (14.80%), street lighting (14.28%), and sidewalks (14.15%). The lowest ranked features included fencing (5.15%), roofline pattern (6.77%), and style, size and location of garages (7.10%).
Figure 15 - Survey Results Question 4

What Features are the most important? Please rank the following features with 1 as the most important, and 22 being the least important.

Participants were additionally asked to identify any neighbourhoods or buildings located within the Study Area that they felt have significant heritage features. Several respondents noted that Main Street is comprised of a concentration of historic buildings that they wished could be preserved. Buildings located in the Alice and Dundas Street area and along Chapel Street were also noted. The responses from this question also assisted in the design of the mature neighbourhood walking tour.

Lastly, participants were asked to provide any additional comments or concerns that they had about the Study Area. Common themes appeared among these comments. The most common response related to upgrading the sidewalks and streets within the Study Area. Participants felt that these improvements would improve the accessibility and walkability of the area, have positive impacts on parking and traffic flow, and improve the overall neighbourhood “feel”.

Some participants expressed concern regarding the number of subdivision developments occurring in the Municipality and additionally expressed that higher densities should be enforced in newer neighbourhoods, so that infill development “does not ruin” the character of Brighton’s mature areas. Some participants also expressed that they felt that property standards have been decreasing in some parts of the urban area of Brighton. These respondents feel that enforcing a property standards by-law would substantially improve the affected neighbourhoods. The full list of responses is attached in Appendix B.
3.3 Neighbourhood Walk & Design Charrette

A neighbourhood walking tour followed by a design charrette was held on April 25th, 2019 from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. This event was advertised in The Brighton Independent, on the Municipality’s website, and notice was sent out to all local identified agencies and organizations via mail and email. Seventeen (17) people attended including councilors, residents, representatives from the development community and community groups and organizations. The event was held to garner “boots on the ground” feedback with the local residents within the Study Area setting. The event generated valuable input and feedback for study purposes.
3.3.1 Neighbourhood Walking Tour

A neighbourhood walking tour worksheet was made available on the Municipality’s website in advance of the event so that participants could preemptively identify areas of concern and interest (worksheet is attached in Appendix C). The following photographs illustrate the neighbourhood walking tour route and where certain elements of the study area were highlighted to be a point of interest or concern.

Figure 17 - Mature Neighbourhood Walking Tour

The walking tour provided an opportunity for the Consulting Team and municipal staff to discuss the purpose of the Study with participants and collect further information about the identified Study Area. During the walking tour, participants had an opportunity to identify features that they felt best defined the area, and provide information on recent developments and the history of the area. By engaging with the public one-on-one through this exercise, the Consulting Team was able to garner a better understanding of the area and the participants’ perspectives. The following is a summary of the feedback we heard during the walking tour:

Neighbourhood Character

- Participants noted that local services (library, community centre, grocery store) are conveniently located in proximity to the residential neighbourhood, which promotes the walkability of the Study Area.
- Participants stated that they prefer a variety of housing styles, noting that the diversity adds to the charm and character of the Study Area.
- Mature trees and a tidy streetscape were identified as important parts of the Study Area’s character.
• Similar to the survey results, participants felt that enforcing property maintenance standards would improve the character of the Study Area.
• Participants pointed out newer developments within the Study Area and noted that they felt that they were not “in keeping” with the areas character.

Development and Change
• Some participants assume that the development pressures on urban Brighton are coming, in part, from an ageing (55+) population originating from the Durham Region.
• Participants stated that they want “controlled growth.”
• Within the Study Area, several participants stated that they felt that new developments are changing the character of the Study Area.
• The lack of available housing options within urban Brighton was mentioned as a concern.
• Some participants expressed concern regarding commercial uses and their parking requirements within the mainly residential areas.
• The infill development that has occurred on Centre and Chapel Street were pointed out with mixed opinions among the group.
• Similarly, the new developments occurring on Gross and Oliphant Street were highlighted as examples of new builds occurring within the mature neighbourhood, again, with mixed opinions.

Traffic and On-Street Parking
• Traffic congestion and speeds were identified as an issue within the Study Area.
• It was noted that Division Street is wider and has a larger sidewalk than Chapel Street and therefore is more pedestrian and vehicle friendly.
• The majority of participants agreed that road, street, and sidewalk repairs are required throughout the Study Area.

Community Improvement
• Participants expressed an interest in the development of a walkway or trail that connects existing trails and parkettes throughout the urban area of Brighton.
• The majority of participants noted that the development of sidewalks on some streets (Lakeview Heights for example) would greatly improve the neighbourhood.
• Participants would like to see a “downtown revitalization” of Main Street, similar to Perth or Oakville.
• Participants expressed that they felt there is a disconnect between the lakefront and the downtown and that is something that could be capitalized on.
3.3.2 Design Charrette

Design charrette participants were given a worksheet that listed 22 neighbourhood features and were asked to rank their top ten (10) choices for what they felt best represented neighbourhood character. The Design Charrette ranking features worksheet is attached in Appendix D. They were then asked to translate their choices onto a large grid using sticky notes, as illustrated in Figure 18 below.

Figure 18 - Group Ranking Exercise

This exercise demonstrated how subjective defining neighbourhood character is and that as a community, they must work together to prioritize key features and action items when looking to preserve Brighton’s mature neighbourhoods. This exercise additionally demonstrated the need for collective and collaborative responses to address the future of the Study Area. The results from the group exercise were tallied and are illustrated on Figure 19.

The tallied results indicated that the group’s top three (3) prioritized features for the Study Area are sidewalks with a score of 145, architectural style with a score of 117 and distance between buildings with a score of 98 (this is a stark contrast to the survey results). The participants were then split into three (3) smaller groups and asked to complete the exercise again while trying to build a consensus among their group members. The groups were given 30 minutes to ideally choose ten (10) features, rank them accordingly and then present their results back to the group.
Within the smaller groups, participants discussed and justified their individual priorities while building consensus. Discussions involved balancing intensification targets while preserving neighbourhood character, with one (1) individual noting that there are currently no high-rise buildings in Brighton's urban area, but that it is one (1) way to reach intensification targets. Another noted that “gentle intensification” can occur within mature neighbourhoods where targets are met without compromising the character of an area. Discussions regarding the changing demographics of the Municipality occurred, with participants noting that older and younger homeowners have different priorities with respect to housing options. Significant discussions regarding building massing and height occurred, with some participants arguing that these features can significantly alter the “look” of a neighbourhood. The issue of sidewalks and their role in increasing the walkability of the Brighton urban area was also discussed at length, with the majority of participants agreeing that significant sidewalk improvements needed to occur.

Each group presented their results and there was an overarching theme that emerged. Each group identified that each feature could not be considered in isolation, and that several features overlapped and represented similar elements of neighbourhood character, which made it difficult to rank the features. One (1) group created their own top priority being: mixed/multi-type residential (aging in place). The group justified this top priority stating that they prioritize: “encouraging a greater mix of housing
opportunities that allow families to grow in Brighton- from young families with children through to retirement. Allowing people to remain in the community for the full span of their life."

**Figure 20 - Building Consensus**

The second group chose building massing as their top ranked feature/priority. They justified ranking this as their top feature as their group felt that lower buildings are more in keeping with the “small town” charm of Brighton and better represented the community character and compatibility.

The third group chose to arrange several features into their top four (4) priorities. Their results are best represented in **Figure 21** below:

**Figure 21 - Group Three Priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Lotting Pattern/Street Pattern/Streetscape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building height; Lot coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Building Massing/Volume</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Architectural style; Building materials; Distance between buildings; Garages &amp; walkways; Facades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Sidewalks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Location &amp; placement of driveways/ walkways; Road widths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Environment &amp; Protected Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Street trees; Trees &amp; landscaping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The group justified their ranking by noting that all of the features are interrelated and that the streetscape is a top priority and that building height and lot coverage affect the streetscape. Their second priority was justified as they noted that the overall look of the residential buildings (massing, architecture, facades, garages etc.) play an important role in defining the unique character of Brighton’s mature neighbourhoods. The group felt that sidewalks, walkways and road widths were all interrelated and affected the walkability of Brighton’s urban areas. Lastly, the group recognized the importance of environment and protected areas, which includes street trees, trees and landscaping. As was noted in the survey results, trees are valued by the Municipality’s residents as they consider them a vital component of neighbourhood character.

**Figure 22 - Presenting Results**
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4.0 Trends, Factors & Influences

4.1 Historical Trends

According to Statistics Canada, the size of Canadian families is decreasing over time, while the number of households has been increasing. According to a recent report by the County of Northumberland, the Municipality is growing at a much faster rate compared to the County as a whole. Among all the member municipalities, Brighton experienced the highest rate of increase in its population (15%) and number of households (29.1%). It was noted that much of this growth is due to an increase in senior-led households (adults 55 to 64 years of age) and those aged 25 to 34 years. With respect to the Municipality’s housing supply, it was noted that the Municipality has a less diverse housing supply compared to the County with 87.4% of their dwellings being single detached. The report by the County noted that “there is a need for a more diverse housing supply in Brighton, including smaller and accessible options.” The report noted that approximately 70% of all the Municipality’s households are one (1) and two (2) person households with 42% being senior-led households.

4.2 Local Building Activity

It was determined that an important facet of this Study was to understand the more recent building trends in the Study Area. This information was required to make recommendations in order to maintain and enhance the distinct character of the identified Study Area. To do so, the building trends were identified by examining the records of building and demolition permits and minor variance requests for properties within the study area over the last ten (10) years. It was determined that between 2009 and 2019, the Municipality issued 43 building permits, 15 demolition permits, and processed one (2) minor variance application for properties located within the Study Area. The types of building permit development activity assessed included permits issued for new buildings; accessory buildings; additions to existing buildings; and renovations for basement apartments. Figure 23 and Figure 24 identify the locations of these permit applications.

As previously mentioned, only one (1) minor variance application was submitted over the past ten (10) years and it was to reduce the rear yard setbacks for a residential dwelling on Chapel Street. It is noted that the instances of minor variance applications is low given that many development applications did not need to obtain such approvals because the existing zoning regulations are permissive/appropriate.
Building Permits

The Study Area has experienced the greatest activity related to demolitions and new dwelling permits in the Municipality. In reference to Figure 23, it appears that new developments have been concentrated on Chapel Street, Main Street, Dufferin Street, and Pinnacle Street. In addition, the Study Area has a large area zoned Urban Residential Type 2 (R2) that was likely intended to allow for both single and semi-detached dwellings to implement the permitted low density residential uses as defined through the Official Plan. The land use challenge being that this same Urban Residential Type 2 (R2) Zone also permits triplexes, fourplexes, and nursing homes which is not the intention of the Low Density Residential Area as defined through the Official Plan. This will be addressed in the zoning by-law update.

Demolition Permits

Demolition permits were analyzed in terms of evaluating this trend in the study area. Eighteen (18) demolition permits from 2009 to 2019 which represents a ten (10) year period were mapped to determine if there were any significant trends in the Study Area. In reference to Figure 24, Chapel Street, Centre Street, Division Street, and Oliphant Street have received the most demolition permits over the past ten (10) years. Demolition permits could be the result of irreparable damage to a building such as a fire or it could be through a desire to demolish an existing dwelling and build a new structure. The reasons for demolitions could not be determined through the data set available but it does provide a general overview of trends.

Land Supply Inventory

In early 2019, the Municipality’s planning consultant prepared a report to Council titled: “Lands for Future Residential Development- Forecasted Available Land Inventory.” In this report, it notes that residential development in the Brighton Urban Area has maintained accelerated rates of growth. The report notes that “the Municipality does not have a sufficient ten (10) year supply of land available for residential development in the Brighton Urban Area, as required by the Provincial Policy Statement.” The report provides council with a recommendation to review the ‘Deferred Growth Area (DGA)’ and consider the re-designation of certain DGA lands to a designation permitting residential development.
4.3 Local Real Estate Trends

A recent affordable housing report by the County of Northumberland stated that in 2018, the average assessed value for a single detached home in the Municipality was $265,863.00, which is reportedly lower than the total averaged assessed value for the County as a whole. The report also noted that the average market rent in the Municipality in 2017 was $840.00, with a vacancy rate of 0.5%.

According to 2016 Census, there were 4,775 households in the Municipality, with 85.3% of the population owning their dwelling. In 2016, there were 4,780 occupied private dwellings in the Municipality, with 87.4% being single-detached homes. The census notes that the Municipality has a higher proportion of single-detached houses than Northumberland (79.4%). Conversely, the Municipality has a much smaller proportion of apartment buildings with less than five (5) storeys (5.1%), compared to Northumberland County (9.0%), and the Province (10.1%).

As of May 2019, the Brighton multiple listing service (MLS®) statistics indicated that the average house price in the Municipality is $437,080.00, indicating that 30 new properties have been listed in the last 56 days and the median days that a house is on the market is 31 days.
5.0
Planning Policy & Progress
5.0 Planning Policy & Progress

The Province gives directions to regions, counties and municipalities to manage land and resources. This section provides an overview of the provincial, regional, and local policy frameworks for residential land uses to understand what tools are available to municipalities to manage growth and regulate development.

5.1 Provincial & Regional Policies

The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13 as amended

The Planning Act is the basis for land use planning in Ontario and describes how land uses may be controlled. The Act provides the foundation for municipalities to prepare their official plans, zoning by-laws, and to utilize other planning tools to guide and regulate development.

Under the Planning Act, local municipal councils may pass zoning by-laws that regulate the minimum frontage, massing, location, height, location, size, floor area, spacing, character, use of building or structures and depth of a parcel of land, and the proportion of the land a building or structure may occupy (S.34.(1).4). Additionally, local municipal councils may pass site plan control by-laws to regulate external building design, site and streetscape matters including the character, scale, appearance, and design features of buildings (S.41(4)).

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2014

The Province issues The PPS under the Planning Act. It provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. These policies support the development of strong communities through the promotion of efficient land use and development patterns. The PPS provides policies for appropriate development while protecting resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of nature and the built environment.

Section 1.7.1 d) of the PPS states that “Long term economic prosperity should be supported by encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.”
A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019

This Plan informs decision-making regarding growth management and environmental protection in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH), in which the Municipality is included. The policies of this Plan regarding how land is developed is based on a set of guiding principles. A few principles relevant to this Study are:

- Support the achievement of complete communities that are designed to support healthy and active living and meet people’s needs for daily living throughout an entire lifetime.

- Prioritize intensification and higher densities in strategic growth areas to make efficient use of land and infrastructure and support transit viability.

- Support a range and mix of housing options, including second units and affordable housing to serve all sizes, incomes, and ages of households.

- Provide for different approaches to manage growth that recognize the diversity of communities in the GGH.

- Conserve and promote cultural heritage resources to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of all communities, including First Nations and Métis communities.

Northumberland County Official Plan, 2016

It is the intent of the County, and a requirement of the Planning Act, that all local Official Plans shall conform to the County Plan and be one (1) of the primary means of implementing policies. The Plan includes population and housing forecasts for the lower-tier municipalities within its jurisdiction, has policies relating to accommodating growth within urban areas, and sets minimum intensification targets. The Plan states that the urban area of Brighton has a minimum intensification target of 42%. This means that a minimum of 42% of all residential development occurring annually within the Municipality shall be within the built boundary of Brighton’s urban area.
The objectives of Northumberland County’s Official Plan Residential Areas policies are to:

a) Maintain and enhance the character and identity of existing residential areas;

b) Encourage the provision of a range of housing types to accommodate persons with diverse social and economic backgrounds, needs and desires while promoting the maintenance and improvement of existing housing;

c) Promote the efficient use of existing and planned infrastructure and public service facilities by supporting opportunities for various forms of residential intensification, where appropriate;

d) Encourage increases in density in new development areas to maximize the use of infrastructure and minimize the amount of land required for new development;

e) Promote a variety of complementary and compatible land uses in residential areas…;

f) Encourage a high standard of urban design for development and redevelopment;

g) Encourage local municipalities to establish comprehensive design guidelines and policies to foster the establishment of communities that are safe, functional and attractive; and,

h) Implement street designs that provide for pedestrian, cycling and other non-motorized modes of transportation to help create more healthy and complete communities.

The Downtown Areas policies of the Northumberland County Official Plan permit “the preservation and enhancement of cultural heritage resources that exist in these areas.” The Plan does not mention the preservation of neighbourhood character in its housing policies.
5.2 Local Planning Framework

When new development or redevelopment occurs, whether it is an addition to an existing dwelling or a new build, several provincial, regional and local policies and regulations must be considered. Figure 25 below illustrates a simplified version of the planning process with respect to development.

![Figure 25 - Simplified Illustration of the Planning Process](image-url)
Municipality of Brighton Official Plan, 2014

The Municipality’s Official Plan (OP) guides and directs the use of land within the Municipality. One (1) of the objectives of the Official Plan is to:

“provide for low density and medium density residential development within the Brighton Urban Area, thereby ensuring that a range of housing types and densities, and ranges of affordability will be available within the serviced urban centre in the years to come.” The OP states that “Residential development and redevelopment is to take place in a planned, orderly manner to ensure that residential uses are located in areas where they are compatible with adjacent land uses.” An additional relevant objective of the Official Plan is to “conserve all cultural heritage and archaeological resources and to promote recognition of the unique nature of cultural heritage, and its contribution to the character, civic pride, tourism potential, and economy of the community.”

With respect to heritage conservation, Section 2.4.11 of the OP states that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be identified prior to development and conserved, through the identification, protection, use and or management in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained... Development on lands adjacent to protected heritage properties shall only be permitted where it has been demonstrated that the significant heritage property will be conserved.”

There are intensification targets the municipality has to achieve to implement the Official Plan Policies. Section 3.1.2 discusses how residential intensification is to be in accordance with the recommendations of the Northumberland Growth Management Strategy and the GPGGH and that 42% of residential growth within the Brighton Urban Area is to occur through intensification within the built boundary of the Brighton Urban Area.

Section 3.1.3 discusses how the Municipality will direct 80% of the allocated residents to the Brighton Urban Area and the remaining 20% to all rural areas of the Municipality.

Section 3.1.2 of the OP notes that factors such as community character and heritage neighbourhoods will be considered when contemplating residential intensification.

The OP has a specific policy for protecting neighbourhood character. Section 3.1.8 of the OP states:

“While intensification, redevelopment and renewal are encouraged, all development within the Municipality shall have regard for the character and quality of established neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood character and the policies of Section 3.7.4, 3.7.5 and 3.7.6 must be considered at all times, in all neighbourhoods.”

D.M. Wills Associates Limited
Section 3.7.2.2 and Section 3.7.2.3 of the OP reference additional planning tools (cultural heritage master plan, cultural heritage planning statements). To date, neither of these planning tools have been prepared by the Municipality and therefore these policies are not in effect.

There are also enabling policies within the Official Plan through Section 3.7.4 concerning built heritage resources which would allow greater controls of existing and proposed developments within areas of cultural heritage value. The intent would be that these areas would have to be protected through the Ontario Heritage Act to enable these controls.

Housing Policies under Section 3.18 states that the Municipality will support the intensification requirements set out by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, by reviewing the Official Plan policies and Zoning By-laws and recommending changes that promote intensification.

Section 3.18 also states that the Municipality will encourage residential intensification where such intensification is in harmony with the existing lot fabric within an established neighbourhood or area and helps achieve the 42% intensification target.

With respect to accessory apartments, Section 3.18.1 of the OP allows up to one (1) accessory apartment in a single-detached, semi-detached or row housing dwelling, pursuant to Section 16(3) of the Planning Act.

Section 4.3.1 (Residential – Low Density Urban) of the OP states: “Various forms of housing will not be intermixed indiscriminately. Housing types will be arranged in a gradation so that medium density development will complement those of lower density, with sufficient spacing to ensure compatibility, while maintaining privacy and the amenity value of low density areas.” The OP suggests that new developments should include opportunities for coordinated design with existing development on adjacent properties.

Currently, under the Low-Density Residential Policies, Section 4.3.2 (Redevelopment, Infilling and Intensification Plans) the OP states:

“In reviewing redevelopment or infilling or intensification plans, Council will ensure that the character of the residential area will be maintained or enhanced and that such development will not burden existing facilities and services.

Residential development in older, established residential areas of heritage value is encouraged to employ designs, which maintain and reinforce the character of the area. This includes having regard to the existing scale and pattern of development and the existing streetscape qualities so as not to adversely impact upon heritage resources.”

For this Study, the Low Density Residential Area and Medium Density Residential Area designations are relevant to the study area. Section 4.3 (Residential – Low Density Urban) lists the permitted residential uses in low density areas as single and semi-detached dwellings and duplexes, whereas Section 4.4 (Residential- Medium Density Urban) includes row or cluster housing, converted single detached dwellings creating
not more than four (4) dwelling units, street front townhouses, and low rise apartment
dwelling houses. Within the Medium Density Urban Residential designation,
development is to occur at a minimum of 20 units per net hectare up to a maximum
density of 55 units per net hectare.

With respect to infilling, intensification, redevelopment and heritage buildings, the
policies in Section 4.4 are very similar to Section 4.3. Additional policies exist that
address the conversion of existing single unit residential dwellings to two (2), three (3), or
four (4) unit residential dwellings, noting that “any exterior renovations shall have regard
to the massing, design, and the relationship of the buildings to adjacent buildings and
streets.” Figure 26 on the following page illustrates the current designations of the lands
within the Study Area.
Municipality of Brighton Zoning By-law 140-2002

While the Official Plan provides for the land use designations and policies which permit low and medium density residential uses in the Study Area, the Municipality of Brighton Zoning By-law 140-2002 provides regulations that control the size of lots and the type of housing development that may occur on a residential lot. Zoning regulations essentially create a building envelope within which development can occur. The zoning regulations include provisions that control the size of the actual lots (lot area and frontage), the location of a house on a lot (setbacks) and the size of a house on the lot (height/massing/coverage).

Through the Official Plan, the Study Area is predominantly within the Low Density Residential Area, but specific sites have been amended to Medium Density Residential Areas in conjunction with site-specific residential zoning providing for a medium density residential use such as townhomes.

The predominant areas that remain as low density residential contain two (2) zones: Urban Residential Type 1 (R1) and Urban Residential Type 2 (R2). The R1 Zone allows for single detached and duplex dwellings. The R2 Zone also allows for semi-detached dwellings in addition to singles and duplexes and a number of other uses including triplexes, fourplexes, and nursing homes. Figure 27 illustrates the standards for the Urban Residential Two ‘R2’ Zone. Figure 28 illustrates the zoning for the properties located within the Study Area.
### Figure 27 - Standards for the Urban Residential Two ‘R2’ Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Provisions</th>
<th>Single Detached Dwelling</th>
<th>Semi-detached Dwelling</th>
<th>Duplex Dwelling</th>
<th>Triplex Dwelling</th>
<th>Fourplex Dwelling</th>
<th>Nursing or Retirement Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Lot Frontage:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Interior lot</td>
<td>15.0 m</td>
<td>10.0 m/ unit</td>
<td>20.0 m</td>
<td>23.0 m</td>
<td>30.0 m</td>
<td>30.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Corner lot</td>
<td>17.4 m</td>
<td>14.5 m/ unit</td>
<td>26.0 m</td>
<td>29.0 m</td>
<td>36.0 m</td>
<td>36.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Lot Area:</strong></td>
<td>400 sq m</td>
<td>300 sq m/ unit</td>
<td>600 sq m</td>
<td>695 sq m</td>
<td>1000 sq m</td>
<td>1000 sq m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Lot Coverage:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Landscaped Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Residential Density:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24.5 units/ net hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Front Yard:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 m (2) (3)</td>
<td>4.5 m (2) (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Exterior Side Yard:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 m (2) (3)</td>
<td>4.5 m (2) (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Interior Side Yard:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 m (1) (3)</td>
<td>1.2 m on one (1) side, n/a on the attached side (3)</td>
<td>1.2 m (1) (3)</td>
<td>4.5 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
<td>6.0 m (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Rear Yard:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 m (3)</td>
<td>7.5 m (3)</td>
<td>7.5 m (3)</td>
<td>7.5 m (3)</td>
<td>9.0 m (3)</td>
<td>9.0 m (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Height:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Main building</td>
<td>11.0 m</td>
<td>11.0 m</td>
<td>11.0 m</td>
<td>11.0 m</td>
<td>11.0 m</td>
<td>11.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Accessory building</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Garage Width:</strong></td>
<td>6.1 m</td>
<td>3.5 m</td>
<td>6.1 m</td>
<td>9.0 m</td>
<td>12.0 m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Driveway Width:</strong></td>
<td>6.1 m</td>
<td>3.5 m</td>
<td>6.1 m</td>
<td>6.1 m</td>
<td>6.1 m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of Special Provisions (#)

1. The minimum required interior side yard is 3.5 metres if the side yard contains a driveway accessing a private garage located in the rear yard of the lot that is accessed by a driveway crossing the front lot line.

2. The wall of a private garage that contains the opening for vehicular access shall be set back a minimum of 6.0 metres from the lot line the driveway crosses to access the private garage.

3. No part of a main building shall be constructed within 10.0 metres of an Environmental Protection (EP) Zone boundary, or a top-of-bank as defined in Section 2 of this By-law. No part of an accessory building or structure shall be constructed within 7.5 metres of an Environmental Protection (EP) Zone boundary, or a top-of-bank as defined in Section 2 of this By-law.
Zoning By-laws Definitions

Important to the interpretation of Zoning By-laws are the definitions of standards and aspects of the lot and building. The following are the definitions of terms often used in zoning controls from Zoning By-law 140-2002.

**Dwelling Unit:** Means a suite which functions as a housekeeping unit used or intended to be used as a domicile by one (1) or more persons; containing cooking, eating, living, sleeping and sanitary facilities; and having a private entrance from outside the building or from a common hallway or stairway inside or outside the building.

**Dwelling Unit, Accessory Apartment:** (added by By-law 220-2004). Means a dwelling unit that is accessory to the main permitted use on a lot.

**Dwelling, Apartment:** Means a dwelling unit in an apartment building.

**Floor Area:** Means the total area of all floors in a building, measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls of the building at each floor level, or from the centre line of common walls separating individual premises within multiple unit buildings.

**Dwelling, Duplex:** Means a dwelling unit in a building that is divided horizontally into two (2) dwelling units, each of which has an independent entrance either directly to the outside or through a common vestibule.

**Floor Area, Gross:** Means the aggregate of the floor areas of a building above or below established grade, but excluding car parking areas within the building that are below established grade.

**Dwelling, Fourplex:** Means a dwelling unit in a building that is divided horizontally or a combination of vertically and horizontally into four dwelling units, each of which has an independent entrance either directly to the outside or through a common vestibule.

**Floor Area, Net:** Means the aggregate of the floor areas of a building above or below established grade, but excluding car parking areas within the building, stairways, elevator shafts, service/mechanical rooms and penthouses, washrooms, garbage/recycling rooms, staff locker and lunch rooms, loading areas, any space with a floor to ceiling height of less than 1.8 metres and any part of a basement that is unfinished, is used solely for storage purposes and is not accessible to the public.

**Dwelling, Semi-Detached:** Means a dwelling unit in a building that is divided vertically into two dwelling units that shares a common wall above grade.

**Floor Space Index:** Means the gross floor area of all buildings on a lot divided by the lot area.
Lot: Means a parcel of land that abuts a public street that is registered as a legally conveyable parcel of land in the Registry Office.

Dwelling, Townhouse: Means a dwelling unit in a townhouse building.

Dwelling, Triplex: Means a dwelling unit in a building that is divided horizontally or a combination of horizontally and vertically into three (3) dwelling units, each of which has an independent entrance to the outside or through a common vestibule.

Height: Means with reference to a building or structure, the vertical distance measured from the established grade of such building or structure to:

i. the highest point of the roof surface or the parapet, whichever is the greater, of a flat roof;
ii. the deckline of a mansard roof;
iii. the mean level between eaves and ridge of a gabled, hip or gambrel roof or other type of pitched roof; and,
iv. in case of a structure with no roof, the highest point of the said structure.

Notwithstanding the above, any ornamental roof construction features including towers, steeples or cupolas, shall not be included in the calculation of height. Mechanical features, such as structures containing the equipment necessary to control an elevator, are permitted to project a maximum of five (5) metres above the highest point of the roof surface, regardless of the height of the building.

Lot Frontage: Means the horizontal distance between the interior side and/or exterior side lot lines, with such distance being measured perpendicularly to the line joining the mid-point of the front lot line with the mid-point of the rear lot line at a point on that line six (6) metres from the front lot line.

In the case of a lot with no rear lot line, the point where two interior side lot lines intersect shall be the point from which a line is drawn to the mid-point of the front lot line. In the case of a corner lot with a daylighting triangle, the exterior side lot line shall be deemed to extend to its hypothetical point of intersection with the extension of the front lot line for the purposes of calculating lot frontage.

For the purposes of this By-law, the Water Frontage of a lot as defined in this By-law shall constitute Lot Frontage for a lot within a Shoreline Residential

Lot Area: Means the total horizontal area within the lot lines of a lot.

Lot, Interior: Means a lot situated between adjacent lots and having access to one (1) public street.

Lot, Corner: Means a lot at the intersection of two (2) or more public streets or upon two (2) parts of the same public street with such street or streets containing an angle of not more than 135 degrees or a lot upon which the tangents at the street extremities of the interior side lot lines contain an angle of not more than 135
degrees. The corner of a lot on a curved corner shall be that point on the street line nearest the point of intersection of the said tangents.

**Lot Line, Interior Side:** Means a lot line, other than a rear lot line that does not abut a public street.

**Lot Coverage:** Means that percentage of the lot covered by all buildings and shall not include that portion of such lot area which is occupied by a building or portion thereof which is completely below established grade. Lot coverage in each Zone shall be deemed to apply only to that portion of such lot which is located within said Zone.

**Lot Line:** Means a line delineating any boundary of a lot.

**Lot Line, Exterior Side:** Means the lot line of a corner lot, other than the front lot line, which divides the lot from a public street.

**Lot Line, Rear:** Means the lot line opposite to, and most distant from, the front lot line.

**Lot Line, Front:** Means the line which divides the lot from the public street, but, in the case of:

i. a corner lot, the shortest of the lot lines that divides the lot from the public street shall be deemed to be the front lot line;

ii. a corner lot where such lot lines are of equal length and where both lot lines abut a public street under the same jurisdiction, the Corporation may designate either street line as the front lot line;

iii. a lot that is separated from a public street by a public park and provided the lot is accessed by a lane, the shortest lot line that abuts the public park shall be deemed to be the front lot line; and,

iv. a through lot, the longest of the lot lines which divide the lot from the public streets shall be deemed to be the front lot line. If both such lot lines are of equal length, the Corporation may designate either street line as the front lot line.

**Outdoor Storage:** Means an area of land used in conjunction with a business located within a building or structure on the same lot, for the storage of goods and materials.

**Lot, Through:** Means a lot bounded on opposite sides by a public street. However, if the lot qualifies as being both a corner lot and a through lot, such lot is deemed to be a corner lot for the purposes of this By-law.

**Outdoor Storage Use:** Means an outdoor storage area forming the main use of a lot, such as a construction equipment and/or materials yard, but does not include a motor vehicle storage compound, or a salvage or wrecking yard.

**Parking Space:** Means an unobstructed space for the parking of a motor vehicle.
**Separation Distance**: Means the horizontal distance between buildings or structures measured from the closest points on the exterior walls of such buildings or structures.

**Sight Triangle**: Means the triangular space formed by the street lines of a corner lot and a line drawn from a point in each street line 9 metres from the intersection of the street lines, measured along the street lines. Where the two street lines do not intersect at a point, the point of intersection shall be deemed to be the intersection of the linear projection of the street lines or intersection of the tangents of the street lines.

**Minor Variances**

Section 45 of the *Planning Act*, notes that a Minor variance is a minor change to a performance standard under the Zoning By-law, granted by the Committee of Adjustment. If a property owner would like to make a change or addition to an existing building; they are required to comply with current zoning regulations in order to obtain a building permit. If their addition or change does not fully comply with the zoning regulations, the *Planning Act* allows for considerations of minor adjustments to existing regulations of the Zoning By-law. These adjustments are referred to as “minor variances” and are considered through a planning application to a local body known as the Committee of Adjustment. The Committee of Adjustment process is a public process with public notification requirements and the decisions are subject to appeal. Applications are assessed based on prescribed tests set out under the *Planning Act* including a requirement that the variance maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

**Site Plan Control**

Section 41 of the *Planning Act*, notes that Site Plan Control addresses the functioning and design of development on a site. In general, Site Plan Control ensures that any proposed development can function appropriately on a site. Site Plan Control generally addresses issues of access, loading, parking, site circulation, lighting, landscaping, waste disposal, grading and drainage. The Site Plan Process is not a process for which public notice is required and there is no right of appeal of a decision other than by an applicant.

**Building Code**

The Building Code and the *Building Code Act, 1992* governs the construction, renovation, change or use, and demolition of buildings in Ontario. The Municipality issues a building permit to a property owner or contractor pursuant to the Building Code to allow them to proceed with the construction or renovation of a property. The Building Code provides implementing standards to ensure public safety in newly constructed buildings. These standards are established by the province and enforced by local municipalities through the reviewing and issuing of building permits, inspections during construction, and the issuing of demolition permits. The building permit helps enforce the requirements of the Building Code, Zoning By-law as well as other laws and standards to ensure compliance during construction as well as the safety of the building and its occupants.
5.3 Best Practice Review

Several Ontario municipalities have undertaken similar studies to discuss and understand how to balance new development within mature residential neighbourhoods. These municipalities have overcome this challenge by implementing a variety of approaches and strategies including the development of policies and regulatory tools. While some approaches amend a municipality’s regulatory framework as it applies to all low density residential areas within its jurisdiction, other approaches involve the identification of specific neighbourhoods and implementation of a localized policy or regulatory overlay.

This section briefly explores how a select few municipalities have addressed the issue of balancing development and redevelopment within their mature neighbourhoods.

Town of Newmarket

In September of 2011, the Town of Newmarket (Town) Council directed Newmarket staff to investigate the matter of infill development and its compatibility in the Town’s “stable residential areas”. In June of 2013, a site-specific amendment to the Zoning By-law was enacted. There are two (2) “stable residential neighbourhoods” located in the central area of the Town. The outcomes of the Study proposed changes to the R1-D and R1-C residential zone regulations. It recommended an “overlay zone”, where lots within the “overlay zone” would be subject to alternate zone regulations. The Town established a site-specific zoning standard within their stable residential areas. The requirements and restrictions applied to those areas were in relation to maximum building height, maximum lot coverage and minimum front yard setback.

In January of 2019, Council enacted Interim Control By-law 2019-04 to restrict the level of change in the Town’s established neighbourhoods until new direction has been established through the completion of a mature neighbourhood study. The Interim Control By-law is in effect for one (1) year and temporarily prohibits the following in several identified areas in the Town:

- Rebuilding a residential dwelling with 25% or more floor area.
- Expanding the floor area of existing residential dwellings by 25% or more.
- Building new residential dwellings on vacant lots.
- Increasing the height of residential dwellings.

Similar to this Study, the Town’s staff are currently examining the regulatory framework of the Town’s Zoning By-law and Official Plan and will propose recommendations that will assist in maintaining the existing character of the mature neighbourhoods.
Town of Halton Hills

In February of 2016, the Town of Halton Hills (Town) enacted an Interim Control By-law to conduct a Mature Neighbourhoods Character Study, which began in May of 2016. The study’s purpose was to examine whether the existing regulatory framework of the Town’s Zoning By-law was effective in maintaining the character of mature neighbourhoods, and to propose recommendations for amendments if necessary. On May 29, 2017 the recommendations were approved by Council and following the mandated appeal period under the Planning Act, an Official Plan Amendment (By-law 2017-0032) and a Zoning By-law Amendment (By-law 2017-0033) came into effect on June 29, 2017.

The Official Plan Amendment included reinforcing existing Official Plan objectives by strengthening policies that addressed the character and identity of existing residential areas and new housing. One (1) of the new policies reads “maintain and enhance the character of Mature Neighbourhood Areas by ensuring that new housing, replacement housing, additions, and alterations are compatible, context sensitive, and respectful of the existing character of the neighbourhood.” Additionally, a new section was added to the Official Plan titled: “New Housing, Replacement Housing, Additions and Alterations in Mature Neighbourhood Areas.” This section requires that new development is “compatible, context sensitive, and respectful of existing neighbourhood character.” Additionally, three (3) new definitions were added including: character, compatible, and mature neighbourhood areas.

The Zoning By-law Amendment established new definitions for lot coverage; half storey; and Structure. The Amendment also established a new minimum driveway length of 5.5 m, and established new zoning standards that address side yard setbacks (minimum), exterior side yard setbacks (minimum), maximum lot coverage, maximum building height, and also stipulated that a balcony or deck is not permitted on the second storey in the interior side in a mature neighbourhood.
6.0
Summary of Findings
6.0 Summary of Findings

Engaging with a diversity of stakeholders within a community is crucial in identifying what is important to a neighbourhood and the community at large. At the core of the Study is community consultation. The outcomes of this Report will inform the analysis and recommendation phases of the Study. The following are the key findings from the background review:

I. Neighbourhood character is typically defined by three (3) types of features: property, neighbourhood, and building related features. Brighton’s mature Neighbourhood Study Area is characterized by a variety of these features including street trees, a mix of housing types, and a mix of architectural styles.

II. Public consultation through the steering committee, online survey, neighbourhood walking tour, and design charrette provided input on defining neighbourhood character and identifying features that are most important to the community and additionally identified key issues related to development pressures.

III. Background research on trends and factors influencing change in the Municipality identified changes in demographics and the housing market which has led to the slow evolution of the housing stock in Brighton as renovations and new builds reflect the changing needs of the population.

IV. Going forward, there are specific zoning regulations and provisions with respect to development and redevelopment that need to be examined throughout the remainder of the Study. As the brief best practice review demonstrates, numerous municipalities have implemented various changes to their planning regulations to control development in their mature neighbourhoods which span from regulations that are quite prescriptive to those that are more flexible.

6.1 Next Steps

This Background Report summarizes the information collected from the initial stages of the Municipality of Brighton Mature Neighbourhood Study. This report will inform the upcoming public open house and the development of the draft recommendations report.

The next steps of the Mature Neighbourhood Study will include and be informed by additional public feedback that will be collected from the public open houses. This information will be evaluated in the next stage of the Study. The recommendation and options will be drafted in August 2019 and will be presented to the public in a second public open house. The public will be invited to provide feedback on the draft options. Public consultation results will be incorporated in the final recommendation report to be presented to Municipal Council in December 2019.
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Mature Neighbourhood Study Survey
Mature Neighbourhood Study Community Feedback Survey

Tell us what you value about the character of your neighbourhood!

The Municipality of Brighton has initiated a Mature Neighbourhood Study in the former Town of Brighton to gain a better understanding, with community input, of the elements and qualities that contribute to neighbourhood character. The study is assessing whether the policies of the Official Plan and the regulatory framework of the Municipality’s Zoning By-law are effective in managing development and maintaining the character of the mature neighbourhoods.

By completing this survey, we invite you to share your input about what you value about the character of these neighbourhoods.

Neighbourhood Character

The following lists include some of the features that are often used to define the character of a neighbourhood. We are interested in hearing your thoughts about these features, and others, as they relate to neighbourhood character.

1. Which NEIGHBOURHOOD FEATURES best define neighbourhood character, in your opinion. Please select all that apply.
   - Lotting Pattern/ Street Pattern/ Streetscape
   - Street Trees
   - Sidewalks
   - Street Lighting
   - Road Widths
   - Environment and Protected Areas

2. Which LOT and HOUSING FEATURES best define neighbourhood character, in your opinion. Please select all that apply.
   - Architectural Style
   - Building materials, Colours and Textures
   - Building Massing/Volume
   - Building Height
   - Size of Homes (Floor Area)
   - Façade Details
   - Building Orientation (Front, Side and Rear Yard Setbacks)
   - Orientation of Corner Lots
   - Lot Coverage
   - Distance between buildings
   - Roofline Pattern
   - Location and Placement of Porches and Decks
   - Location and Placement of Driveways and Walkways
   - Style, Side and Location of Garages
   - Trees and Landscaping
   - Fencing
3. Please specify any other LOT and HOUSING FEATURES that, in your opinion, best define neighbourhood character.

4. What FEATURES are the most important? (Please rank the following features with 1 as the most important and 22 being the least important)

   ___ Lotting Pattern / Street Pattern/ Streetscape
   ___ Street Trees
   ___ Sidewalks
   ___ Street Lighting
   ___ Road Widths
   ___ Environment and Protected Areas
   ___ Architectural Style
   ___ Building Material, Colours and Textures
   ___ Building Massing/Volume
   ___ Building Height
   ___ Size of Homes (floor area)
   ___ Façade details
   ___ Building Orientation (front, side and rear yard setbacks)
   ___ Orientation of corner lots
   ___ Lot coverage
   ___ Distance between buildings
   ___ Roofline pattern
   ___ Location and placement of porches and decks
   ___ Location and placement of driveways and walkways
   ___ Style, size and location of garages
   ___ Trees and landscaping
   ___ Fencing
5. Are there any neighbourhoods or buildings located within the study area that you feel have significant heritage features that should be preserved? Please indicate the address below or identify the location on the enclosed map.

6. Do you have any additional comments or concerns that you would like to discuss?

7. Please indicate your postal code.

For more information, please contact Rupert Dobbin (Special Projects Planner) at RDobbin@brighton.ca or (613) 475-1162 or Diana Keay (Consulting Project Manager) at DiKeay@dmwills.com or (705) 742- 2297 ext. 245

All responses will be confidential and information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection Act.

If you require accessibility under the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, please contact either Project Team member above.

Please mail in or drop off the completed survey to the following address:

Attention: Rupert Dobbin
Municipality of Brighton
67 Sharp Road
Brighton, ON
K0K 1H0
Study Area as Identified by Interim Control By-law 127-2017
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Mature Neighbourhood Study Survey Results
## Mature Neighbourhood Study Survey Comments

**Question 3:** Please specify any other LOT and HOUSING FEATURES that, in your opinion, best define neighbourhood character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neat and tidy lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tidy driveways and front yards, landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Geez, they all define “neighbourhood character”. What are you looking for here??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Landscape and green lawns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lot size and spacing between homes we don’t need infill in mature neighbourhood keep density to new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pride of ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community neighbours, people who live here year round and take an interest in the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Front Veranda or porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Diversity of façade, Dead end streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Paved vs gravel road/ boulevards/ sidewalks/ drainage ditches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Country charm, rural, single dwelling homes, mature trees, sidewalks, porches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I love the variety of different looking houses side by side, built at different times. I definitely dislike the generic cookie cutter houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Asphalt older neighbourhood streets for preventative maintenance. Have to build new neighbourhoods, but at the same time replace older neighbourhood roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Underground wiring for street lights; cleanliness; trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I don’t understand your emphasis on mature neighbourhood character. It appears to me that the study area is already populated and lot patterns, architectural style, façade details, road widths, etc. are all in place &amp; whether or not they define the character-they are here to stay! Money spent on this neighbourhood character would be much better spent on existing mature neighbourhood needs-drainage, lighting, pavement repairs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Single family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The age of the Architectural Style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Housing layout is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Owned homes VS rented homes (people who own their homes seem to take better care of their yards and such **This is generalized of course) Additionally-SIDEWALKS and speed control create neighbourhoods- allowing people to walk safely. (IE sidewalk ends on Prince Edward Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Smooth road surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Street width, and speed on the street. Cars not stopping at the four way stop sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Maintenance (how well it’s kept and maintained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Variety of housing styles and choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cleanliness of streets, curbs, driveways limited to family vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mature trees, lot size and space between homes, maintained sidewalks, tidy lots and roads, good lighting, varied architecture.

Density, no on-street parking, access to good walking paths, in Brighton’s case a better connection with the downtown area and the Brighton waterfront and Presquile area.

IF IT HAS A NEAT AND TIDY YARD

Consistent size and architectural compatibility

Quiet

None

Landscaping

n/a

Quality of Construction, Tidy maintenance, variety (i.e. neighbours do not have exact same house)

Natural environment

**Question 5:** Are there any neighbourhoods or buildings located within the study area that you feel have significant heritage features that should be preserved? Please indicate the street address below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>House at Corner of Alice &amp; Dundas with wrap around veranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 Russell st/ alice and Dundas corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Main Street buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40 and 36 young st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Main Street (white house)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anything older that 75 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes. Will have to get the numbers. Brighton has many historical homes that need to be saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>All.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Any downtown Main St./ Prince Edward St. Heritage buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Any century home should be preserved- however it doesn’t seem fair to dictate what somebody can do with their own home…I feel it is more important to ensure sewage and water is more important ..as well as ensuring sidewalks are accessible and safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Century homes at Chapel/Center Sts; east side of Prince Edward St. at Main; south side of Main St. Prince Edward to Division St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cannot be sure what the study area is since the map is too small to identify all the street if we are to do this survey better, we’ll need a bigger map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Not for me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Street, (businesses area)

Some of the old houses on Main Street.

Unknown

Don’t know addresses without getting out and driving around so I would start by at least looking at homes over 100 yrs old.

THE OLD DARRINGTON HHOME ON SANDFORD ST.

Done

None

None

8 Russell st this section needs input from the heritage advisory committee

No

Richardson Street, Main Street, Centre Street, Young Street

Question 6: Do you have any additional comments or concerns that you would like to discuss?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Untended areas such as the corner of Elizabeth and Young. Old building near Coles Lumber. Weeds on street edges and at the railroad crossing on Prince Edward. Possible hazardous waste on the old Cooey property. Great lack of truly affordable housing for seniors. Cost of Applefest seniors accommodation and others like this. Thousands of dollars per month for one room (plus additional costs) is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We need to keep the higher density in new developments. The mature area tend not to have the road width or sidewalks or parking to support the higher density. I’m sure the mature areas need infrastructure up dates to accommodate the density which doesn’t happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Having new subdivisions attach to what were formerly quiet and/or dead end streets changes the whole character of neighbourhoods, with huge increases in traffic, noise, dirt and litter, combines with the loss of green space, trees and charm that this community used to have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No more monster homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>If someone wants to tear down a house why not look at moving a historical home instead? Like Markham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The outrageous number of housing developments is ruining the charm of Brighton. The identical houses are ugly and the yards are super small. Use the space for a park or something pretty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asphalt older roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The TRAIN WHISTLE needs to stop! The older neighbourhoods are the most vulnerable to sleep disruption during the night. PR. Edward St at least!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sidewalks on Chapel Street are badly in need of replacement. Lighting is also poor in some areas. Drainage problems persist- Frequently water covers road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from side to side. Parking is not allowed on either side of street “no parking” on one side should be sufficient.

<p>| 13 | Grade separation @ John St. to eliminate heavy truck and large traffic volumes from what really is now mostly residential area. No logical option for commercial traffic to get south of rail corridor or traffic going to prince Edward county. School buses etc. would prefer grade separation. The new county rd…. Via JOHN St. |
| 14 | No |
| 15 | Nil |
| 16 | No |
| 17 | The Municipality MUST make an effort to upgrade sidewalks in out town. (IE there is no sidewalk in some areas… the curbs are not wheelchair accessible AND there needs to be garbage cans IE the dog area on Stephen Street (behind the mailboxes) there is no garbage can for people to dispose of dog waste. I feel that the pot holes are an issue- and the attempts to fix them are not effective- they are patching them-not fixing them... within a few weeks- the ‘patch’ is gone and the hole is even larger. I also feel that speed control is an issue. Why do some neighbourhoods have a reduced speed (40km) where Prince Edward is still 50 AND many people are travelling at much higher rates of speed. Finally- I wonder if Brighton would consider having the ‘fire burn notice’ that many municipalities have at the bottom of the sign when we come into town. The sign either says ‘no or low risk, some risk, medium risk and fire ban’- It seems odd that our town doesn’t have that… |
| 18 | Reinstate parking on Chapel St. (south side only), removing it has increased the traffic speed along the street. |
| 19 | The Municipality of Brighton is merely a registered corporation. The towns people are not your slaves and I do not appreciate the municipalities attempt to restrict freedom and liberty. I would be willing to litigate against attempts to do so. |
| 20 | Hope this is satisfactory and I am open to further information in this regard. |
| 21 | Only vehicles not doing a full stop at the stop signs |
| 22 | No |
| 23 | What exactly is the main purpose of this survey? My house is within the designated area. |
| 24 | Just start enforcing owners of Lots and Properties that need to be cleaned up. |
| 25 | Have noticed a steady decline over the past 5 years living here in the maintenance and curb appeal of many downtown businesses, resulting in us shopping elsewhere or to businesses showing more pride in their stores. Compare with Picton, Brighton shows a much more dilapidated look. |
| 26 | Why are there no 2 storey homes in this town? Young families are moving here and its all bungalows great for retired people but would be nice to see some 2 storey single family homes being built. |
| 27 | NO |
| 28 | Done |
| 29 | No |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>Would like some property standards. I not look out my picture window a huge RV. And a yard with construction materials and equipment from homeowners business in a residential area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>White I agree that building style/architecture is important, I believe that attempt by the municipality to CONTROL such features will only add to the cost of housing. Inclusion of trees/parkland/attractive street lights in new developments is effective toward creating beautiful neighbourhoods and can easily be requested as part of a subdivision agreement. Further, the municipality should take a co-operative stance to support builders. Many already build quality, attractive homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Neighbourhood Walking Tour Worksheet
NEIGHBOURHOOD WALKING TOUR & DESIGN CHARRETTE
WEDNESDAY APRIL 24TH, 2019 FROM 9:00AM – 2:00PM (5.7KM)

Directions from Meeting Point

A From Memorial Park, walk west down Main Street to the Health Centre. Cross the street and walk east towards Maplewood Avenue.

B Turn right onto Maplewood Avenue; in two blocks turn left onto Chapel Street and walk the entire length of the street where you will then turn right onto Prince Edward Street.

C In one block, turn left onto Gross Street and follow Gross Street as it becomes Perry Ave and walk to the end of the street.

D Turn right on Elizabeth Street; walk one block, turn right onto Dufferin Street and walk to the end of the street; turn around and walk back to Elizabeth Street.

E Turn left; walk one block, cross the street at the crosswalk; continue one block and turn right onto Alice Street.

F Walk way up Alice Street; Turn right onto Singleton Street; walk one block and turn left onto Hope Street; At the end of Hope Street, turn right onto Lakeview Heights.

G Walk to the end of the Lakeview Heights before it turns into Sarill Lane. Turn around and walk back down Lakeview Heights, left onto Hope Street, right onto Singleton Street; walk two blocks to Young Street.

H Turn left onto Young Street, and walk down the street to Main Street, turn right and walk back to the starting point, Memorial Park.
Tell us what you value about the character of your neighbourhood!

Please join us on April 24th from 9:00am to 11:00am for the guided neighbourhood walk (5.7km) followed by a design charrette held at Trinity St. Andrews United Church, located at 56 Prince Edward Street, Brighton from 11:00am – 2:00pm (lunch provided)! If you are unable to make it at this time, you can conduct a neighbourhood walk on your own on any of the streets identified in the highlighted study area. Once complete, please submit your feedback form to the Municipal Office located at 67 Sharp Road, Brighton ON, K0K 1H0 by April 23rd to ensure your feedback can be incorporated into the design charrette.

The following list includes some of the features that are often used to define the character of a neighbourhood. During the walking tour, we are interested in hearing your thoughts about these features, and others, as they relate to neighbourhood character.

Please check the boxes below to indicate which features best define neighbourhood character, in your opinion.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD FEATURES**

- Lotting Pattern / Street Pattern / Streetscape
- Street Trees
- Sidewalks
- Street Lighting
- Road Widths
- Environment and Protected Areas

**LOT AND HOUSING FEATURES**

- Architectural Style
- Building materials, Colours and Textures
- Building Massing/ Volume
- Building Height
- Size of Homes (Floor Area)
- Façade Details
- Building Orientation (Front, Side, and Rear Yard Setbacks)
- Orientation of Corner Lots
- Lot Coverage
- Distance between buildings
- Roofline Pattern
- Location and Placement of Porches and Decks
- Location and Placement of Driveways and Walkways
- Style, Size and Location of Garages
- Trees and Landscaping
- Fencing
- Other

Please rank the three features that you believe to have the strongest impact on neighbourhood character.

1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________

Do you have any additional comments or concerns?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

How did you find out about this walking tour?

- Municipal website
- Mailing list
- Newspaper
- Library
- Other: __________________________
FOCAL POINT EXERCISE

Find a focal point a focal point is a building or group of buildings in your neighbourhood that stand out, it may be larger, have multiple uses or may be a large destination or institution. Municipal buildings, schools, recreation centre, even your local grocery store could be your focal point.

1. Circle and label your chosen focal point on the attached map.

2. Visit the site and complete the checklist below. Answer the questions provided and add any additional commentary you feel is appropriate.

PROVISIONS FOR WALKING

- Wide, comfortable sidewalks
- Street trees, shade
- Pedestrian access to main entrance
- Accessible pathways
- Well-lit paths
- Public seating, benches
- Good access to transit
- Waste disposal
- Pedestrian paths have buffer from traffic

PROVISIONS FOR CYCLING

- Bike lanes, any type
- Bike parking, any type
- Secure bike parking, bike lockers etc.
- Signs of programming that encourages cycling
- Are bikes allowed indoors?
- Public Washrooms
- Connections to any public cycling route

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

For more information, visit the Municipality of Brighton Website at www.brighton.ca or contact Rupert Dobbin (Special Projects Planner) at RDobbin@brighton.ca or (613) 475-1162 or alternatively Diana Keay (Consulting Project Manager) at DiKeay@dmwills.com or (705) 742-2297 ext. 245
Appendix D
Design Charrette Ranking Features Worksheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lotting Pattern/ Streetscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Widths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Protected Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material, Colours &amp; Textures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Massing/ Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Homes (floor area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Orientation (front, side and rear yard setbacks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of corner lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofline Pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location &amp; placement of porches &amp; decks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location &amp; placement of driveways &amp; walkways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style, size and location of garages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees &amp; landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>