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1.0 Introduction

The Township of King has initiated the review of existing zoning within the Urban Areas of King City and Schomberg. Zoning By-laws are implemented and administered by municipalities to regulate the use of land and the character, location and size of buildings and structures. Zoning By-laws are considered to be the primary tools for implementing Official Plans, as they may translate high-level planning objectives and policies into more detailed land use permissions and lot and building requirements. This section outlines the purpose of the Zoning By-law Review for the King City and Schomberg Urban Areas as well as the purpose of this Discussion Paper.

1.1 Background

The Township of King has identified a need to review and update zoning for the Urban Areas of King City and Schomberg. Specifically, the outcome of this review will be the preparation and completion of new Zoning By-laws for the Urban Areas of King City and Schomberg (Figures 1.1 and 1.2, respectively). Alternatively, the outcome of this review may be the development of a single Urban Areas Zoning By-law that addresses all three Urban Areas of King Township, including King City, Schomberg and Nobleton. The delineation of these Urban Areas is consistent with the respective Community Plans for King City and Schomberg. This project follows the completion of a new Zoning By-law for the Nobleton Urban Area.

The intent of this review is to ensure that zoning for King City and Schomberg:

- Is consistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement;
- Implements and conforms to the policies of the King City and Schomberg Community Plans, including consideration for a variety of policy conformity issues and opportunities;
- Considers the implications of the on-going Official Plan Review for the Township of King;
- Addresses other issues with the current zoning by-laws, as raised by the public, stakeholders and Township staff;
- Implements other relevant studies, such as the King City and Schomberg Core Area Design Guidelines, the Employment Area Design Guidelines, the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan and the Community Improvement Plan for Nobleton, King City and Schomberg, as appropriate; and
- Considers improvements to the By-law’s administration, interpretation and clarity.

1.2 Process

This project is being completed in accordance with a three-stage work program:

- Stage 1 focuses on a background review and review of existing by-laws, and includes opportunities for public and stakeholder consultation, specifically to help the project team
identify issues with the current by-law and consider them through this process. The outcome of Stage 1 will be a finalized version of this report which considers consultation in Stage 1.

- Stage 2 will involve preparing the Draft Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg, which will be presented to the public and stakeholders.
- Stage 3 involves refinement and enactment of the Zoning By-law(s) through consultation with the public and stakeholders.

Figure 1.1 | Study Area – King City Urban Area

Figure 1.2 | Study Area – Schomberg Urban Area
1.3 Purpose of this Discussion Paper

The purpose of this Discussion Paper is to outline the key potential issues to be addressed through this project and identify the preliminary options and recommendations to address key issues.

The process of reviewing and updating a comprehensive zoning by-law is a complex, iterative and often a very technical process, which may involve many minor changes and improvements to the current zoning by-law that is in effect. Accordingly, it is not the intent of this Discussion Paper to outline all of the issues and changes that will be made to the current zoning for King City and Schomberg, but to outline the key issues and changes that are required, based on a review of background material and consultation with interested persons. This Discussion Paper is intended to function as the basis for preparing the new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg, by identifying key directions and issues to be addressed.

The directions outlined in this report are preliminary in nature. Consultation with stakeholders and Township staff, as well as residents, will greatly benefit this report so that clear, agreed-upon directions may be developed, and that there is a comprehensive understanding of the issues involved in preparing the new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg.
2.0 Planning Context

Zoning by-laws are prepared under the Planning Act and must also be consistent with or conform to other Provincial policies and plans. Furthermore, zoning by-laws must conform to the policies of the Township’s applicable Official Plan (i.e., the Community Plans for King City and Schomberg). Other studies may also indicate important issues and opportunities that can be addressed by a zoning by-law. This section includes a review of relevant legislation, policies and studies.

2.1 Planning Act

The Planning Act provides the tools for municipalities to regulate land use in Ontario’s communities. The Planning Act outlines matters of Provincial interest (Section 2) and enables the Province to issue Policy Statements to provide direction to municipalities on matters of Provincial interest (Section 3). Provincial planning policy is discussed in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of this Discussion Paper.

The Planning Act enables municipal councils to implement a variety tools that relate to the planning and relation of land use and the built environment. Under Section 16 of the Planning Act, most municipalities, including the Township of King, must prepare and adopt official plans in accordance with the process and requirements for content as described in the Act. Official plans contain goals, objectives and policies to guide decision making on a wide range of land use planning and related matters. Municipal decisions, by-laws and public works are to conform to the policies of the official plan (Section 24(1)). The Community Plans for King City and Schomberg, now in effect, were developed and approved under this section of the Act.

Section 34 of the Planning Act enables councils to develop and pass zoning by-laws to regulate the use of land and the location, height, bulk, size, floor area, spacing, character and use of buildings and structures, as well as parking and loading requirements. Additionally, zoning by-laws may be used to prohibit the use of land or erection of buildings and structures:

- In wetlands, lands with steep slopes or otherwise hazardous land;
- In contaminated lands or in areas with sensitive groundwater or surface water features;
- In significant natural features and areas; and/or
- In significant archaeological resource sites.

In accordance with Section 24(1), zoning by-laws must be prepared to conform to the official plan.

Zoning by-laws are legally enforceable documents with very precise requirements for each lot within the municipality. A property owner is not entitled to obtain a building permit unless their proposed building, structure or change in land or building use is consistent with the applicable requirements of the zoning by-law. Further, persons who have erected a building or structure or changed the use of land or the use of a building which is not consistent with the zoning by-law that is in effect may be subject to penalties as outlined in the Planning Act and in accordance with the by-law. A zoning by-law may also provide for issuance of certificates of occupancy, which may be required to permit a change in use (Section 34(6)).
If a person intends to use their property or construct a building or structure that is not consistent with the zoning by-law, they may apply for a minor variance or a zoning by-law amendment. Minor variances may be granted by the Committee of Adjustment in accordance with Section 45(1) of the Planning Act, provided the variance satisfies the four tests of the Planning Act. Major deviations from the requirements of the By-law, however, require an amendment to the Zoning By-law, which would involve a more substantial process and involve the submission of supportive studies as required by the municipality in accordance with the official plan.

The Planning Act also governs legal non-conforming uses and non-complying buildings/structures. Section 34(9) provides assurance that any use of land or building or structure that was legally erected or established continues to be permitted, provided that the use continues. The by-law may be amended to permit an extension or enlargement of such a use, building or structure.

The Planning Act was recently amended to prohibit site-specific zoning by-law amendments two years after a new comprehensive Zoning By-law is passed under Section 26(9) (i.e., a zoning by-law update made within three years of an official plan review under Section 26(1) or 26(8) of the Planning Act).

2.2 Provincial Policy Statement

The 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) is a statement of the Province’s position on land use planning matters and is issued under Section 3 of the Planning Act. The PPS contains policies on community development, employment areas, housing, public space, infrastructure, economic development, energy, resource management, natural heritage, agriculture, cultural heritage and public health and safety. It promotes the development of healthy, livable and safe communities, and the efficient use of land and infrastructure through higher densities, mixed uses and access to multiple modes of transportation.

Decisions on land use planning matters, including the goals, objectives and policies of official plans, must be consistent with the PPS. It is intended that official plans are the primary vehicle for implementing the PPS. The PPS also recognizes zoning by-laws as an important tool for implementing the PPS, and planning authorities are required to keep their zoning by-law up to date with the official plan and the PPS. Otherwise, although the PPS does not specifically reference zoning by-laws, the provisions of the zoning by-law will need to be consistent with the applicable policies of the PPS.

2.3 Provincial Plans

The Province has implemented several Provincial Plans which include King City and Schomberg in their planning areas. Planning decisions, including new Zoning By-laws, must conform to the Provincial Plans that are in effect.

- The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Office Consolidation June 2013) provides detailed policies respecting growth management and related matters for municipalities across the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The primary vehicle for implementing this Plan is the official plan; however, the policies are still relevant to the preparation of a Zoning By-law, which will provide for detailed built form standards.
The Greenbelt Plan (2005) and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2001) focus on protecting lands for agricultural uses and on conserving natural heritage systems. In particular, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan requires that Zoning By-laws be made to conform to the land use designations outlined in the Plan; accordingly, the Township implemented by-law 2005-23 to provide for conformity with the Plan.

- Virtually all of King City is located within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area (a very small area at the southwest corner of King City’s Urban Area is not included). Much of King City is designated as a Settlement Area, and some areas in the southerly portion of King City are designated Natural Core Area. The zoning provided by by-law 2005-23 should be reviewed but largely carried forward as it applies to King City’s Urban Area. Note that Zoning By-law 2005-23 has not yet been approved by the Province.

- Schomberg is not subject to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, but is designated Towns and Villages and is located within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan. The policies of Section 3.4.2 apply to Towns and Villages. In general, the Plan encourages continued planning to intensify, revitalize and improve these settlements. The remainder of the policies largely governs settlement boundary expansions into the Greenbelt, which is not being considered through this Zoning By-law Review as it is a matter to be addressed through the ongoing King Township Official Plan Review.

A review of these Provincial Plans is currently underway, and the Province has released draft versions of the new proposed Plans. The designations for King City within the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan are not proposed to be changed according to the proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2016). The Urban Area of Schomberg continues to be designated Towns and Villages and surrounded by Protected Countryside under the proposed Greenbelt Plan (2016). Although the Provincial Plans Review is most applicable to the Official Plan Review, it should be noted that the Growth Plan is proposed to be implemented without transitional provisions. That is, under Section 1.2.2, all decisions made on or after the Plan’s effective date are to conform to the Plan. Accordingly, the new Zoning By-laws may need to consider and implement specific policies. One of the key implications is identified in Section 6.3 of this Discussion Paper.

### 2.4 York Region Official Plan

York Region’s Official Plan (April 2016 Office Consolidation) outlines the Region’s policies respecting community growth, development and land use. The Official Plan makes several references to municipal zoning by-laws, including the following specific issues for consideration in this review:

- the need to identify key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features in zoning and to protect them (2.2.9);
- the need to minimize risks to human health and safety and property within natural hazard areas by containing mapping and policies that address floodplains, hazardous lands, hazardous sites,
regulated lands through permitted uses, setbacks, buffers and identification of Special Policy Areas (2.3.29);

- the need to permit a mix and range of housing types (3.5.4);
- the need to implement second suites in zoning by-laws (3.5.22);
- the need to prohibit the approval of local zoning amendments that would have the effect of reducing the density of a site in areas that are approved for medium and higher density development except as otherwise determined through a municipal comprehensive review of the Official Plan (3.5.23);
- consideration for implementing live-work units to promote telecommuting (4.1.11, 5.2.6, 5.6.6);
- the need to only permit employment and ancillary uses on Local Corridors and other major streets within employment lands (4.3.13);
- consideration for parking management standards that reflect consideration for walking distance to transit and complementary uses, other modes of transportation, shared parking requirements (e.g., time-of-day parking demands), site design to promote pedestrian-friendly urban forms, surface parking to support redevelopment and retrofitting as well as potential locations for carpooling and car-sharing spaces and bicycle storage requirements (5.2.10);
- the need to permit renewable energy projects and alternative energy systems, including those projects and systems which are not regulated by the Province (5.2.12);
- to promote value-added agricultural uses (e.g., local farm markets and farm-gate sales) (6.3.17); and
- incorporation of intake protection zone and wellhead protection policies and mapping into Zoning By-laws in consultation with the Region (7.3.36).

The York Region Official Plan also indicates that zoning by-laws may be more restrictive than the policies of the Plan, except that the zoning by-law is not to be more restrictive than the policies of the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan for agricultural uses, mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits.

The Township’s new Official Plan (currently underway) must conform to the policies of the York Region Official Plan, and the issues noted above should be considered through this Zoning By-law Review. The review of zoning for the King City and Schomberg Urban Areas is an opportunity to implement the applicable policies noted above.

### 2.5 Community Plans

The Community Plans for King City and Schomberg provide detailed land use policies respecting the development and management of land use in these communities. In accordance with the *Planning Act*, the new zoning by-law(s) prepared for King City and Schomberg will need to conform to the policies of these plans.

#### 2.5.1 King City Community Plan

The current King City Community Plan was approved January 27, 2000 as Amendment No. 54 to the Official Plan for the Township of King Planning Area. The Plan was amended by Official Plan Amendment
No. 540 on October 20, 2003 to implement the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. This Plan is currently under review through the Township of King Official Plan Review process (discussed in section 2.6).

The King City Community Plan provides policies, principles, objectives and other strategies for managing the natural environment, servicing, land use, transportation and other matters. All land use planning decisions, including any new zoning by-law for King City, will need to conform to the policies of this Plan.

The zoning by-law will be a critical tool for implementing the policies of the King City Community Plan. The Plan makes numerous references to zoning. It is the intent of the Plan that the zoning by-law be amended to conform to and give effect to the policies of the Plan (12.3.1). Policies that are relevant to zoning including an analysis of conformity of the existing zoning by-law are discussed in detail in Section 4.

The Community Plan makes many references to zoning. The key policies directly related to zoning are identified as follows:

- Section 6 includes policies regarding permitted uses, as well as lot and building requirements for the various land use designations for existing uses. There is a need to ensure these policies are appropriately implemented by the applicable zones.
- Section 7 contains policies for lands surrounding the existing community, including potential density, permitted uses and criteria for evaluating development applications. The zoning will need to be consistent with these policies where development has occurred, or consideration can be made to require a zone change at the time of development. Consideration may be made in some cases to pre-zone future development areas or to establish template zones that implement the policies of the Plan.
- Section 12.3.3 provides policies for existing non-conforming uses. Generally, legally existing non-conforming uses are intended to be permitted to continue, expand or enlarge provided there are no adverse impacts on adjacent lands or on the implementation of the Plan. The plan includes criteria for evaluating zoning by-law amendments to allow for any such continuation, enlargement or expansion of legally existing non-conforming uses.
- Section 12.3.4 provides policies for the use of holding symbols. Holding symbols may be utilized in any land use designation which permits development to limit development until such time as appropriate approvals are received and/or agreements are entered into.

2.5.2 Schomberg Community Plan

The Schomberg Community Plan (November 1, 1998 Office Consolidation) was approved on December 24, 1996. The purpose of the Plan is to provide a framework for future growth in accordance with sound planning and design principles. The Plan provides principles, goals, objectives and policies for a wide range of planning matters, including environmental protection, land uses, transportation, development and other matters.
Section 8.3 provides policies for zoning by-laws. It is the Plan’s intent that the comprehensive Zoning By-law be amended to conform with and give effect to the policies of the Community Plan. As above, the policies relevant to zoning and analysis of conformity are identified and discussed in Section 4.

The Community Plan makes many references to zoning by-laws. Some of the key policies related to zoning are identified as follows:

- The Community Plan identifies a Special Policy Area in the core of Schomberg, which provides special policies for development and land use to manage flooding hazards. It is intended that these policies will be implemented in the zoning by-law (3.3.3 j)).
- It is intended that Environmental Constraint Areas will be delineated in the zoning by-law along with detailed floodline mapping (3.2.3 a) and 3.2.3 k)). Additionally, the zoning by-law is to implement appropriate setbacks (3.2.3 d)).
- It is noted that the conversion of a single detached dwelling to a 3- or 4-unit dwelling is to require a zoning by-law amendment, and criteria are established for evaluating these proposals (3.5.4 d).
- New medium density residential development will require a zoning amendment (3.5.5 g)).
- The Plan identifies the ability of Council to enter into agreements for cash-in-lieu of parking requirements (4.3.2 f).
- Generally, Section 3 identifies policies for permitted uses, as well as general requirements for lot size and building form within each land use designation as illustrated on Schedule A (Section 3). Within these policies, the Community Plan also identifies the potential for creating separate zoning classifications to regulate different types of uses.
- Section 8.3.3 contains policies for legally existing non-conforming uses. Generally, it is intended that these uses are permitted to continue and may be permitted to expand or be enlarged provided it does not result in adverse impacts or does not impact the implementation of the Plan. The Plan contains criteria for evaluating zoning by-law amendments in which an applicant is proposing to continue, expand or enlarge a legally existing non-confirming use.
- Section 8.3.4 contains policies for applying the holding provisions of the Planning Act. Holding by-laws may be used within a variety of land use designations for the purposes of ensuring that proposed developments have received appropriate approvals and that appropriate agreements are in effect. Until that time, existing uses and public uses are permitted.

2.6 Other Plans, Studies and Programs

While the focus of the Zoning By-law Review will be on ensuring conformity with local, Regional and Provincial policy, other studies may be indicative of zoning issues and opportunities that should be considered.

- The recent completion of the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law (adopted by Council July 11, 2016) represents an important starting point and opportunity for preparing the new zoning by-law(s) for King City and Schomberg. However, the individual context and issues within King City and Schomberg will need to be considered.
• The King City Village Centre Urban Design Guidelines (2006) and Schomberg Village Centre Urban Design Guidelines (2006) provide detailed guidance respecting both the private realm (massing, setbacks, architectural features, fences, signage, etc.) and the public realm (streetscapes, gateways, etc.). The Guidelines are relevant to zoning as they provide a basis for potential development standards in the core area. While the Guidelines represent a high level of detail that may exceed the scope of the Zoning By-law, the Guidelines respecting massing, height and character may be implemented in the Zoning By-law.

• The Employment Area Design Guidelines (December 2007) provide detailed guidance for the development of employment lands. As with the Core Area guidelines, these guidelines may be translated into zoning requirements to implement design standards.

• King Township’s Integrated Community Sustainability Plan was prepared to ensure that decision-making is sustainable, by balancing economic, socio-cultural, environmental and financial considerations. The Plan outlines a vision, values and priorities for creating a more sustainable community. One of the priorities of the Plan is to strengthen the Township’s by-laws to reinforce environmental protection and public health and safety. A potential action is to implement the zoning by-law. Many of the values and priorities identified in the Plan are very relevant to zoning, such as the need for affordable housing, accessibility and natural heritage protection.

• The Community Improvement Plan for King City, Nobleton and Schomberg came into effect in November of 2014, and outlines a strategy for revitalizing the core areas of the three communities. Section 5.3 of the Plan identifies an amendment of the zoning by-laws as being critical to ensuring the appropriate development of the core areas of the three communities. Section 2.3.4 of the Discussion Paper prepared prior to the Community Improvement Plan specifically notes that the current zoning in the core may not be consistent with the established, higher density main-street character of the core areas. The report also notes that since the zoning by-law currently utilizes the same zoning in all three communities, there is no sensitivity towards community-specific character.

• The King Township Economic Development Strategy was approved in November 2013 and includes recommendations for sustainable and desirable economic development. The strategy notes that King Township’s land use policies and zoning is generally outdated, and there is a need to review these provisions to ensure investment readiness. The report noted that stakeholders who were consulted on the land development process noted that navigating the process and amendments is difficult and can deter investment.

• As noted previously, the Township is undertaking an Official Plan Review. Once the Draft Official Plan is released, any relevant policies will need to be considered.
3.0 Existing Zoning By-law

The outcome of this project, as noted, will be new zoning by-law(s) for the King City and Schomberg Urban Areas. This section examines the existing, in-effect zoning for King City and Schomberg and considers the new Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law.

3.1 Overview of King Township Zoning By-laws

The Township administers several Zoning By-laws which are relevant to the King City and Schomberg Zoning By-law Review, including:

- Zoning By-law 74-53 (OMB approved, May 31, 1976) applies to the Urban Areas of King City and Schomberg and most of King Township.
- By-law 2005-23 amends Zoning By-law 74-53 to implement zoning requirements for the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area. It applies to the majority of King City, where the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan applies. This Zoning By-law does not apply to Schomberg.
- Various site-specific by-laws have been passed for recent developments within King City and Schomberg. There is a need to review and consider consolidating recent amendments, as they do not appear to be accurately integrated into the Township’s mapping data as presented in Section 3.1.
- Zoning By-law 2016-71 is the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law. It replaces all former zoning by-laws that apply to the Urban Area of Nobleton, as generally delineated in the Nobleton Community Plan. There are minor variations in the boundaries of the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law and the Urban Area as delineated in the Community Plan, as the delineation of the Urban Area was conceptual in nature and subject to further refinement through detailed study and development applications. Additionally, it is desirable to match the extent of the zoning by-law to parcel fabric for ease of administration and interpretation.

3.2 King Township Comprehensive Zoning By-law 74-53

Zoning By-law 74-53, as amended, is the Township’s Comprehensive Zoning By-law and applies to the Urban Areas of King City and Schomberg. The By-law consists of 28 sections:

- Sections 1 and 2 address the title and defined area of the By-law.
- Section 3 provides 155 definitions of terms to assist in the By-law’s interpretation.
- Section 4 outlines the zones and the index of zoning maps.
- Section 5 provides interpretation provisions.
- Section 6 outlines general provisions applicable to all zones, consisting of 59 subsections and addressing a very wide range of matters. This includes provisions for specific uses, parking requirements, and provisions that may only be applicable under certain circumstances.
- Sections 7 through 27 outline the provisions for each of the zone categories. Within each of these sections, the By-law typically outlines permitted uses (subsection 1), zone requirements
(subsection 2), the application of the general provisions of the By-law under Section 6 (typically subsection 3), and zone exceptions (typically subsection 4 onwards). Some of the zones also contain special provisions respecting certain uses or lot/building requirements.

- Section 28 outlines provisions for the administration of the By-law.

Figures 3.1 and 3.2 depict the existing zoning within King City and Schomberg, respectively. Note that these maps are based on the Township’s existing Geographic Information Systems (GIS) zoning data and its depiction of site-specific amendments (including Zoning By-law 2005-23) may be inaccurate or incomplete and will require detailed review through the development of the new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg.

3.3 Zoning By-law 2005-23 (Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area)

Nearly the entirety of King City is affected by Zoning By-law 2005-23, which is considered an amendment and replacement of portions of Zoning By-law 74-53 (refer to Figures 3.1 and 3.2). The amendment introduces new definitions applicable only to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Area, as well as amended general provisions and new zone categories that reflect land uses in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. However, Zoning By-law 2005-23 is not yet approved by the Province, which is required in accordance with Section 9(5) of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001.

3.4 Recent Developments

Recent developments in King City and Schomberg have primarily been implemented through site-specific zoning by-laws. There will be a need to consider and consolidate recent site-specific zoning by-laws.

3.5 Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law 2016-71

Council adopted the new Zoning By-law for the Nobleton Urban Area (By-law No. 2016-71) on July 11, 2016. The new Zoning By-law repeals and replaces all former zoning by-laws, effectively removing the Nobleton Urban Area from being subject to Zoning By-law 74-53, as amended. The Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law was prepared utilizing the content of Zoning By-law 74-53 as the basis, but numerous modifications were made, summarized as follows:

- The overall structure and organization of the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law differs somewhat from Zoning By-law 74-53, including:
  - Parking and Loading Provisions are under a separate Part of the By-law, rather than integrating these provisions within the General Provisions.
  - Zone provisions were organized into one of four parts: Residential Zones, Commercial Zones, Employment Zones and Other Zones. In Zoning By-law 74-53, the zones are each included in an individual section.
- Updates/modernization and expansion of definitions as well as deletions of definitions that were no longer necessary based on other changes made in the Zoning By-law.
• Modifications, additions and deletions to the General Provisions to provide provisions for other uses, to address modern development practices, and ensure conformity with the Nobleton Community Plan.

• Many of the zone categories from 74-53 were carried forward along with some modifications. Some new zone categories were implemented, including Residential zones for mature neighbourhood areas, and a new zone for the Core Area. Other zone categories which were not applied in Nobleton were not included (e.g., C5 – Commercial Marine).

• The By-law incorporates and consolidates recent amendments, which are organized as exceptions to base zones (e.g., R1-1 is Exception 1 to the R1 zone).

• Formatting updates were made, included font sizes, colour schedules, and the use of matrices to organize zone provisions and permitted uses and allow comparison between zones.
Figure 3.1 | Existing Zoning in King City (Note: This map is subject to confirmation of accuracy and consolidation of recent Zoning By-law Amendments.)
Figure 3.2 | Existing Zoning in Schomberg (Note: This map is subject to confirmation of accuracy and consolidation of recent Zoning By-law Amendments.)
4.0 Community Plan Conformity

The key exercise of this Zoning By-law Review involves determining whether the existing zoning conforms to the policies of the applicable Community Plans for King City and Schomberg. This section discusses how the zoning relates to the land use designation policies, and discusses how the Zoning By-law implements various zoning-related policies in the Official Plan.

4.1 King City Community Plan Conformity

Figure 4.1 illustrates the current zoning overlaid onto the land use designations identified by the King City Land Use Plan (Schedule A). Many of the land use designations correspond well with appropriate and related zoning categories. Some land use designations consist of more than one zone category. It is noted that it may be appropriate to have more than one zoning category in a land use designation, particularly where a land use designation permits a variety of different land uses.

Table 4.1 below summarizes the zone categories that are located in each land use designation, based on Figure 4.1, along with a brief discussion of whether the zoning conforms or conflicts with the land use designation and its associated policies in the Community Plan.

Table 4.1 – Analysis of Land Use Designations and Conformity of Zoning (King City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Current Zoning (Figure 4.1)</th>
<th>Comparison of Policies and Current Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Area</td>
<td>C1, R1, I, C4, M1</td>
<td>The zoning is generally not in line with the policies for the Core Area, which contemplate a mixed use, walkable community character that is sensitive to historic development forms. The C1 zoning permits a broad range of commercial uses including automobile uses with a highway commercial character. These areas are examined in detail in Section 6.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO Station Area</td>
<td>M2, T, C2, R1, RU1</td>
<td>The zoning is not in line with the designation, which also contemplates a mix of uses and a walkable built form. This area is discussed in 6.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Area</td>
<td>C4, RU1, M2, C1</td>
<td>This area has recently developed with a mix of commercial, residential and employment uses. Recent zoning by-law amendments may be incorporated into the new Zoning By-law for King City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige Employment Area</td>
<td>RU1</td>
<td>This area is planned for future office and prestige-type employment uses. The zoning reflects existing uses, and a rezoning would be required to implement the policies of the designation. Consideration may be made to implement a Future Development or transitional zone, recognizing that portions of these lands are subject to development applications. This area is discussed in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Current Zoning (Figure 4.1)</td>
<td>Comparison of Policies and Current Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commercial Area</td>
<td>RU1, M2, C2, RU1</td>
<td>The designation permits a broad range of uses, and is intended to enhance existing uses. The zoning generally reflects currently existing uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>RU1</td>
<td>The Rural area designation includes a small portion of land on the west side of Dufferin Street, south of King Road. The zoning addresses the designation but extends beyond the designated lands and into the environmentally protected lands that surround the Rural Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space/Institutional Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Area</td>
<td>EP, O, R1</td>
<td>The designation aligns well with EP zoning. There are only a few portions that are zoned O. This issue is considered further in Section 6.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area</td>
<td>EP, O, ORMFP, RU1, R1</td>
<td>There is a need to ensure the zoning for the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Area is appropriately consolidated and implemented (i.e., Zoning By-law 2005-23). The zoning based on the Township’s GIS data does not appear to correctly reflect Zoning By-law 2005-23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>O, T</td>
<td>The existing cemetery on the north side of King Road is zoned O and T. The Estate Residential 2 Area designation also makes provision for the potential expansion of this cemetery and potential future development of adjacent lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>I, O</td>
<td>Various institutional designated lands across King City are designated I and O, which appears to be appropriate based on their existing uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park Area</td>
<td>O, I, EP</td>
<td>Various community park areas, which recognize existing and future park areas, are appropriately designated O, I or EP based on their use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Study Area</td>
<td>EP, R3, R2, O</td>
<td>This designation appears to have been implemented through site-specific development applications which have refined boundaries of environmental protection zoning and permitted some developable lands for residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Low Density Residential Area</td>
<td>R1, RU1, T, I, O</td>
<td>The designation is largely aligned well with the R1 zone. These areas are being examined as the mature neighbourhoods of the community (refer to Section 6.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Residential 1 Area</td>
<td>ER1</td>
<td>Zoning is closely aligned with the designation, which recognizes existing estate-style residential areas. These areas are also being examined as part of the mature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land Use Designation and Current Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Current Zoning (Figure 4.1)</th>
<th>Comparison of Policies and Current Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estate Residential 2 Area</td>
<td>T, RU1, R1</td>
<td>This designation relates to potential future expansion of the cemetery and potential future residential development, subject to environmental constraints. Consideration may be made to more appropriately align the current zoning with the extent of the designation and to recognize future development potential subject to further study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Residential 3 Area</td>
<td>RU1, ER1, T, O</td>
<td>This designation mostly aligns with the RU1 zone and is intended to permit future development at 1 unit per hectare. Future development would require a rezoning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 1 Area</td>
<td>R4, RM1, I, O, EP, RU1, R1</td>
<td>This designation contemplates future development at 5-6 units per hectare. It aligns with recently developed residential areas and lands under current development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 2 Area</td>
<td>RU1, R3, R2, EP</td>
<td>This designation provides for future development at 5 units per hectare. The westerly portion is undeveloped (RU1) while easterly portion is under development, subject to various residential and EP zoning. Consideration should be made to consolidate the site-specific zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 3 Area</td>
<td>RU1</td>
<td>Zoning aligns closely with this designation for future development which may be undertaken in accordance with or with revisions to a former application considered by the Ontario Municipal Board in 1993. The current RU1 zoning would require an amendment to permit development. This area is subject to the recently adopted (not yet approved at the time of completing this Discussion Paper) Official Plan Amendment 89 to the Township of King Official Plan (KCCP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 4 Area</td>
<td>R1, EP</td>
<td>These lands are contemplated for future development at up to 5 units per hectare. These lands have been recently developed for low density residential uses (DiNardo Court and Carmichael Crescent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 5 Area</td>
<td>RU1, RR, I</td>
<td>RU1 zoning closely aligns with this designation, with the exception of two parcels zoned RR and one parcel zoned I. This area is subject to an ongoing study and will require rezoning to permit development and to adjust boundaries of environment features as required, so the existing zoning may be appropriate in the interim, or future development zoning could be considered. This area is subject to the recently adopted (not yet approved at the time of completing this Discussion Paper) Official Plan Amendment 89 to the Township of King Official Plan (KCCP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Current Zoning (Figure 4.1)</td>
<td>Comparison of Policies and Current Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 6 Area</td>
<td>R1, EP</td>
<td>This area has been subject to recent development and any site-specific zoning by-laws may be consolidated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1 – King City Land Use Designations Compared with Current Zoning (Note: Zoning is subject to further review and consolidation of recent amendments).
4.2 Schomberg Community Plan Conformity

Figure 4.2 illustrates the current zoning overlaid onto the land use designations shown on the Schomberg Land Use Plan (Schedule A of the Schomberg Community Plan). As in King City, most of the existing zoning categories are related to the corresponding land use designation. Similarly, there are some land use designations that are related to more than one zone category. In some cases, this may be appropriate. Table 4.2 below summarizes the zone categories that are located in each land use designation, based on Figure 4.2.

Table 4.2 – Analysis of Land Use Designations and Conformity of Zoning (Schomberg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Current Zoning (Figure 4.2)</th>
<th>Comparison of Policies and Current Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Central Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>The current zoning is not well aligned with the policies for the core area, which envisage a walkable mixed use historic core. This issue is discussed in detail in Section 6.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>C1, C2, R1, I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Commercial</td>
<td>C4, M2, M1, T</td>
<td>The District Commercial designation contemplates principally automobile-oriented commercial uses. However, the zoning addresses a mix of commercial and industrial uses within these areas. The zoning should be reviewed for conformity, with consideration to recognize existing legal non-conforming uses as may be appropriate and in accordance with the uses permitted in the Community Plan. This is discussed in Section 6.4.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>M1, M2, RU1, T, O</td>
<td>The Industrial area is principally zoned M1 and M2. Other areas zoned RU1 and T will require rezoning to permit uses in accordance with the Community Plan. Consideration may be made to alternatively identify Future Development zoning for remaining development opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facility</td>
<td>I, O, T, R1</td>
<td>Many of the institutionally designated properties are not well aligned with I or OS zoning but portions are subject to R1 zoning, so further mapping review is required to ensure existing institutional uses are appropriately zoned and designated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>R1, R1S, O, EP, T, C1, C2, I</td>
<td>The Low Density Residential areas are principally zoned R1 and R1S. There are two commercially zoned properties which may be appropriate in accordance with the policies of the Low Density Residential. Instances of the I zone to recognize existing institutional uses may also be appropriately zoned as I, provided they are permitted uses in the Low Density Residential Designation (e.g., schools and parks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>R1, R1S (variations)</td>
<td>All four of the Medium Density Residential areas are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Current Zoning (Figure 4.2)</td>
<td>Comparison of Policies and Current Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>subject to somewhat recent site-specific zoning by-laws and consideration may be made to consolidate these by-laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Constraint Area</td>
<td>EP, O, R1, C1, C2, C4</td>
<td>Many of the Environmental Constraint Areas are zoned O or have other commercial and residential zoning applied. There will be a need to ensure implementation of the Special Policy Area, along with the appropriate application of EP zoning to implement this designation and known environmental features and natural hazard areas. These issues are discussed further in Section 6.5 and Section 6.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Open Space</td>
<td>O, EP</td>
<td>The Recreational Open Space areas are appropriately zoned but will be subject to further review of the Environmental Constraint Areas as discussed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2 – Schomberg Land Use Designations Compared with Current Zoning (Note: Zoning is subject to further review and consolidation of recent amendments).
5.0 Consultation

The development of a new comprehensive zoning by-law is of critical importance to the Township, agencies and to residents and other interested persons. Residents and members of the community are interested in zoning as it has a clear relationship to private property rights and it is a tool to manage planning issues that may be of interest. The Township will be interested in the zoning by-law as the principal administrators of the By-law, and also to ensure that the zoning by-law is advancing community planning objectives. Finally, agencies and other levels of government have an interest in the zoning by-law as it represents a potential tool to implement their related plans and planning goals.

Consultation will be on-going throughout this project, with a number of planned meetings and other opportunities to provide input. The purpose of this section is to summarize the consultation undertaken and input received to date.

Note: This section is subject to change as the consultation program advances. This Discussion Paper will be finalized with input received prior to preparation of the Draft King City/Schomberg Zoning By-law.

5.1 Staff, Agencies and Stakeholders

An initial meeting with Township staff and agencies was held on July 12, 2016. The intent of the meeting was to introduce the project and obtain initial input on the types of issues that may be addressed through this project. This Discussion Paper will be circulated in draft to the various Township staff, agencies and stakeholders that have been identified. Subsequent meetings with staff, agencies and stakeholders are anticipated later in the process.

5.2 Public Open Houses

To date, two public open houses have been held. A public open house was held in King City on June 14, 2016, and a public open house was held in Schomberg on June 20, 2016. The intent of each public open house was to:

- Introduce the purpose of the project;
- Present the timeline and process for completing the project;
- Identify the potential key issues to be addressed through the project; and
- Begin to seek input into the issues and potential changes that are required to the zoning.

A questionnaire was made available at the meetings and is available on the Township’s website. To date, three written questionnaires have been received. Comments included:

- Section 7.2 – zoning requirement of 30% maximum lot coverage is high. Zoning By-law is from 1974 and needs to be amended. Should be something in place to preserve greenery (trees).
• The zoning By-law should be more specific with respect to building specifications in mature
neighbourhoods and the estate neighbourhoods should have a workshop opportunity.
• There are applications going through the Committee of Adjustment that may not conform to the
Community Plan and this should be considered in addition to reviewing whether current by-laws
conform to the Community Plan.

5.3 Mature Neighbourhoods Workshops

Two design workshops have been held to date. The first workshop was held in King City on June 29,
2016. The second workshop was held in Schomberg on July 12, 2016. The purpose of each workshop
was to present and discuss zoning options for conserving the character of the mature neighbourhoods in
King City and Schomberg. This issue is discussed in detail in Section 6.2 of this Discussion Paper,
including consideration for input received.

There were a total of 15 participants in King City and 9 participants in Schomberg, excluding all staff,
consultant team members and members of Council that attended. Participants joined one of two tables
and discussions were facilitated by consultant team members with staff available as a resource.
Participants were asked to record their input within individual workbooks. Additionally, a participant
was asked to volunteer as a recorder to record the group discussion. The intent of the discussion was
not to achieve consensus, but to gather all input even where there were differing opinions. Each
workshop followed a similar agenda, as follows:

• A presentation by the consulting team included a brief introduction to the Zoning By-law Review
and the issue being addressed. This included an identification of the mature neighbourhoods
and description of the existing zoning and the Community Plan policies affecting the mature
neighbourhoods.
• Participants were asked to review and comment on a map of “Character Areas” which were
intended to delineate different neighbourhoods based on observed character and patterns in
built form. The Character Area maps as presented in the workshop are included in Figure 5.1
(King City) and Figure 5.2 (Schomberg). Note these maps were prepared for discussion purposes
only, and are not intended to represent future proposed zoning delineations. Participants were
asked generally to comment on the issues observed with respect to managing character in each
area, and to comment about what the value in the mature neighbourhoods.
• Participants were asked to comment on visualizations of how the existing zoning relates to each
character area, and whether this zoning is appropriate for each character area.
• Participants were asked to comment on potential proposed zone categories for each character
area, along with visualizations.
• Participants were asked to comment on overlay zoning as a potential zoning tool.
• Participants were asked to comment on other zoning tools that can support conserving the
character of mature neighbourhoods, including issues and impacts associated with accessory
buildings/structures and the applicability of pervious surface requirements.
• Each table was asked to present a summary of their discussion to all attendees.
The input received is summarized in Table 5.1 (King City) and Table 5.2 (Schomberg) and is discussed further in Section 6.2.
Figure 5.1 – Character Areas in King City (as presented at the King City Mature Neighbourhoods Workshop on June 29, 2016)
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Figure 5.2 – Character Areas in Schomberg (as presented at the Schomberg Mature Neighbourhoods Workshop on July 12, 2016)
### Table 5.1 – Summary of Input from the King City Mature Neighbourhoods Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delineation of the Character Areas / Values</th>
<th>“Table 1”</th>
<th>“Table 2”</th>
<th>Other Individual Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Changes are occurring, and there’s a mix of older and newer development. Newer homes are typically much larger than existing.</td>
<td>• Generally agreed with Delineated Character Areas, but felt that Area 3 in the southeast should be split into two areas based on appearance and timeframe of development.</td>
<td>• Love large setbacks and mature trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes are occurring, and there’s a mix of older and newer development. Newer homes are typically much larger than existing.</td>
<td>• Need to balance development rights and ensuring character is addressed.</td>
<td>• Spaciousness is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ditches, vegetation, mature shrubs and gardens are important characteristics.</td>
<td>• Can redevelop bungalows profitably – redevelopment do not have to be very large.</td>
<td>• Homes are built to the maximum permissions but should be built to average of adjacent lots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Garages should be less dominant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally agreed with delineated Character Areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for architectural control in character areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness of Existing Zoning in Each Character Area</th>
<th>• Existing houses typically set back more than 7.5 m as required by R1 zone.</th>
<th>• 11 m height is a key issue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existing houses typically set back more than 7.5 m as required by R1 zone.</td>
<td>• Side yard setbacks are key to managing compatibility.</td>
<td>• Side yard setbacks should be a total of 4.8 m, rather than 1.2 m on one side and 3.6 m on the other side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 11 m height is too large.</td>
<td>• Front yard setback and vegetation are key to the character of the streetscape.</td>
<td>• Need much larger front yard setbacks and side yard setbacks in older areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R1 zone does not work well – may need larger setbacks.</td>
<td>• R1 zone is too far permissive.</td>
<td>• Setbacks should consider neighbouring building heights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ER1 zone is generally appropriate for Character Area 5.</td>
<td>• R1 zone creates potential impacts to privacy.</td>
<td>• Larger lots should have larger setbacks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Proposed Zone Categories for Each Character Area</th>
<th>• Character Area 5 should be oriented for bungalows and opportunities for retirees/seniors. Height of 7.5 m and 30% coverage.</th>
<th>• Generally the group supported the proposed zone categories, noting in Character Area 1 lot coverage should be just 30%. Support side yard setbacks based on building height and support proposed setbacks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Should consider increased density in Character Area 1 (townhomes and other uses).</td>
<td>• Group suggested possibility of maximum front yard setbacks.</td>
<td>• It is possible to redevelop appropriately and profitably even where height is restricted to bungalows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Potential Proposed Zone Categories for Each Character Area          | • Better to be conservative with lot coverage – should be 30% in Character Area 1 and not 35% as suggested.          |                                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlay Zoning</th>
<th>“Table 1”</th>
<th>“Table 2”</th>
<th>Other Individual Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support overlay zoning to ensure setbacks are in harmony with adjacent lots. Lot coverage maximums should be consistent.</td>
<td>• Overlay zoning could contribute to creating uniformity along front yards.</td>
<td>• Overlay zoning might not work where a home is next to recently developed houses that are not in character with the overall neighbourhood.</td>
<td>• Works for older homes, but would not work where a lot is adjacent to both a new home and an older home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overlay zoning requirements should be determined at the streetscape/ neighbourhood level rather than just adjacent lots.</td>
<td>• Importance is on the side yards and overlay zoning could be considered for side yards.</td>
<td>• Importance is on the side yards and overlay zoning could be considered for side yards.</td>
<td>• Overlay zoning not appropriate outside of areas 4 and 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Garage setbacks should be larger than house setbacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tools – Accessory Buildings and Pervious Surface Requirements</td>
<td>• Concerned about accessory buildings being too close to lot lines.</td>
<td>• Group generally felt that existing provisions appeared to be working well for accessory buildings and no specific issues were observed.</td>
<td>• Garages should not be in the front of a house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pervious surface requirements are important for managing increasing extreme weather. Should consider house footprint, garage, patios, pools, walkways, etc.</td>
<td>• The table was generally supportive of pervious surface requirements. Group suggested that perhaps the requirements indicated in Nobleton were not restrictive enough.</td>
<td>• Should limit accessory structures to a percentage of the lot as well as set minimum setbacks and height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Should be a maximum 2 car garage in character area 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developers fill backyards with pools and pavers so this should be regulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provisions should take into account lot size and neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Take drainage of landscape/neighbours into consideration. As many trees as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to regulate tree cutting and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Variances should be agreed to by neighbours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 – Summary of Input from the Schomberg Mature Neighbourhoods Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“Table 1”</th>
<th>“Table 2”</th>
<th>Other Individual Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delineation of the Character Areas / Values</td>
<td>• Value the appearance and function of the areas.</td>
<td>• The grouping appears to be okay.</td>
<td>• Need to retain trees during redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Areas are generally well delineated, but Character Area 1 could potentially be broken up into 2 areas where there are older houses versus relatively newer houses.</td>
<td>• Areas 1, 2 and 3 are similar.</td>
<td>• Risks vary in each area. In areas 1 and 2, risk is more architectural, while areas 3-5, the risk is related to massing/coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the R1 Zone in Each Character Area</td>
<td>• Height of 11 m is too high for all areas.</td>
<td>• Height of 11 m is a major issue.</td>
<td>R1 zoning generally appropriate for Areas 3-5, except for height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to be careful about lot frontages in areas 1 and 2.</td>
<td>• Need to ensure that everything that is permitted is relative to adjacent homes.</td>
<td>• Building should not be allowed at the far rear of the lot, but consistent with front yard setbacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to be careful about how the lot frontages and lot coverages work together.</td>
<td>• Setbacks need to be in line with neighbours.</td>
<td>• Unclear why Character Area 4 provisions were varied from other areas (i.e., height and maximum lot coverage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Proposed Zone Categories for Each Character Area</td>
<td>• Generally liked the proposed zone categories, as they captured a lot of desired changes from the R1 zoning.</td>
<td>• The group suggested various improvements to the proposed requirements.</td>
<td>35% lot coverage may be too high for Area 1, given there are some larger lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some specific changes suggested.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 35% lot coverage in Area 1 should be increased. Maximum height of 8 m should be decreased and minimum rear yard of 10 m should be increased. Suggested front yard setback of 4.5 m is OK as long as it reflects adjacent homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay Zoning</td>
<td>• Generally like the overlay zoning but the height variation may be best suited to ½ storey.</td>
<td>• Generally like this approach.</td>
<td>Most appropriate in areas 1-2 where there is more variation in form and building location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The front/rear yard flexible variation of +/- 1 m may only be appropriate where adjacent lots are the same. Where there is variation already, +/- 1 m may be impactful.</td>
<td>• Variation in height should be only ½ storey, and not 1 full storey. Should not be 3 storey homes.</td>
<td>• Utilize overlay only for primary buildings, not accessory buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overlay is most appropriate for Areas 1-3.</td>
<td>• Overlay zoning should be restricted to the primary residence and not applied to accessory structures.</td>
<td>• Helps manage rooflines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Tools – Accessory Buildings and Pervious Surface Requirements, and other comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other Individual Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Heritage barns are important.  
- Difficulty in managing pervious surfaces. Will want to maximize but may be hard to regulate. | - Water infiltration is important in the front and rear yards.  
- There is more variation in lot types/built form in Character Areas 1 and 2 so will need to consider this when developing these provisions. | - Enforcement and implementation should include consideration of design guidelines.  
- Need to use existing design guidelines.  
- Downtown core should be a heritage district to help protect character.  
- Need to manage impacts of other uses such as home occupations. Setbacks should be greater than the minimum where height approaches maximum.  
- Number of structures is an issue – should be 2 or fewer per lot.  
- The historic core is the biggest issue of concern for Schomberg. Core is becoming increasingly residential. What is existing must be protected.  
- Need to utilize the Ontario Heritage Act to protect buildings and landscapes. |

### 5.4 Online Consultation

A project webpage has been established to provide project updates and contact information. To date, no written input has been received through email correspondence.
6.0 Key Issues and Opportunities

This Discussion Paper is intended to provide a summary of the key changes that may be made to the zoning for King City and Schomberg. Based on the previous background review, review of the Zoning By-law and the Community Plan conformity review, as well as consultation undertaken to date, this section provides a preliminary identification and discussion of the key issues that will need to be addressed through the development of the new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg.

6.1 Core Areas of King City and Schomberg

As noted, the core areas of King City and Schomberg are principally zoned C1. In King City, significant portions of the core area are also zoned R1, while in Schomberg, some of the properties are zoned R1 as well as C2. The C1 zone is principally intended for commercial uses that are oriented to the travelling public, and generally does not relate well to the applicable land use designation policies in each core area. The provisions for the C1 zone are compared with the policies for the two core areas in Table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1 – Comparison of Existing Core Area Zoning with Community Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing C1 Zoning</th>
<th>King City Community Plan policies (Core Area)</th>
<th>Schomberg Community Plan policies (Main Central Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Maximum of 11.0 m (about 3 storeys)</td>
<td>Maximum of 3 storeys</td>
<td>Up to 3 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 4 storeys where residential uses are developed in conjunction with commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>Minimum 9 m front yard</td>
<td>Development is to be in keeping with character of surrounding development</td>
<td>Massing/design is to be in keeping with character. The character of the Main Central Area is not consistent with the setbacks required in the C1 zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum side yards setbacks 3 m on one side and 1.5 m on the other side</td>
<td>The setbacks in the C1 zone are not consistent with the observed character of the King City Core Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum rear yard 7.5 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
<td>One unit per lot with a separate entrance</td>
<td>Mixed use developments permitted</td>
<td>Permitted in the form of apartments forming part of a commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low and medium density residential permitted including seniors housing</td>
<td>Preferably located above commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Uses</td>
<td>Variety of commercial uses including automobile services</td>
<td>Commercial and office uses excluding car sales and rental</td>
<td>Variety of commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automobile sales/service not permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There are many clear differences between the existing zoning and the intent of each Community Plan’s policies. While the maximum height is generally in line with the zones, the lack of a minimum building height requirement would mean that one-storey buildings could be developed. For the most part, this would be impactful to the core areas of King City and Schomberg, where the dominant height is typically two storeys and where the policies speak to ensuring that massing and height is to be in keeping with the community character. Additionally, the setback requirements are not appropriate for King City and Schomberg, where setbacks are minimal due to historical development patterns. There are also key differences in the types of permitted uses, particularly the treatment of residential uses. The zoning also does not regulate density directly through floor space index, which could be used to implement the density requirements of the Community Plans.

It is further noted that the policies for Nobleton, Schomberg and King City’s core areas are distinctive, and the character of each community is distinctive. Accordingly, a single new zone category developed for both of these core areas may not appropriately reflect the differences. In particular:

- Density is established at a maximum floor space index (FSI) of 0.5 for King City and 1.0 for Schomberg.
- The King City Community Plan contemplates stand-alone residential uses while the Schomberg Community Plan limits residential uses to those associated with commercial uses.
- Maximum building heights are similar at 3 storeys, however, the Schomberg Community Plan contemplates up to four storeys where residential uses are proposed.
- Setback requirements may need to vary in each community to correspond to the particular character of each community core in accordance with the policies for ensuring that development is sensitive to the individual character of the community.

Implementation of the Core Area land use policies was similarly addressed for Nobleton as part of completing the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law. The recommended approach implemented in the Nobleton was the development and application of a new Core Area (CA) zone, which better reflected the permitted uses and lot and building requirements within the applicable Village Core designation of the Nobleton Community Plan. The zone was applied to much of the Village Core, effectively pre-zoning the area, permitting development to proceed under the CA zone without the need to first complete a zoning by-law amendment. In some cases, a holding provision (h) was applied due to the need to confirm servicing availability prior to development taking place. It is recognized that there are currently
no particular servicing constraints in King City and there is sufficient servicing capacity in Schomberg to facilitate full build-out of the community in accordance with the Community Plan. Similar new core area zone categories may therefore be developed and applied in King City and Schomberg without the application of a holding symbol.

There are essentially three options to be considered for implementing the core area policies of the King City and Schomberg Community Plans:

1. **Status Quo:** The status quo option of maintaining the existing zoning within the core areas (i.e., C1 zoning and other zones as applicable to the core areas) is not considered appropriate and would not conform to the policies of the Schomberg and King City Community Plans. By leaving the zoning status quo, development would be permitted as-of-right in accordance with the existing C1 zoning. This may lead to uses and built forms that do not conform to the policies of the Community Plan and would impact the implementation of the Community Plan.

2. **Pre-zoning:** The option of developing and applying a new zone category which implements the policies of the Community Plan is considered pre-zoning. Under this option, development is required to take place in accordance with the new zone category, and any deviations from the permitted uses or lot and building requirements would require a minor variance or zoning by-law amendment. Development applications would also be subject to site plan control under the pre-zoning option, even where a proposed development is in accordance with the new zoning. This is the option that was implemented for the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law.

3. **Future Development Zoning (Existing Uses only):** A future development zone can be applied to permit only existing uses and require a zoning by-law amendment for any change in land use or new development. The benefit of this option is that all development proposals will precipitate a zoning by-law amendment and therefore require a site-specific evaluation of the application, providing an opportunity to ensure the proposal conforms to the Community Plan’s policies. A major negative aspect of this approach is that it may present a possible barrier to future development and therefore limit the ability of the Community Plan’s policies to be achieved.

The pre-zoning option outlined in option no. 2 above is recommended in both King City and Schomberg. This option will most effectively implement the policies of the Community Plans. The key to ensuring the appropriateness of this option is to develop zoning requirements that ensure the compatibility and sensitivity of future development while achieving the policies of the Community Plans. Additionally, the site plan control process will be available to help address any site-specific considerations. Should there be servicing constraints, or other particular matters that must be confirmed, the application of a holding symbol can be considered along with pre-zoning.
The development of the new core area zones should be specific to each community, and consider the recommendations of the applicable Village Core Design Guidelines documents prepared in 2006. To ensure that pre-zoning will provide for appropriate and compatible development, consideration may be made to include the following provisions in the new core area zone categories for King City and Schomberg:

- Permit the uses that are contemplated by the Community Plans. In King City, this would include mixed use developments as well as residential and commercial uses, excluding automobile service uses. In Schomberg, permitted uses are similar, except that residential uses cannot be stand-alone and must be limited to being associated with a non-residential use.
- Establish maximum density requirements in accordance with the Community Plans, at 0.5 FSI for King City and 1.0 FSI for Schomberg.
- Establish maximum height requirements in accordance with the Community Plans. This could also include special requirements for upper storeys to manage compatibility. In Schomberg, for example, a maximum of four storeys is permitted for mixed use developments. However, consideration should be made to establish further step backs for the fourth storey, as this could be impactful to the character of the core.
- Establish minimum heights to ensure that development is sensitive to the predominant character of each core area.
- Establish minimum and maximum setbacks to ensure that development is sensitive to the character of each core area, and to direct parking to the rear yards or side yards as appropriate.
- Establish buffer requirements to ensure compatibility with adjacent residential land uses and minimize impacts of parking areas.

6.2 Mature Neighbourhoods

6.2.1 Background

Most of the existing and older residential neighbourhoods in Schomberg and King City are zoned R1 and are subject to the same development standards. In King City, the estate residential areas are zoned ER1. However, there is considerable variation amongst the individual neighbourhoods. There is generally a distinction between some of the older residential subdivisions surrounding the core of each community and in the newer subdivisions. It is noted that some of the residential communities are also subject to some development-specific standards completed at the time of development, and consideration can be made to integrate these standards into the Zoning By-law.

The risk of utilizing the same zoning across all neighbourhoods is that the redevelopment, expansion or addition to an existing dwelling may result in a dwelling that is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood or street. Additionally, leaving the zoning as is may not effectively implement the policies of the Community Plan and it may not be desirable for the future of these neighbourhoods. Other alternatives must be considered.
6.2.2 Community Plan Policy Context

The King City Community Plan provides policies regarding development and redevelopment in the existing residential areas. Existing residential areas are principally designated Existing Low Density Residential Area and Estate Residential 1 Area. These designations recognize existing residential development and ensure that new development is generally compatible with existing character and density. In the Estate Residential 1 Area, the permitted gross density is 1 unit per hectare. In both designations, permitted uses include existing buildings and structures as well as replacement, additions and modifications to existing buildings. A single detached dwelling on an existing lot of record is permitted subject to the zoning regulations. Development is also subject to the design policies of Section 9. The relevant design policies are as follows:

- New development in existing neighbourhoods is to be designed to be integrated with the character of the particular area (9.2.5.1).
- Infill housing and new housing abutting existing neighbourhoods is to be of a scale, type and density to complement existing housing (9.2.5.2 ii).
- Character of existing neighbourhoods is to be maintained and enhanced by new development or redevelopment (9.2.5.2 ii).

Additionally, the King City Community Plan’s policies for severances are also relevant (Section 12.5, amended through OPA 63). A consent is to be given favorable consideration if it has the effect of infilling (12.5.5). Infill lots are to reflect the character of the existing neighbourhood to ensure they are consistent with natural vegetation, lot frontage, lot area, building height/massing/setbacks and amenity area (12.5.6). No parcel is to be created that does not conform to the zoning requirements (12.5.9).

The Schomberg Community Plan designates most residential neighbourhoods as Low Density Residential, including both older and more recent development areas. Any infill or addition in this area is to recognize and enhance the scale and character of the existing area, having regard for natural vegetation, lot frontages/areas, building height/massing/setbacks, privacy and overview (3.5.3 b). New residential development in older established residential areas with historic/architectural or landscape value are encouraged to employ an effective design to reinforce character. Section 3.5.3 d) indicates that regard shall be given to design and massing of various forms of development to ensure it is generally compatible. Section 8.5 provides policies for consents to sever land. Consents will be given favourable consideration where it has the effect of infilling (8.5 d). A consent shall generally be denied where the effect is to create a lot of disproportionate depth and width (8.5 h).

It is further noted that on November 2, 2015, Council endorsed a series of policy directions to form the basis for developing the new King Township Official Plan. Policy Direction 3 relates to existing residential neighbourhoods. The endorsed direction states that new lot creation is to be prohibited in existing and new residential neighbourhoods, given availability of other intensification lands. Further, the new Official Plan is to include direction on provisions that should be implemented in the Zoning By-law to regulate development on existing lots.
6.2.3 Mature Neighbourhoods Workshops

As summarized in Section 5, two public workshops were conducted to obtain input on the zoning options for conserving the character of the mature neighbourhoods. There was a great range of detailed input received. The following key outcomes from the workshop are identified:

- The issue being discussed appears to be much more relevant to the residents of King City, where housing redevelopment has been very common. In Schomberg, participants focused much more on the importance of maintaining the character of the core area along Main Street and the older residential neighbourhoods.

- Participants were mostly satisfied with the “Character Area” delineations, which would form the basis for applying distinctive zone categories. Several comments were made regarding the delineation of the character areas:
  - In King City, the key suggestion was that Character Area 3 (southeasterly portion) should be split into two separate areas, as there is a distinction in character based on the timing of development.
  - In Schomberg, it was noted that there are different characters amongst Character Areas 1 and 2, particularly with respect to the older areas and the somewhat newer areas.

- The R1 zoning is not appropriate for the older areas of both King City and Schomberg. The key issue raised by participants was the height and massing of housing permitted by the R1 zone.

- Generally, participants felt the ER1 zoning is appropriate for the estate residential areas in King City. Some participants suggested specific refinements such as larger side yard setbacks.

- Participants generally felt that Character Area 5 (Rural Areas) was best developed with estate residential zoning, while other portions of this Character Area may not be appropriate for future development. It is noted that one portion of this area has been subject to a development application while other areas are contemplated for development by the Community Plan.

- Participants were mostly supportive of proposed zone categories for the Character Areas, while some participants suggested specific refinements.

- Generally, participants were supportive of overlay zoning but noted that it may work better in some character areas where there is more variation. In areas where buildings are more similar, it may be too inflexible. Some participants felt that the development of overlay zoning should be based on the analysis of the streetscape rather than just the adjacent lots. Additionally, participants suggested some refinements to the proposed overlay provisions (e.g., allowing variation by half a storey rather than one full storey).

- Participants also highly value the mature vegetation which is often lost through redevelopment. They suggested the need to better regulate tree cutting. In the context of the zoning by-law, this can in part be achieved by establishing minimum pervious surface requirements and also limiting building envelopes to minimize potential impacts to vegetation and maintain open space.

- Participants did not note any particular concerns with respect to accessory buildings and structures. Some participants suggested that in King City, the current zoning was working well to
manage these structures. In Schomberg, it was noted that some accessory buildings may have historic value.

- Participants in both communities were generally supportive of introducing pervious surface requirements but noted that the provisions should be appropriate for each area.

In consideration of the policy context, comments from participants, Council’s recently endorsed direction for managing lot creation and redevelopment in existing neighbourhoods, as well as the approach undertaken through development of the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law, it is recommended that the following be considered in the development of the Draft Zoning By-law:

1. New zone categories should be developed to reflect the individual character areas in King City and Schomberg. The delineation of the zoning should be made in consideration of the input received on the character areas and through further analysis to ensure the provisions appropriately reflect character. The potential zone categories presented at the workshops may form a basis for these zone categories, but other refinements will need to be considered in relation to the input received and through further analysis.

2. Overlay zoning should be considered to complement the new zone classifications. On its own, overlay zoning may be difficult to implement. However, it is a useful tool when utilized to complement zone categories that are developed to reflect neighbourhood character, giving some degree of flexibility. This is the approach implemented in the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law.

3. Requirements for accessory buildings and structures should initially be based on the provisions developed for Nobleton, which were refined through considerable input from the Township and public. Minor refinements may be considered through further analysis and consideration of input received.

4. Minimum pervious surface requirements should be considered for both King City and Schomberg. The requirements should be appropriate for each character area to ensure that the requirements are both achievable and beneficial to the communities. These provisions will help to contribute to maintaining open space and mature vegetation, and also contribute to other sustainability objectives such as water infiltration.

### 6.3 GO Station Area (King City)

Lands in proximity to the existing GO Station, fronting on the west side of Keele Street and on Station Road, are designated GO Station Area by the King City Community Plan. The Community Plan contemplates mixed use, higher density development within these lands (Section 6.9 of the King City Community Plan). In summary, the policies address the following:

- This area is recognized as a key entrance to the community and its potential to function as a southern anchor to the Core Area.
- Permitted uses include a range of commercial and office uses, low and medium density residential uses, mixed use developments and institutional uses.
• Existing uses are permitted by the Community Plan, and it is recognized that these uses include a mix of commercial and industrial uses which “do not contribute to creating an appropriate entrance to the community.”
• Permitted uses are subject to other criteria, including a maximum building height of 3 storeys, a maximum floor space index of 0.5 for commercial and mixed use development, and maximum density of 20 units per hectare for medium density residential development.

The existing zoning for this designation generally reflects existing uses (refer to Figure 4.1). This includes lands zoned General Industrial (M2), Rural General (RU1), Commercial Highway (C2), Transitional (T) and Residential Urban One (R1). Portions of this area are zoned for environmental constraints.

It should be noted that new policy directions are emerging for these lands. The Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2016) includes a proposed policy that references a minimum density of 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare for land served by express rail service on the GO Transit network (Policy 2.2.4.5 c)) and within major transit station areas, which would be interpreted to include the GO Station Area in King City. Additionally, to support the implementation of these policies, proposed Section 2.2.4.7 addresses the following:

• Planning is to be undertaken in a timely manner, inclusive of updated zoning, to support development in this area (2.2.4.7 a)).
• Alternative development standards such as reduced parking standards are to be provided to support development (2.2.4.7 d)).
• Land use and built form that adversely affects the achievement of 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare is to be prohibited (2.2.4.7 e)).

The evolution of the Growth Plan and enactment of this document will need to be considered through the development of the Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg.

The options for zoning these lands to implement the policies of the Community Plan are similar to the options for zoning the Core Area of King City, as discussed in Section 6.1:

1. The zoning may be kept as status quo. Currently, the lands are subject to a variety of different zones reflecting existing uses, as noted above. Although existing uses are permitted by the Community Plan, leaving the zoning as is currently applied would permit future development under the applicable zone categories, and this is not desirable to implement the policies of the Community Plan, since the current zone categories are not aligned with the Community Plan’s policies for the GO Station Area.
2. The lands may be pre-zoned to permit development in accordance with the Community Plan. This would include the development and application of an appropriate zone category or application of other zone categories that conform to the policies of the Community Plan. This may also be associated with appropriate holding provisions to help manage certain issues, such as servicing or other matters to be considered before development is permitted.
3. Lands may be zoned for ‘future development’, with only existing uses permitted. A rezoning would be required to permit any future development, therefore triggering a more thorough planning process. To support this option, zone categories may be developed (but not applied) which articulate the intent of the Community Plan policies, and Growth Plan policies, as appropriate.

At this time, the option of zoning lands for future development is recommended, along with potential development of a GO Station zone category, which would be applied through future rezoning applications. This option is preferred over pre-zoning, as the lands currently consist of a mix of residential, industrial and commercial uses, and a rezoning process would be preferable to enable a more thorough study and evaluation of a development application. Additionally, given the current configuration of the parcel fabric within these lands, some degree of land consolidation may also be required in a manner that ensures that the ability of other parcels to redevelop is not negatively impacted. This is best addressed by the requirement to rezone lands prior to development. Finally, the proposed Growth Plan policies noted above create the possibility that development could be much more intensive than what is currently permitted by the Community Plan, so a future development zone is recommended until such time as these policies can be confirmed.

6.4 Employment Areas

6.4.1 Schomberg

The employment lands within Schomberg represent King Township’s largest employment area. These lands are designated Industrial by the Community Plan.

Currently, this area is principally zoned Restricted Industrial (M1) and General Industrial (M2), and some of the lots are subject to site-specific amendments. A large portion of these lands is also zoned Rural General (RU1) where there is an existing wastewater treatment facility and stormwater pond. Some vacant lands which currently have local/collector road access are already zoned M1 or M2 with an exception applied. The southerly, undeveloped portions are zoned Transitional (T) and RU1. The Trisan Centre is zoned M2, with an exception applied, although the southerly portion of the facility is zoned Open Space (O) with an exception applied.

On May 16, 2016, Council endorsed policy directions regarding employment lands, which establishes some key directions for the ongoing Official Plan Review. The new Official Plan is to recognize and retain currently designated employment lands, and also to protect them from the impact of future sensitive uses which could limit the viability of their development.

Permitted uses and lot and building requirements for the M1 and M2 zones should be reviewed to ensure they are appropriate for the types of employment uses intended by the Community Plan. Generally, the M1 Zone is principally applied to lands along Highway 27 and Highway 9, which is generally appropriate since the M1 Zone is restricted to wholly enclosed industrial uses and office uses, and these lands are highly visible. The interior of the employment area is zoned M2, which is more permissive. The general intent of the policies of the Community Plan are to ensure that industrial uses
are compatible with adjacent land uses, and to ensure that industrial uses adjacent to Highway 9 and Highway 27 appropriately address the streetscape. The current zoning by-law includes a 30 m separation distance required between an M1 or M2 Zone and any T or residential zone, which helps to address the Community Plan’s policies for ensuring compatibility.

It is noted that some lands that are designated Commercial District along Highway 27 are zoned M1, M2 and one lot is zoned T. These lands are occupied by some automobile uses, commercial uses and appear to include existing outdoor storage. Generally, at least some of these uses are likely legal non-conforming. Leaving these lands zoned M2 is not desirable to implement the policies of the Community Plan, as it may result in redevelopment in the form of industrial uses that are impactful to adjacent residential uses that back directly onto these lands. Consideration could be made to implement future development zoning, which permits existing uses and requires a zoning amendment. Alternatively, the lands may be pre-zoned with an appropriate zone category that implements the policies of the Community Plan (e.g., the Shopping Centre Commercial [C4] zone), along with consideration for implementing a holding symbol. Given the sensitivity of adjacent residential uses, the most appropriate approach may be to identify these lands as a future development zone and require a zoning by-law amendment to thoroughly evaluate a future development proposal.

6.4.2 King City

There is one designated Prestige Employment Area in King City, and it is currently zoned primarily for rural uses. At the time of completing this Discussion Paper, development applications for a portion of these lands are in process. Consideration could be made to retain existing zoning or to apply a Future Development Zone. Pre-zoning may not be appropriate since a portion of the lands are subject to development applications and detailed study will be required. However, the employment zone categories should be reviewed to ensure that a zone category is available to be appropriately applied to the future development in conformity with the policies for the Prestige Employment Uses. The Restricted Industrial (M1) zone generally aligns with the policies of the Community Plan but minor modifications may be required to ensure it addresses the types of uses contemplated within the Township’s designated employment areas.

6.5 Schomberg Special Policy Area

Much of the core area of Schomberg is subject to a Special Policy Area, as outlined in Section 3.3 of the Community Plan and also delineated on Schedule C. The policies recognize that under a Regional Storm event, much of the Main Street area would be subject to extensive flooding. The policies of the Special Policy Area provide guidance and requirements for future development to minimize risk and impact in the event of a flooding event, while allowing for the Main Street area of Schomberg to continue to function as the commercial and cultural focal point of the community. In summary, the policies address the following:

- Some land uses are prohibited, including:
  - Uses involving the sale or storage of chemicals or hazardous substances which would impact public safety in the event of flooding.
Sensitive uses, such as hospitals, nursing homes, daycare centres and schools which would be at great risk in the event of a flood.

Uses involving emergency services, electrical substations and similar utilities which would be impaired during a flooding event.

- Placing or removal of fill, construction in the flood plain or alteration of a watercourse is subject to approval by the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA).
- Prior to issuing a building permit, the Township will consult with LSRCA to assess flood damaging reduction measures, such as structural design, elevation of openings/living spaces/ground floor, location/elevation of heating, electrical equipment and municipal services and other utilities, and other measures as required. Accessory buildings and structures may be exempted subject to LSRCA approval.

These policies are not addressed in the Zoning By-law. It is a policy of the Schomberg Community Plan that the Zoning By-law be amended to implement the Special Policy Area (Policy 3.3.3 j)). Additionally, it is a policy of the Region of York Official Plan to address Special Policy Areas in the Zoning By-law, and is generally desirable to ensure that future development is consistent with the policies for the Special Policy Area.

It is recommended that LRSCA be further consulted to advise on the development of appropriate zoning regulations that will address the Special Policy Area. This may include:

- Delineation of a Special Policy Area overlay on the zoning map or separate schedule, along with associated general provisions which limit permitted uses and reference the need for LSRCA approval; or
- Identification of a separate zone category or a suffix to indicate the application of the Special Policy Area.

6.6 Natural Heritage Conservation

Zoning By-laws are an important tool to implement policy for conserving natural heritage features and functions. Natural heritage conservation is a key policy priority for the Province, the Region and the Township. The King City Community Plan delineates “Environmental Protection Areas” and the “Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area” as part of the Land Use schedule (Schedule 4). The Schomberg Community Plan delineates “Environmental Constraint Areas”. Within these areas, development and land disturbances are prohibited with some exceptions as outlined in the policies. Currently, the application of the EP zone is well-aligned with these designations in King City. In Schomberg, the zoning is not well aligned, and some of these areas have different zones applied, such as the Open Space zone which would permit a variety of park and community uses.

Recent development applications have in some cases refined the boundaries of natural heritage features through site-specific zoning by-law amendments. In these cases, the zoning should be integrated into the new Zoning By-law to best reflect the delineation of the features and ensure their conservation.
The approach utilized in the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law included:

- Refining and expanding the application of the EP zone where the delineation of natural heritage features was well known based on mapping, delineation of zone boundaries or recent zoning by-law amendments where the zoning was refined.
- Limiting permitted uses in the EP Zone to conservation uses, to more strictly limit this zone as a conservation zone.
- Further, the TRCA’s regulated area mapping was overlaid to identify areas where natural heritage features and watercourses were known to exist, but where detailed mapping was not available.

The approaches recommended above are applicable to King City and Schomberg. It is recommended that TRCA and LSRCA be consulted to advise on potential refinements to the EP zoning based on accurate mapping of natural heritage features, where available. As zoning represents a legal tool, it is important to ensure that any updates to the EP zoning be made based on accurate and recent information. Consideration may also be made to integrate the regulated area overlay as undertaken in the Nobleton Zoning By-law to provide an indication of where a permit from the applicable Conservation Authority will be required before development or site alteration is permitted.

6.7 Source Water Protection Plans and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan

Zoning is considered to be a key implementation tool to implement Source Protection Plans, which are being prepared and implemented across Ontario under the Clean Water Act. The intent of these plans is in part to limit land uses and activities which can pose a threat to drinking water. The policies for limiting land uses and activities is relevant to zoning, which can directly implement these policies.

King City is subject to the CTC Source Water Protection Plan, and there are two wellheads located northwest of Keele Street and King Road. The CTC Source Protection Plan has now been approved, and has also been implemented in the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law. In Nobleton, a new Schedule “B” is included to illustrate the location of the three local wellheads and associated wellhead protection areas. These areas are associated with general provisions that limit certain uses and activities which are considered to pose a threat to drinking water protection. Additionally, definitions are included to support interpretation of these policies. Implementation of the Source Protection Plan for King City should follow the approach undertaken for Nobleton, which was undertaken in consultation with York Region and TRCA.

Schomberg is subject to the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan which is now in effect. Further consultation with York Region and LRSCA is recommended to identify the appropriate approaches for implementing this Plan and to obtain mapping for wellhead protection areas. Generally, the approach utilized should be as consistent as possible with the approaches implemented for Nobleton and King City to ensure ease of administration for Township staff. Schomberg is also located within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan area. This Plan was completed under the Lake Simcoe Protection Act. The purpose of the Plan is to help protect and restore the ecological health of Lake Simcoe and the associated watershed in part by restricting land uses and managing the location of sewage systems, for
example. Accordingly, zoning by-laws are considered to be an important tool for implementing this Plan. Where the Plan restricts permitted uses or establishes special setbacks from watercourses, the Zoning By-law can incorporate overlay zoning or a suffix. Further consultation with the Region and LSRCA is required to identify options and approaches to implement this Plan in the Schomberg Zoning By-law.

6.8 Second Suites

The Province recently amended the Planning Act to require consideration for permitting second suites as an important source of affordable housing. Policies for these uses are to be implemented in municipal official plans (Section 16(3)). Additionally, zoning by-laws are required to give effect to such policies (Section 35.1(1)). The York Region Official Plan similarly reflects these policies (Section 3.5.22). The King City Community Plan, developed prior to the Planning Act changes, does not explicitly address second suites. The Schomberg Community Plan permits apartments in houses as of right within Residential areas, but further direction or policies are not provided (Section 3.5.2).

On November 2, 2015, Council endorsed a series of policy directions to guide the on-going Official Plan Review. Policy Direction 3 relates to existing residential neighbourhoods and addresses second suites. The endorsed direction states that the Official Plan Review will identify policies for determining appropriate locations for secondary residential units as well as criteria for permitting the units (availability of servicing, unit size, number of bedrooms, parking requirements and access).

At this time, it is recommended that direction from the Draft Official Plan be sought to identify permitted locations and standards for second suites. Second suites were not addressed in the new Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law, since the directions from the new Official Plan were not available, and also due to servicing constraints in Nobleton. Should directions from the Official Plan not become available at the time of completion of the new Zoning By-law for Schomberg and King City, proposed permissions and provisions for second suites may be contemplated for these communities since they are not subject to the same servicing restrictions. The development of permissions and requirements may be completed in consideration of approaches used by other municipalities in a similar context as King City and Schomberg.

6.9 Group Home Dwellings

On July 11, 2016, Council endorsed a recommendation to explore the development of policies regarding the management of group homes as part of the Official Plan Review. Accordingly, it is recommended that the regulation of group homes in the Zoning By-laws for King City and Schomberg await direction from the new Official Plan. It is noted that Section 3.5.2 of the Schomberg Community Plan includes a definition for group homes, along with a requirement for licensing as required by Provincial law. Section 3.5.3(i) intends to prevent “an undue concentration of group homes” and a minimum distance is to be incorporated in the implementing zoning by-law.

6.10 Legal Non-Conforming Uses and Non-Complying Structures

Consideration may be made to give legal status to uses known to be legal non-conforming to the uses permitted by the Zoning By-law and to structures known as legal non-complying to the provisions of the
Zoning By-law. For example, where a use or structure was legally established or constructed, but the zoning provisions have changed over time, the use or structure may no longer be in conformity with the permitted uses or the provisions of the Zoning By-law (but is considered to be legal). Uses that were legally established but do not conform to permitted uses are described as legal non-conforming uses. Buildings and structures that were legally constructed but do not conform to the various lot and building requirements are described as legal non-complying buildings or structures.

A legal non-conforming use or legal non-complying structure is limited in the way it may expand and may be required to obtain a minor variance or zoning by-law amendment. Some legal non-conforming uses and structures may already be existing, where the use was established prior to Zoning By-law 1974-53 coming into effect.

There are also possibilities in which situations of legal non-conforming uses or non-complying structures may also be created as part of updating the zoning, as follows:

- The application of a new zone category, with different permitted uses, may result in instances of legal non-conforming uses. This is relevant to the core areas of Schomberg and King City (see Section 6.1) and within the Industrial area of Schomberg (see Section 6.3.1). These situations may be appropriate and intentional for ensuring that future development or redevelopment is undertaken in conformity with the Community Plan. However, the situations should be identified and understood. In some cases, it may be desirable to explicitly permit existing uses to give some ability for the use to expand and to permit additions without requiring a variance or amendment.

- The application of new zoning within the mature residential neighbourhoods is likely to create some instances of legal non-compliance with front yard setbacks or other lot requirements that have changed (see Section 6.2). However, the intent of developing these provisions is to identify zoning that best reflects the character of the neighbourhood, so there must be an aim to minimize these legal non-compliance situations. However, there will likely be “outlier” lots that do not fit into the new zoning. These structures will be permitted, provided they were legally constructed, but will not be permitted to further encroach into the non-complying situation. Additionally, the application of overlay zoning can help provide some further flexibility for locating buildings and structures.

### 6.11 Other Transportation and Sustainability Considerations

There are other matters related to sustainability, healthy communities and transportation objectives that can be implemented by the Zoning By-law. The Township’s Integrated Community Sustainability Plan, the policies in the Community Plans for King City and Schomberg and other relevant studies provide a basis for developing zoning provisions for a wide range of sustainability-related matters.

#### 6.11.1 Bicycle Parking Requirements

York Region’s Official Plan promotes consideration for minimum bicycle parking requirements (refer to Section 2.4). Zoning by-laws are now more commonly introducing minimum bicycle parking
requirements, in addition to the minimum motor vehicle parking requirements as traditionally regulated by zoning by-laws. The Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law introduced bicycle parking requirements (Section 4.7). Any provisions introduced for King City and Schomberg should be appropriate for the context.

6.11.2 Green Energy

Renewable energy undertakings are regulated by the Province, and the types of structures subject to Provincial regulation may change from time to time as the Province updates its regulations. Any other structures may be regulated by the zoning by-law in accordance with the Planning Act. The Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law exempts any renewable energy undertakings that are subject to Provincial regulation from the provisions of the by-law (Section 3.29). This approach will be relevant to King City and Schomberg subject to any further direction provided from the new Official Plan.

6.11.3 Core Area Parking

Consideration may be made to reduce the minimum parking requirements in the core area to reflect the walkability of the core, availability of transit services and the density of uses, which enable visitors to park in one location but visit multiple locations. These characteristics of the core areas of Schomberg and King City may provide a rationale for providing parking exemptions or reductions in required parking, relative to parking requirements for shopping areas that are oriented for the travelling public. However, care should be taken to ensure that reduced parking requirements do not create or worsen parking issues in the communities.

Section 4.5 of the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law provides some special parking requirements applicable to the Core Area (CA) Zone. Under this section, a reduced parking requirement is applicable to apartment dwellings, and a change of use from one commercial use to another commercial use shall not be required to provide additional parking, provided the GFA is not increased and provided all existing parking spaces are maintained. Otherwise, the same minimum parking standards apply based on the use of the lot, regardless of the zone. Additionally, Section 4.5 permits parking to be provided off-site within 90 metres of the subject lot, provided that the parking spaces are maintained through an agreement with the Township that is registered on the title of the land that is being used for the parking.

6.11.4 Local Food

Zoning by-laws are more explicitly addressing community gardens, farmers markets and similar uses, in order to support objectives for promoting local food. On November 2, 2015, Council endorsed policy directions which indicate the Township’s intent to develop Official Plan policies for these uses. It is recommended that direction from the Official Plan be identified to inform the development of appropriate permissions and requirements for these types of uses. It is noted that the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law addresses farmer’s markets as a permitted use. Approaches to managing these uses in other communities may also be considered in the development of provisions.
6.11.5 Trails and Connectivity

Trails and pedestrian connections are desirable for creating pedestrian connectivity, promoting healthier lifestyles and reducing automobile dependency. The Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law explicitly permits trails within all zones, giving flexibility and clarity to allow pedestrian connectivity to be developed without the need to modify zoning. This approach should be considered in the Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg.

6.11.6 Energy/Water Efficient Building Requirements

Zoning by-laws are somewhat limited in its ability to encourage or promote standards for energy and water efficient buildings, which are often a key part of achieving more sustainable community development. Zoning By-laws are generally not considered to be appropriate for regulating architectural design, structural or engineering aspects of building design, building materials or similar matters. The use of zoning by-laws is limited to the matters outlined in Section 34 of the Planning Act. Accessory structures that contribute to energy and water efficiency, such as rain barrels, would normally be subject to the general requirements for accessory structures, although consideration may be made to provide additional flexibility for the location of these structures, provided they are not otherwise impactful.

6.12 Zoning By-law Structure Considerations

There are a number of options available for developing the new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg, namely:

1. Whether the basis for the new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg should be the Nobleton Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law 74-53.
2. Whether one Urban Areas Zoning By-law will be prepared, addressing King City, Schomberg and incorporating the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law, or whether separate zoning by-laws will be prepared for each Urban Area.

6.12.1 Basis for the King City and Schomberg Zoning By-laws

It is intended that the new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg will be developed using a “base” zoning by-law, rather than developing the zoning by-law from scratch. This approach allows staff and reviewers to identify changes made between the base zoning by-law and the proposed by-law. There are two potential base zoning by-laws that may be utilized:

1. Comprehensive Zoning By-law 74-53 (as amended); or
2. The Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law.

The Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law was developed through extensive consultation with Township staff, stakeholders/agencies and the public. This Zoning By-law was developed utilizing Zoning By-law 74-53 as the basis. Many of the changes and improvements made to Zoning By-law 74-53 through this process will be relevant and appropriate for the King City and Schomberg Zoning By-law(s), given that all
three areas represent the Township’s Urban Areas. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law form the basis for developing new Zoning By-law(s) for King City and Schomberg. It is noted that there will be a need to consolidate recent amendments and ensure that any existing provisions in 74-53, as amended, that may have been removed from the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law are considered where they are appropriate for King City and Schomberg.

6.12.2 Urban Areas Zoning By-laws

There are two options for developing and organizing the King City and Schomberg Zoning By-law(s), as follows:

1. Creating a single Urban Areas Zoning By-law, which incorporates the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law; or
2. Developing separate Zoning By-laws for King City and Schomberg.

If separate zoning by-laws were prepared, there would likely be much repetition between the three zoning by-laws. Any modifications made to the provisions through the process of developing the zoning for King City and Schomberg are likely to be applicable and desirable to apply to Nobleton. A single Urban Areas Zoning By-law would be easier for the Township to administer and ensure consistency.

However, a single Urban Areas Zoning By-law is likely to result in a relatively large number of zone categories. It is anticipated that each core area will have its own zone category, and there will be various zone categories related to the mature neighbourhoods and the new development areas. This may be managed by dividing and symbolizing the zone categories based on the applicable community (e.g., the Core Area Zone in Nobleton [CA] could be symbolized to as CAN). The commercial zones, the employment zones and other zones are likely to be relevant to all three communities, subject to further refinement.

It is therefore recommended that one Urban Areas Zoning By-law be developed, including consolidation of the Nobleton Urban Area Zoning By-law. This approach will be easier to administer. Additionally, should the Township ultimately decide to integrate all zoning by-laws, it will be much easier to integrate a single Urban Areas Zoning By-law.
7.0 Next Steps

This Discussion Paper has been drafted initially based on a background review, initial consultation with Township staff and the public. It is anticipated that this paper will be revised based upon written input received from residents, agencies and stakeholders. Additional key issues and opportunities may be identified through consultation. The directions and recommendations presented in this report will be refined through consultation.

It is intend that the broad recommendations made through this Discussion Paper will form the basis for preparing the Draft Urban Areas Zoning By-law. Development of the Draft Urban Areas Zoning By-law is expected to include various iterations and consultation to refine the recommended provisions.