

Attachment 3 - Garden Suites Survey Written Responses

Please note that all potentially identifying content from the following comments has been removed. Otherwise all comments appear as submitted.

9. What best describes your interest in Garden Suites? –Other, please specify

- Generally interested
- I am a property owner with an existing (almost 100yr old) Garden Suite
- I one day hope to own property to potentially build a garden suite.
- I'm interested in progressive city planning that deters NIMBYism
- This is a prequalifying question and I don't think it is useful - it biases the sample analysis
- I work with the small landlord community who often leverage their housing investment in generate revenue to assist with mortgage payments. We've lead previous the Second Suites in Toronto project in 2000 and 2004/05
- I am concerned about housing affordability but also about environmental concerns when yards are paved over to make room for Garden Suites.
- I'm pleasantly surprised the City is even considering letting people do what they want with their properties.
- All of the above!
- Want to increase urban living density to help slow urban sprawl
- I am a citizen concerned about availability of affordable housing in the city.
- Have lived in a 'Garden Suite'... in downtown Toronto
- I have mixed feelings about Garden Suites and want to make sure they increase livability in Toronto, not hinder it
- I believe we should take every opportunity to gently increase density in Toronto, and to offer options to those who might want to liver inter-generationally. I fully support the Garden Suite initiative. I
- smart city planning should focus on inclusivity and best use (residential) in areas appropriate - downtown density
- I am concerned about the availability of housing, and also creatively taking into account efficient land use in and around the city (both to accomodate people of all incomes and to ensure preservation of green space and reduction of pollution).
- Concerned about potential for overcrowding and increasing traffic and effects on public health and safety
- Garden suites could be allowed on corner lots
- I'm in favour of more housing of this type
- Support all forms of innovative housing
- I'm concerned about housing affordability but also impacts of garden suites.
- increasing housing options in Toronto and greater density in the yellow zone
- 1 and 2.
- just curious
- I am tottaly against this concept as it will impact the value of my property and lead to overcrowding in my neighbourhood
- I would like to encourage building of garden suites, but I am concerned at potential impacts
- Property owner, industry professional (architect), concerned about affordability.
- If I could own a house, I would want a Garden Suite. If I was still renting I think they are a great option to live in too. Also am concerned about housing affordability in Toronto.
- I am a condo owner in downtown. I wish to encourage density, available and affordable rental housing and much better use of areas full of single family dwellings
- I am interested in all of the above except I am not an industry professional (should be a multiple answer)
- I am concerned about tall buildings and mid-rise buildings in primarily residential areas

- I am a resident NOT interested in garden suites. The previous graphic does not accurately represent neighbourhood layouts especially houses on a corner lot.
- I believe passionately in the importance of changes in policy that support the missing middle form of gentler intensification and reducing urban sprawl. I probably won't create a second suite but would be thrilled to live next to several.
- I'm unsure how I feel about Garden suites
- I am a resident totally opposed to this unacceptable plan to destroy our residential communities.
- No garden suites in my neighbourhood!
- Property owner that does not support garden suites as a practical approach to increase rental units
- Doubt that we'd build one, but like the idea, with reservations.
- Interested in learning more and understanding potential impact on my house
- I'm a property owner that is ok with garden suites if they aren't too high.
- Not interested at all, ridiculous idea putting little homes in backyards
- Do not want anything to do with these suits on my property or my neighbors.
- Interested homeowner
- I am a property owner that DOES not want a Garden Suite
- I don't want a stranger living on my property and don't need the rental income
- Do not agree with this
- I am a resident uncertain (not 'worried') about the impacts of garden suites. I am also a professional planner interested in the issues involved though have no interest in any involvement in such projects.
- Let people do what they want with their property
- All the above
- Have lived in my neighbourhood for a long time, and want changes to be well thought out
- Just interested
- I have a couple of friends that want to do this....and one day I might trade my condo for a house and want to do it. :)
- All the above except I am not an industry professional
- Not interested
- I am not interested in Garden Suites at all. Not ever.
- Want to understand the opportunity
- I am concerned about overbuilding an already densely City which already has too much hard surfaces and inadequate drainage already
- I am a property owner deeply concerned with steadily increasing population density and high-rise development.
- Am interested in buying a property and building garden suite
- I am interested in the city planning projects.
- I used to live in a garden suite/coach house in Toronto
- I want to keep aging parents close
- I am a property owner living in a detached house with a garden suite/coach house in my back yard
- Multiple, interested in renting one and also concerned about affordable housing
- Both an owner of property and design-build professional that wants to build these on my own properties and for clients!
- More overcrowding. Maybe too many people coming in to the city?
- All of above but not industry professional
- Not at all interested.
- Interested in densification. however I must note that this proposal will not necessarily contribute to affordability. Could instead increase values, which in turn increases taxes, which in turn increases cost of housing.
- Not interested
- Am a property owner interested to see the city move forward on this initiative. don't think my property would ever fit.

- I don't have any intention of building or living in a garden suite, but I like the idea of them.
- Need multigenerational housing option
- concerned about housing affordability plus support solutions that expand housing options without destroying neighbourhoods.
- I am someone who has been impacted by the roll-out of laneway dwellings. I am also someone who is concerned about housing affordability.
- I do not have room for a garden suite on my property.
- I am interested in housing alternatives that promote inter generational relatedness
- Interesting concept...I think that if an owner had a deep lot perhaps but there aren't many deep lots in the Beach. I certainly wouldn't want my immediate neighbours building one and blocking the only sun I get in my backyard? Trying to bring in affordable housing in the Beach? With the taxes we pay on our existing properties, this will just provide more money for the city. People will still be unable to live here.
- My interest was originally tiny houses, on wheels and not, but I don't think Toronto will ever see them legalized. I think this is the best kind of gentle density, though perhaps not the cheapest to build/rent, it will free up other housing. I've been following lanescapes work. A city in the US, can't remember specifically, had 3 or 4 designs available free/low cost to homeowners. Pre-approved and proven.
- I am an industry professional concerned about affordability, may want to build a Garden suit, but concerned about impact. Your poorly designed survey doesn't consider this
- I am a Toronto resident
- Own a house that has a garden suite built long ago (1920's?)
- all of the above
- I am a Realtor who is keen to see more housing opportunities in Toronto. I think Garden Suites are a good idea.
- I am a realtor and I strongly support the approval of allowing toronto residents to convert and build laneway homes and garden suites. Our inventory shortage is a consistent issue and the zoning needs to be updated to allow for more housing.
- I am a resident interested in seeing Toronto develop thoughtful policies which help provide affordable housing to others while respecting existing neighbourhoods. Definitely NOT a NIMBY - I'm fine having them and think trying to stop land intensification is short-sighted and lacking in overall perspective - I'm just curious about how all the interests involved - and there are a lot! - can and will be balanced.
- I am interested in the many benefits of a denser city (for existing residents, for new arrivals, for the environment, for interesting living neighbourhoods).
- General interest in opportunities for additional housing options
- interested in advancing options for infill housing in the core
- I am an owner who is vehemently opposed to garden suites
- I am an advocate of garden and laneway suites and any other forms of affordable housing. I also know of spaces for garden suites in my neighbourhood.
- I think it's a great idea.
- Just curious
- I am not interested in garden suites in my already cramped area
- I am an industry professional (e.g. builder, architect, planning consultant, etc.) that may want to design or help build a Garden Suite, but also concerned about the housing affordability in Toronto
- I am concerned about housing equity, declining neighbourhood population density, and affordability
- We would like to offer to place refugee claimants in laneway suites
- I wish to be informed what the City is contemplating to do with my property
- The more opportunities for housing in Toronto, the better. Supply is a major problem. We want to own a house one day and have room for our parents. If we could build a Garden Suite, that would help us a lot.
- I want a place for aging parent to be able to live close by, but Toronto prices are restrictive

- I am a Tiny House owner interested in placing tiny houses within these housing opportunities. They belong.
- Aging family members who want to stay in their own home
- My parents want me to come back home while also having my own space and privacy. They are also concerned that I'll never own anything in this city, and they don't want me to leave.
- I am a resident and love the idea of garden suites
- I am interested in urban planning and how to improve housing supply
- My parents own a house and we want to build a laneway house for that house
- I am a property owner worried about the impacts of Garden Suites but also concerned about affordable housing.
- We have a son with disabilities who could live there independently with our support nearby
- For my son who has a cognitive disability
- I'm a data scientist that wants to map the data and find the optimal way to identify garden suites opportunities
- None of the above
- I am a property owner that wants to build a garden suite and an architect who definitely wants to design them!
- Interested in owning a house in Toronto in the future with the option of providing a live-in aging place for my father in law.
- Disinterested party
- both an Architect interested in designing Garden suites, am concerned about housing affordability, and hope to be a future property owner of a laneway or garden suite.
- I plan on purchasing a property and to build a garden suite.
- I am concerned about housing affordability and also about impacts of garden suites
- I am a property owner with an existing (almost 100 yr old) Garden suite
- I'm interested in cities generally
- I want to see more flexibility in housing options in Toronto
- I have a family member who wants to build a garden suite
- Planning student who is interested in missing middle housing solutions
- I think it is a good way to add density.
- I am a property owner who is not interested in building a GS but support the initiative.
- I am an industry professional concerned about housing supply in Toronto
- I am a combination of these
- I am firmly opposed to garden suites and increased density
- Do not think this type of unit should be allowed at all.
- I am a property owner who may want to build a laneway suite, and am interested in all options available.
- We need more density.
- new idea, I am curious. But I would not want to have one
- I am a property owner considering a possible Garden Suite build one day and concerned about affordable housing in Toronto.
- Would love to have one for my mom but don't think I will be building one
- I am a property owner and am not worried about the impacts of Garden Suites
- I am both concerned about cumulative impacts of garden suites AND about housing affordability
- I am interested in participating in the discussion about the city
- not too concerned at the moment but need more time to think through this
- I am interested in Toronto offering more housing options
- My son wants to build one and maybe one day we'll live there independently
- I'm interested in increasing density in low-rise, residential communities and having this done appropriately and well.
- I believe that housing affordability, sustainability and appropriate density should be a priority in everytown and city. Toronto being a major city is a leader and can leave the way, not to mention it is completely unaffordable to most middle income earners.

- I'm an owner strongly opposed to garden suites
- I am a property owner who wants to build a garden suite ASAP.
- My family owns Property in Toronto and wants to look after our kids and aging parents.
- Excellent opportunity for future live in caregivers accommodation. This would permit my disabled wife to get long term care without moving to assisted living.
- want to build a garden suite for my mother or our child
- I am a resident and do not want shanty towns and air B&B suites all over the city lane ways... I do not want Toronto turning into a Gypsy looking town. If you can't afford to live in Toronto move far away
- Property owner simply interested in the concept of garden suites
- Live in Toronto
- My husband and I are 78 and 77, If one of our children wanted to live in the main house as we age, I would be interested in living in an accessible garden Suite. Our property is 60' by 185' plenty of room. My husband, however, does not like the idea.
- I am interested in a garden suite but concerned about our already over dense neighbourhood.
- As a tenant, interested in garden suites for possible rental.
- I am a resident of Toronto who is eager to see the new housing options that are available.
- My property would not be big enough for a garden suite.
- Just interested in urban development
- I am a property owner that can't imagine ever having the funds to build a Garden Suite unless the lottery comes my way.
- Interested in the actual applications and uses
- all of the above
- I am a property owner that doesn't want to build a Garden Suite but I don't object to them
- Just interested in the idea
- Interested
- I have a PhD (Civ Eng) in sustainable/resilient neighbourhood design & think garden suites are a good idea.
- My interest is purely academic. I'm just curious
- We plan 3 stages: 1. We want to use Garden Suite for additional living space because my wife and I are now permanently working at home and we have a small 900 sq ft bungalow. 2. In a few years our son will live there until he can afford to buy in T.O. 3. In about 10-12 yrs we will retire and move into our garden suite and rent out our home.
- I just think garden suites will make our City a better place to live.
- built a studio instead of renting as present
- I am a property owner who is interested in providing affordable housing.
- Two responses: I work in the sustainable building design space (P.Eng and researcher) but would also LOVE to live in one
- I am TOTALLY OPPOSED to any multi tenant housing (Rooming Houses)
- I AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND REDUCTION OF SCARCE GREEN SPACE ALREADY ON THESE PROPERTIES.
- I am interested in preserving permeable surfaces, building new green infrastructure and providing adequate green spaces with growing density.
- I am opposed to Garden Suites
- Concerned of limited housing options for young and of aging population.
- I wouldn't build one and don't need one, but like the idea of them and support them completely.
- General interest
- I am concerned over affordable housing for my family, I want to build a Garden Suite above existing garage to provide housing
- May want to build a granny suite in future, but am concerned on impact on neighbourhood
- I am a homeowner with an open mind about the issue

- I am interested in accessible and affordable housing and would consider building and living in a Garden Suite in order to age in place, achieve low lot density and green space and maintain my independence.
- I am city concerned about housing affordability and the impact of garden suites
- Housing affordability and a more even spread of density across the city are very important to me.
- I'm concerned about housing affordability in Toronto, however, because of negative experiences with a neighbour in our semi, and the lack of action by our councillor and city inspections that would show the neighbour's actions (changing his semi in to a rooming/boarding house where none are permitted, I am terribly concerned that unscrupulous owners may take advantage of the Garden Suites options and negatively affect my family and property value.
- So i can age in place in a custom built barrier free home ear friends, family an a hspital if necessary
- I am interested in publicly accessed green spaces
- Build more housing quicker. I am interested in affordability and concerned with the SIGNIFICANT cost that the city imposes on homebuilders as they delay development approvals through their bureaucracy. It is one of the single greatest drivers of cost to build new homes.
- We need more housing choices, and increased population densities in neighbourhoods.
- I would rent one, but I'd like to have one in a property we buy in the future and have more options. Backyard land is cheap and housing and land is extremely expensive in toronto.
- Interested in the concept
- I live next to a Lakeway house being built and I am interested (not worried) in the impacts of garden and laneway houses on neighboring properties
- I am concerned about housing affordability and I am an industry professional(intern architect).
- I am an architect and homeowner and see the value of gentle ways to densify our existing neighbourhoods and the role garden suites could play in keeping our city liveable for families
- I help clients purchase and sell homes. Affordability is an issue for them, as is allowing aging parents to stay with them. Similarly, the ability to rent out a portion of their home. Moreover, I am interested in enabling gentle densification in the neighbourhoods.
- I am an aspiring property owner who would like to have a garden suite for my mother or partner's mother to live in, or rent it out to help with the high costs of housing.
- 61 now. I watched my wifes illness prevent her from being able to access the only washroom on the second floor. I hope to remain in my house as I age but will need additional space with a washroom
- I am dismayed by the number of high-rise condo developments in midtown and am interested in seeing the city encourage more low-rise alternatives.
- I believe garden suites could add needed gentle density to neighbourhoods
- Want to stay informed - interested in the topic
- i live on a laneway BUT as a landlord, it is the BEST option for tenants to pay their OWN utilities as the LTB does not protect landlords well enough on this matter!
- I am a Toronto resident who wants to see more housing options in neighborhood areas, differing housing typologies, and greater density
- Laneway suites are needed to absorb demand for ground related housing that would otherwise result in suburban sprawl. Laneway suites are also needed to - in combination with conversions to semi-detached and lot splits - bring existing neighborhoods up to densities and a mix of uses (~100 jobs & people/ha) that is sufficient to support active transportation and enhanced, 24h high-order transit.
- interested in the development of this policy
- I'm an urban planning and design student interested in learning more
- I am a property owner that is both concerned about housing affordability and would like the option to perhaps build a Garden Suite one day.
- realtor

- Affordability plus densifying Toronto in a way other than high rises. Supporting walkable, cyclable neighbourhoods
- I am concerned about doing this
- No interest in a Garden Suite. We live on a ravine - this would be illegal!
- n/a
- And also concerned about impacts.
- I want to show support for Garden Suites.
- If can be suitable for DSO individuals wait listed with developmental disabilities needing housing
- I think they're a great idea for certain groups, renters, families, etc. I'd rather see an elderly parent living in one of these units than a basement.
- General interest
- I am a home owner who is concerned about the increase of our Property Taxes with the Rezoning of our Established Neighbourhoods, whether the City of TO can afford to build, keep up with the required infrastruce and services.
- I am a real estate investor/developer with an interest in expanded housing options in neighbourhoods
- Have in laws that need a place to live. Sharing our home is not feasible. A garden suite would be a great solution. Also as a landlord this makes a lot of sense to expand housing supply
- Need affordbale housing everywhere
- Adult child with disabilities who would benefit to live independently but family support near by
- I live in a Heritage Conservation Districk and this Garden Suites would be completely contrary to the purposes of this designation.I am against any densification of this sort of development. .
- I am concerned about affordable housing and also want to help show how tiny homes can be a suitable and affordable asset.
- Interested in helping the city understand land leasing opportunities
- I am a property owner that would like to build a Garden Suite, and potentially I may want to live in my garden suite someday as well to make room for my children to have the opportunity to move into the main house as they mature with families and need more space. I also like the idea that this can be used for our aging parents if needed.
- I am a property owner who wishes there were more rentals available in my neighborhood for singles or young couples
- Large yards are wasted space. Renters should have options that aren't just hi-rises.
- I support garden suites
- Just interested
- I want to add one above my garage in the back. It creates more living options for renters too. We are really in a crunch for housing in this city. It's no longer affordable. I worry about the next generation. And the foreign speculators. Canadians cannot afford to buy a home at the rate for a home anymore. And it definitely increases housing.
- I am a property owner that may want to build a Garden Suite one day, I am an industry professional (e.g. builder, architect, planning consultant, etc.) that may want to design or help build a Garden Suite, I am concerned about housing affordability in Toronto
- I am a resident excited about small scale intensification across the city and an expert in sustainability
- Property owner wanting a say in what happens in my ward.
- My neighbour intends to build a two storey garden suite adjacent to my property severely impacting my sight lines to the park out back.my privacy will also be severely impacted.

10. Please indicate your position on each of the statements below. (*The following responses are from the “Other, please specify” field. The statements in the question are shown in the two columns below*)

Garden Suites can enable intergenerational living on the same property

Garden Suites can allow seniors to downsize and age in place

Garden Suites can enable homeowners to earn income from their properties

Other, please specify

Garden Suites can give more people the opportunity to live in low-rise residential neighbourhoods

Garden Suites can improve housing affordability in Toronto.

Garden Suites can increase the City's rental housing stock

Garden Suites can have a positive impact on quality of life in Toronto

Garden Suites can provide homeowners flexibility in how they live on their property

Garden Suites can positively contribute to the character of the neighbourhoods where they are located

- It's a bad idea as people don't want their neighbours looking into their backyard which is invading privacy
- Garden suites will use up much needed green space.
- Garden Suites can also offer safety in that, more eyes watching the neighbourhood means it will be safer.
- Garden suites may potentially increase noise levels and garbage in otherwise quiet neighbourhoods, especially on smaller lots.
- Garden Suites rents should be controlled to secure affordability
- Garden Suites can provide more independence for those who cannot live entirely on their own
- Rules against garden suites are racist and classist
- Garden suites would add to the security/safety of neighbourhoods as well as improve mental health by increasing community and connection
- Neighbour's suits could impact a family's privacy of their own backyard space especially if suits over garages have windows overlooking the backyard
- Garden suites can allow adult children to provide a place for seniors or family members with disabilities to age in place with the support of family on site
- Fix housing affordability with real measures. End single family detached zoning in the city.
- needs to be considered with better transit and bike lanes so it is not a parking problem
- Garden suite can help accommodate remote working
- During pandemic, additional space for children and/or at home work would have been incredibly productive
- Most laneways have garages and if you build within the laneway, that house may need a garage or parking space.
- Helps increase overall density in a holistic way maintaining neighborhood character and residential livability.
- Garden suites can help support local retail and transit use
- Garden Suites will allow homeowners to get rid of necessary green space in their back yards.
- Garden Suites can leave neighbours with no choice of how they live on their property
- Garden Suites may have a negative impact on the tree canopy
- These are not affordable rentals. Many will be Air bnb. The lanes do not provide safe access/ egress for seniors
- Garden suites and more middle housing are great at improving the city
- They are freaking awesome.
- Help to deal with housing affordability
- Building creates jobs

- Garden suites are good for Toronto
- For both owner and renter, garden suites are enriching and serving the most well off people in the city.
- Should have been implemented years ago
- Garden suites (and all forms of distributed density) are an important carbon reduction measure.
- Garden Suites, constructed to higher energy performance standards, can contribute less to GHG emissions
- Garden suites can be detrimental to neighbours and neighbourhoods
- earn income / pool family resources (slight difference)
- Garden suites can increase density where it is already too dense
- Garden suites are a good option for young adults who want independence while living with their parents.
- The energy efficiency of garden suites can reduce the environmental impact of the city
- Will increase population density as well as vehicular traffic, strain on infrastructure that is already over taxed
- Garden suites can create new risks related to fire, noise and safety
- Increasing the density of people, cars, and noise at the expense of trees and quality of urban living which is already desperately in need of open public green spaces would be a travesty. !!
- Garden suites should not be allowed
- Will lead to speculation by developers and drive up prices
- Turn established neighbourhoods to eliminate green spaces with a mish mash of garden suites
- Garden suites will increase property taxes
- I think noise and privacy will be a nightmare
- We already have too many people living in Toronto. Do I need to move out to keep the little green space I have. Please do not let this happen. It's a bad idea. I like to think of my backyard as my oasis in the city.
- Garden suites will turn into airbnb taking away neighbor privacy
- Too much crowding
- Parking issues and noise and access issues
- Investors will have a field day!
- Garden suites can earn the city more tax dollar revenue to support real programs in need
- Garden Suites will increase housing stock
- add separate private space for family/friends or caregivers
- Garden suites will have negative Impacts on City tree canopy and permeability
- Increasing Population density is a good thing
- Will densify already dense neighbourhoods
- These questions are leading and skewing the answers
- An amazing idea given Toronto's housing crisis.
- GS reduce neighbours enjoyment and privacy of their property
- Enhance community
- You are asking for opinion responses to math questions. That will result in unusable survey data. Ex, suites will increase stock (that's a math question) but I don't think it's a good idea (that's an opinion response) - you have to reword your questions.
- Garden suites impact quality of life negatively for all involved.
- Garden suites will increase traffic flow and create parking issues.
- Essential policy change in context of inevitable population increase of Toronto
- Unless Garden Suites are located in appropriate locations they can become a disaster for neighbourhoods
- Garden suites will provide more options for caregivers and those in need of care
- We need to promote purpose built rental accomidation and or for multi generational living
- increase risk to community
- Should not be able to be rented out for income.
- Believe there will be way less green space in the neighbourhood
- infrastructure will be challenged to service such suites.
- Too high density.

- Garden suites can help address Toronto's housing crisis
- Allow me to live one one level wheel chair friendly
- Ridiculous concept in some neighborhoods. We have land usage laws which would need to be changed, parking issues, green space issues, density issues, property tax issues, impact on neighbours property values, security issues etc etc. We have now in exist
- Will create expensive 'mancaves' that will create more hard covered surfaces that directly affects stormwater issues. All Ontario residential properties have privacy in the front but more open backyards, so now neighbours will have garden suites facing th
- Improve family unity and support throughout life
- Garden suites will drive up the cost of owning a house and be a bonanza for developers who buy, redevelop and flip properties.
- Garden suites will negatively impact our municipal services including sewers, community centres, green space
- Garden sweets increase hardscaping, reduce greens pace, and have a negative impact upon the local environment
- Garden homes will increase density and impact on neighborhoods
- These units are thrown together, unsafe ad shouldn't be legal to allow someone to live there. If they are built to code, they'll be unaffordable. This is a scheme to help the Wealthy get wealthier
- Garden suites are eco-friendly by adding density
- Impact privacy
- Garden suites can provide increased gentle density in Toronto's thinning suburbs
- Not keen in our neighborhood but may be appropriate where space allows.
- Garden Suites are an alternative for smaller houses to expand their living spaces without having to dig down or build up
- Garden Suites put the infrastructure under stress
- Garden Suites may increase housing supply but at great cost (higher house prices, more congestion, less green space, poorer quality of life, etc.)
- Garden suites would inevitably impose on neighbouring home owners.
- Great opportunity for home offices, caregiver space or barrier free handicap access units
- Garden Suites will result in more congestion in already crowded residential areas
- Garden Suites create congestion, noise, parking problems and more
- The physics of heating and insulating a garden suite will increase Toronto's carbon footprint vs. building a single three-unit structure in place of both the single detached house and garden suite. If you want triplex density, just permit triplexes.
- Parking/Traffic is already negatively impacting area
- all of these statements are dependant on size, cost of rentals
- Remove Rob Ford
- Garden suites are a good idea for all lot types
- Garden Suites all ow for improved drainage
- Garden suites can diminish the peace, privacy and local foliage of neighbours without their consent
- aLLow A PLACE FOR YOUR CHILDREN TO LIVE IF THEY EVER NEED HELP.
- Garden suites will increase population and traffic densities of a neighbourhood.
- Suites for alternative work space but not live
- The setup of statements and positions is biased.
- Garden suites are a drop in the bucket for housing affordability and strongly favours homeowners rather than renters.
- Garden suites will put more pressure on quality of city services
- Garden Suites will make TO like a condensed Rat City
- garden suites can definitely negatively impact density
- Garden Suites add an extra set of eyes in the community and increase safety.
- Garden suites can reduce soft scrape and damage trees and lead to flooding
- Garden suites would give a Neighbourhood character
- Garden Suites will bring down property values, strain infrastructure and overpopulate neighbourhoods.

- Add attractive element to neighbourhoods
- Canada is 2nd largest country in the world and 39th in terms of population, Garden Suites is madness
- Have family members close by.
- Existing severed lots in laneway MUST ALSO BE ALLOWED TO BE DEVELOPED. Ban new severances, but for those already severed, allow them to be developed.
- This survey is severely skewed to support laneway housing. Eg will Laneway suites improve home affordability. Of course it would as all property's would go down in value.
- Garden suites are an opportunity to force denser developments into Neighbourhoods
- G.S. make Toronto more liveable
- They increase the tax base and allow the City to collect more revenue from the same land. In suburban neighbourhoods they allow bigger density to support viability of schools and shops nearby. They allow us to live closer to work and reduce car dependency
- Garden suites improve safety
- There are privacy and noise issues. We have one next door. Too many cars, parties. loud voices, lights at night. Not a good solution in many areas
- Being able to adapt to accommodate population growth is necessary
- Much more affordable housing option for a lot of folks
- Implementing Garden Suites should be regulated to encourage greater affordability
- Ability to live in a detached unit that isn't a huge condo!
- Impact on neighbours enjoyment of their backyards and impact on tree coverage and overall congestion.
- It's a good idea to help families in all sorts of different positions issues : while keeping families close by and giving some freedom too
- Introduce increased density and negatively impact on availability of public services
- This survey is weighted to elicit support.
- Garden suites will allow the next generation to live in the same city they grew up in.
- Allows privacy with coop living
- No airbnb
- Creating as-of-right blanket zoning provisions like this and reducing files to CoA can improve efficiency, competitiveness and cost of housing for Torontonians.
- Makes Toronto more modern
- Garden suites can make ownership more affordable to first time buyers by providing income towards the mortgage
- It's the right strategy of creativity in these times
- parking issues - overcrowding
- We need green space and garden suites could reduce green spaces.
- They make sense when we have so much land in Toronto that is unused.
- Garden suites can seriously interfere with neighbours e.g. noise, privacy, view, sunlight.
- It can be used as a yoga space
- Allow properties with large lots to build garden houses that can be sold as opposed to becoming a landlord
- A garden suite will replace lot area currently used for vehicle parking with an apartment unit.
- Garden suites rented to non-family can have a negative impact on aging owners and their enjoyment of their property.
- Garden Suites might reduce backyard green space.
- Great idea!
- Builders can gentrify and homeowners continue to have all the wealth and the government is okay with it all. Go away.
- Can lead to short-term rentals, can impact infrastructure, parking issues
- This is willful destruction of elegant and historic neighborhoods
- Allow aging people to remain in their neighbourhoods and communities.
- They are cool!
- AirBnBs, bright lights, tree removal, drainage

- Generational garden suites can facilitate independent living arrangements while helping young people to save towards a future purchase of their own houses.
- Can intrude on neighbours privacy
- Garden suites can NEGATIVELY impact privacy of adjacent properties
- Increase density in well services neighbourhoods
- Let's make green roofs compulsory to make up for the lost garden/greenspace.
- garden suites will increase income disparity by allowing those who already own home to profit further from them without creating new opportunities for home ownership
- Garden suites will hinder efforts to preserve and re-habilitate biodiverse ecosystems in the Carolinian zone (by removing available space for native plants and native bees)
- This is a very biased pro garden Suite feature
- re flexibility, an owner can live in the small house and rent the big house, separate from tenant(s)
- Gardensuits might increase property prices
- A Garden Suite may allow a family member to reside on the same property as parents living in a home, and provide care for them as they age.
- This is a great initiative and fills the missing middle and tackles the Toronto yellow belt of low density housing
- Garden suites promote flexibility and versatility to accommodate for changes in housing needs over time.
- AirBNB enforcement issues
- It just makes sense
- Garden suites will lead to uncontrollable density
- Can help repopulate areas with low density and in decline (eg school aged population)
- So far this survey seems more like a promo to push the benefits of Garden homes than a survey of attitudes..very biased...no consideration of all the negative aspects, maybe that's next
- Negative Impact on adjoining properties
- Toronto should clean up the Committee of Adjustment first. It's out of control granting variances that neither reinforce nor respect the prevailing neighbourhood character. See OP Ch. 4. Policy 5.
- Stop this stupid idea.
- Garden suites can provide another living space for isolation in the case of sickness in the event of a pandemic.
- Garden Suites provide an opportunity for adhoc community building - this should always be encouraged
- Garden suites will create more high density living and impact neighbours
- Higher density in low rise neighborhoods supports more local amenities and businesses.
- Opportunistic Developers/Irresponsible Landlords can take advantage of use of garden suites
- The house can be more accessible for older people
- Environmental Impact is positive
- Help with Toronto's housing crisis
- They can in tease densification while respecting historical neighbourhood profiles.
- Diversity of housing types is essential for having a city with diverse people. We want our elderly to stay and young to arrive and stay for a generation.
- Garden suites create more dynamic low-rise neighbourhoods
- Will allow my disabled daughter a place to live with support from me.
- Garden suites can help to passively increase density in 'yellow belt' areas of the city
- Denser cities are more sustainable and allow for live/play/work situations
- Banning garden suites is silly
- Garden Suites could allow small families and newcomers embrace historical neighbourhoods instead of being limited with Condos.
- Impact on neighbors and green space is NOT considered
- We own but can not afford to stay when we retire and would find a small place in our garden a perfect solution
- Garden suites should be prioritized by City Planning Department over condos
- Na
- garden suites can help residential neighborhoods intensify gradually

- slow the impact of urban sprawl and teach a more mindful use of space
- Implementing garden suites without ability to sever the property ownership only serves to support existing landowners.
- Will be used mostly by the wealthy and not as a low income solution
- With concrete rules concerning design, Garden Suites can positively contribute to the character of the neighbourhoods where they are located.
- Do you think the City will work out a flexible and adaptable regime of property taxes to differentiate between the use of garden suites (multigenerational, retirement, mortgage affordability, or for profit)?
- Increase density so more local services are feasible
- Garden suites are cool and would take advantage of land that is otherwise being unused
- Gentle density makes effective use of existing infrastructure (roads, transit, water/sewers, community services) and reduces sprawl
- Would like to add garden suite for parents retirement, until then to help with large mortgage payments which prevent my husband and I from building savings even with a good income from work. Peers my age (millennials) are struggling to purchase homes and
- Much depends on governing bylaws
- This blank space is puzzling.
- Fire access requirements will ensure nothing gets built
- Garden suites will have profound impact to low rise neighborhoods and a thorough study should be done to understand the pros and cons
- Love them, what are we waiting for!!
- Provide safe housing for vulnerable populations
- Give poorer family members a place to live alone.
- Will serve to increase rent/lower quality of life expectations in the city
- Will also allow grandparents to provide care giving to children without the need to travel.
- ruin the historical/architectural character of GS
- Allow for home office space
- Property Owners should have the right to build whatever they want on their property as long as it complies with zoning by-laws
- Garden suites use land as efficiently as lane houses
- Can have a positive impact on existing neighbours
- Garden Suites will affect capital gains on primary residence unless the federal government makes changes to the income tax act.
- They may change the character
- rainwater no place to go, permanently removing backyards
- Option for older children to stay at home in granny suite
- Independent living for adults with disabilities
- Provide affordable housing for people with special needs to live more independently while having someone on the property watching out for them
- Only wealthy will benefit. Studies show permissions for accessory units *generally increase unaffordability* by increasing property values/taxes, leading to higher housing/rental prices. Seniors will likely be pushed out of their homes by this initiative.
- This will result in depletion of green space and trees
- good low rise options for disabled and the seniors
- Can help children who cannot afford to have a home in the city they grew up in
- This is focused on homeowner and does not address impact on neighbours.
- I will be able to live close to my elderly without having to live in basement whole life
- Garden suites are a creative way of tackling Toronto's housing issues
- Opportunity to provide a home for family or friends while living separately in close proximity
- add gentle densification of neighbourhoods without changing their character
- Garden suites can provide incomes to small and local development/construction businesses
- allows for diversity, accessibility and inclusion in Toronto
- seamless transition for established neighbourhoods that don't have public laneways
- Will also reduce cars and garages.

- Can they be used by home owners to work from home in an office type space?
- Garden suites can increase population density in already dense areas, and would need an appropriate upscale of local services
- Current zoning by-law is out-dated
- Depends on how set up. If used as AirBnb could be very bad for neighbourhood
- Height limits should be considered and sewer access...if
- Garden Suites on their own are inadequate for addressing living needs in the city.
- I think garden suites will have a very negative effect on neighbourhoods, more cement and less green. Will impact neighbours and reduce their property value. How they are used will be difficult to enforce bylaws etc
- Great for adult children who haven't mustered the courage to move out
- negative impact on neighbours increasing noise, security concern, density, more garbage, encroaching on neighbours plots
- Garden Suites can negatively impact the quiet enjoyment of neighbours on nearby properties.
- GS's can hurt trees by denying rain to the ground, and runoff issues
- Opportunity to give someone low rent
- Low-rise multi-residential would house more people than Garden Suites
- In current times when our young adult children Can not afford to live on their own in rentals in Toronto, garden suites offer them an affordable option if rented from parents, but allows independence
- Garden suites need to be tightly regulated. One bedroom or bachelor suites less than 800 sq feet. Should not result in loss of mature trees. Ever.
- Provides affordable rent and helps with the incredibly high housing costs.
- can intensify neighbourhood sustainably
- garden suites will create more problems than they will solve. Crowded conditions will look like a third world country.
- Its a low cost solution for huge social problem!
- Gives elders and young families a sense of "belonging"
- It can help increase density in a city where more people want to live in.
- Rent home for retirement income and live in a garden suite when not traveling.
- Privacy of neighboring property a huge concern!
- Garden suites will negatively impact quiet and enjoyable neighbourhoods.
- Garden suites will not reduce soft landscaping
- Unscrupulous renters cannot be evicted
- What an absolutely horrid idea
- This type of housing option will decrease the property value of those properties surrounding a garden suite in which low income individuals live
- Privacy from Neighbour's will be negatively impacted with people looking into the neighbours house
- May result in too many people living in a small property and disrupting neighbours privacy and aesthetics around their home
- 2 reasons - first, I will need a place for my adult daughter with disabilities to live 'independently' but closely supervised, and second I may need to have a place for an 80+ year old parent to live with us
- There should be more density options than high-rises (down with the yellow-belt)
- Important to provide fact based information to citizens about the benefits of such a program
- Garden suites enable rich homeowners to profit even more off nimbys zoning regulations that don't allow actual housing that will make a dent in affordability to be built
- Will create more congestion in communities. Have we not learned from the COVID pandemic, we need space.
- Garden suites can allow families to house and care for elderly family members
- Garden Suites can negatively affect the quality of life of neighbours
- It would allow to take care of my parents while they can remain independent
- Garden suites may impact the privacy of neighbouring homeowners and enjoyment of their property

- Good idea, do it.
- Garden suites negatively change the character of our city and reduce privacy.
- Provide supportive affordable housing for seniors w family living close by
- Overcrowding
- Use previously unused land for housing without impacting neighbourhood's look and feel
- provide great rental housing options for young families in Toronto
- Allows for densification, therefore would make city services more efficient.
- Can also be models for true sustainable design & building
- Neighbors will like to have a Garden House by their yard?
- Opportunity to build relationships with renters to assist with property upkeep and general neighbourhood curb appeal.
- If I couldn't afford to live in a specific neighborhood, then I would look elsewhere and try to live within my means.
- Provide multi generational housing opportunities
- Home office opportunity
- Allows for mixed income communities to flourish in diversity depleted pockets of the city
- Garden Suites can increase the investment value in a person's home.
- Garden suites will have a detrimental impact on the city's biodiversity and environment.
- Garden Suites can overload the original design specs for power, water and sewage systems
- I am concerned about affordable housing. I was not able to indicate this in the previous question, which allowed for one response only.
- I believe they will increase Affordability for people of my generation for whom buying a home is impossible
- It just makes sense. Improves property value.
- They bring extra density to an area and take away from one's ability to enjoy their backyard
- create more crowding and sewage/water issues
- Garden suites May infringe on adjacent property provacy
- I need a caregiver, it would be a great way to offer housing to a professional that could be on call during an emergency like a fall.
- Just what the community needs!
- Garden Suites will negatively impact the quality of life of neighbouring houses
- Dismiss the creation of garden suites
- Provide an opportunity for families to live affordably without having to put up large payments for a new dwelling for dependent family members.
- downsizing can positively affect our impact in the environment.
- People will get used to living in smaller places, smaller eco footprint
- Garden suites will increase the housing inequality gap with owners growing their capital and renters increasing their cost of living. Garden suites are interesting but will not be affordable and will make housing more expensive.
- Garden suites will be taken advantage of by developers
- Is this enough to address affordability?
- parking will become a problem.
- These are loaded push-poll questions!
- NO Garden Suites
- Garden suites can offer a better environment for renters living in the basement units
- Garden Suites can reduce green space and sunlight
- Garden suites are nothing new—they are very common in much of the Western World.
- Housing prices and taxes will increase for all properties
- It absolutely depends on the location and size of the property. May children live on a laneway where they fit the current rules for a laneway house and it wouldn't impact neighbours. I live on a difficult lot access laneway where houses are very narrow.
- Very bad idea!
- This is a bird brain scheme. Does city hall have nothing better to do?
- if the homeowner rents a garden suite - it would need to be self-contained with no need for the tenant to use the main house at all

- This will destroy our neighbour hoods
- Garden suites are a positive economic and environmental move for Toronto and an example for other Cities.
- Garden suites can increase the safety of deep lots by increasing usage at all hours
- At their worst, they will make our backyard spaces incredibly ugly.
- There should be no/few restrictions on the design of the garden suite. Why does it necessarily have to be smaller than the main house?
- This is a bad idea
- Density issues outweigh any benefits
- Negative impact on existing infrastructure
- G-Suites increase demands on infrastructure including public parks for pets.
- Garden Suites invade neighbours' privacy
- Garden suites can have a negative impact if their sole purpose is to increase density
- Garden Suites are not for grad students
- They can also lead to crowding and parking problems.
- Rental and ARN BNB will increase school and safety affordability.
- Families can live together in the house as we do currently
- This is an act to invade privacy
- Garden Suites can help slow development in farming areas to the north of the city
- This idea will negatively impact our city. We require well thought out, organized housing for the most vulnerable. Toronto deserves better!! Please plan for a great Toronto. This is not it!!
- Garden Suites are a great idea!
- This is just a nice term to bring more problems into our community. Our community has been significantly impacted by crime since the homeless shelter brought in. This is another problem for bringing more crime and trouble to our neighbourhood .
- Younger generation (millennials) can take advantage on their parents properties and find an alternative way to have an ability to move out and be near family.
- This push poll is not truly designed to obtain the opinions of residents. The questions are simply assertions in favour of allowing garden suites in already densely populated urban areas.
- Green space will decline.
- You can build customized property even you can't rebuild your semi detached or town house
- just makes sense
- Garden suites can negatively contribute to the character of neighbourhoods.
- help prevent equity erosion in retirement years aiding in wealth transfer for future generations & support savings in early years by younger generations
- these suites corrupt neighbourhoods and should not be allowed
- Garden suites will likely exacerbate the wealth gap between owners & renters
- Allows us to provide elder care in a separate unit rather than retirement home
- Garden suites can lead to substandard living conditions for tenants (ie 'refurbished' garages)
- Like anything else I feel that this will be abused by people
- Garden Suites can negatively impact those who do not wish to live in congested areas
- Garden Suites can have a negative impact on neighbouring properties
- Garden suites should not be a replacement for low and high rise property
- Garden suites can give young people more flexibility in living arrangements/bility
- Garden suites will be used by homeowners as short-term rental units.
- Garden Suites offer an alternative to replacing small small houses with 'monster houses'.
- garden suites allow for gentle density and can be nicer in some cases than building more condos
- The city should also focus on encouraging if meaningful mid rise mixed buildings on major streets
- Garden suites can have environmental impacts such as increasing watershed
- Garden suites will have a negative impact on privacy of neighbouring homeowners .
- Impacts neighbour privacy
- Garden suites will improve the safety of communities.
- Helps parents and kids live together. 99% of kids in grad 12 and under will never be able to adopt these houses. I can't even!

- Garden Suites would allow older children who can't afford to rent to live with their parents, but in a more private setting.
- Garden Suites can cause parking problems due to limited street parking
- Great option for allowing owner to downsize
- Garden suites can improve accessibility
- garden suites will be one more threat to open green space on private land
- keep family members close in order to support each others
- Sharing garden space could be dubious
- Garden suites build homeowners' wealth, not society's.
- contribute to real estate building industry
- They should be legalized
- Going to take away green space while increasing resource uses
- Garden Suites would allow a family member with and Intellectual Disability their own place to live and a degree of independence.
- Garden Suites can be part of the solution of addressing the 'missing middle' in Toronto's housing crisis.
- Improved environmental impacts by utilizing existing developed land (could reduce rainwater management capacity on residential lots, but there is no guarantee that the outdoor spaces aren't already somewhat hardscaped and this would reduce lawn irrigation
- Rooming Houses are the answer, the government has to building affordable housing and not expect private house owners to be the solution to government abismal action to solve this problem.Canada has millions of land across the country, less populated.
- They will not be abused.
- Garden suites attached to missing middle properties are the only LTB protected stand alone dwellings. Houses and condos can be sold allowing eviction. Missing middle scale developments protect tenants while allowing tenancy in proper residential settings.
- Affordable
- seniors who are downsizing can afford to build another house on their property
- I'm interested in turning the garage into a unit I can live in.
- Build homes in Barrie and leave us alone.
- They Ruin existing neighbourhoods meant for residents not to make properties development oportunities for rich developers to price properties out of reach of ordinary home owners
- Can generate income for owners
- Multigenerational is a good thing
- will increase housing unaffordability
- There are safety issues
- Neighbourhoods with Garden Suites will have higher crime rates in the next 10+ years
- Concept of Garden Suites
- I love the idea of garden suites, and want TO to have more choices and lower rent opportunities. I do worry a little bit about losing sunlight in our postage stamp backyard if someone else built a garden unit. But live the idea of more flexibility.
- Garden suites are a bad idea in most residential properties in Toronto
- Most efficient use of land in low density neighborhoods, postive ESG effects
- Infrastructure not there, parking issues!
- Overcrowding of residential areas
- Garden suites can cause significant disruption in daily life of neighbours
- Garden suites are a good option for seniors to live on the same property as their children and have their own space.
- My grown children can live in a separate house
- Create scenarios with additional short term rental
- Current building footprint percentages relative to lot sizes should be respected
- Garden Suites should not be allowed for short term transient rental such as R-BNB
- Garden Suites allow bigger family group to provide privacy to teen/children growing-up.
- Garden suites can negatively impact stormwater runoff by reducing trees and gardens with more buildings

- I happen to need an accessible home and this is the perfect opportunity to have one without leaving the neighbourhood.
- get some brake to the next generation to star their life
- Can provide for accessible housing at grade
- Provide access to interesting architecture for all
- They can allow families whose children otherwise could not afford housing in Toronto to remain close and supportive of one another,
- Homeowner should not be able to dictate how other homeowners use their property- there is a housing crisis in this city and the minority are controlling the needs of everyone else.
- The city is too crowded
- Families can live close to each other. Multigenerations living in one lot.
- Garden Suites reduce the amount of green spaces.
- More supply of Garden suites can mean less high rises in the GTA
- I have a child with a sever disability. I look at a garden suite as an opportunity for her to live semi-independently - or to offer housing to a full time caregiver. But first, I would want an opportunity to use the housing for elderly parents.
- Additional residents create an economic base for revival of retail and services along flanking main streets.
- Short-term rentals should not be allowed in Garden Suites
- Garden suites decentralize development and help the little guy
- This is a fabulous and long overdue initiative
- Create increased economic activity
- It can preserve the original plan and ownership of the lot of a Victorian house.
- So they can have a yoga studio, gym, office
- Garden Suites unlike laneway suites will cause serious parking and emergency access issues. Enforcement will be weak just like for our bylaws for building in residential areas now.
- So long as the Garden Suite tenant has equal access to the private outdoor space, or their own private outdoor space, Garden Suites can be great places to live.
- Provides ability to house elder parents and provide them dignity and independence
- Garden suites will destroy communities, increase congestion, increase anger between neighbours
- They're a start but you really should be allowing plexes
- Detached land will increase in value due to increased productivity, making detached homes limited to exclusively generational weath/investors
- garden suites can impact the neighbours
- Garden Suites will be tiny and mostly used for short term rentals
- Garden suites should be severable so they can be sold instead of rented
- Some detached home owners are already renting out part or the entire property as Airbnb. An addition of a garden suite at the back of the property will affect safety, traffic, privacy and disturbance of the neighbourhood.
- Garden suites, more than purpose built rentals or condos, provide the greatest opportunity to enable more affordable rentals. Moreover, they contribute to the principles of inclusivity and equity, which are critical to building a more livable city.
- Potential for noise problems and privacy.
- Decreases probability of single family housing conversions to large apartment buildings and helps preserve character of residential neighborhood
- Parking will be an issue and trash
- Garden suites can provide proximity to make caregiving for elderly parents more accessible
- allowing for more low rise and tall buildings provides more units per area than garden suites
- Garden Suites increase the risk of Air BnB and transient tenants
- Provide viable security for older, live alone owners.
- Garden Suites increase population density when we are already a very crowded city and they also take away green space that is desperately needed to combat air pollution, bee pollination, biodiversity, etc. We don't want people living in every square inch.
- Everything you listed above is 100% accurate. It is just facts based on raw supply and demand.

- Garden Suites can provide newlywed couples the ability to have affordability in a home
- Lost in appeal. Too mixed in population. Too dense. People and tenants do not behave. My area has deteriorated a lot because of multiple tenants in a house. Pls don't. I will move away. I have enough already right now. There are four cars on the drive
- Garden suites may become investments for the wealthy if both the main house and garden suite are rentals.
- Garden Suites can exacerbate housing inaffordability in the same way basement apartments have
- Increased traffic in neighbourhoods
- increases density, better use of city resources, shorter commute times, more liveable city
- City services are not able to handle increased population
- Create the opportunity to improve the suburban streetscape on arterials with reverse frontage lots.
- Many Garden suites already exist in Toronto: Esta es una oportunidad que la ciudad tiene de legalizar, reglamentar y controlar garden suites en Toronto the city could Legalize, regulate and control garden suites in toronto and
- Worried about the housing market and giving homeowners more license to increase their market values. Also concerned about over crowding, slum landlords and exploitation . Need more affordable housing which means a reduction in rental costs.
- Promote a more effective work from home space
- Implement them. Period. Housing affordability is out of reach.
- Garden suites will divert hoteling/Airbnb units to permanent housing.
- ALL tenants would like to live in a home but DO NOT want any yard and snow maintenance
- Should be like Florida whereby House owner owns land. Part of the rent to garden suite is to be treated rent to own only building.
- Garden Suites can provide additional space for homeowners who cannot afford to move or to allow adult children to move back home.
- They can allow us to preserve more heritage buildings in historic neighbourhoods while increasing density and housing affordability
- Garden suites can increase density in low rise neighborhoods to lower our carbon footprint
- Garden suites are needed to divert demand for ground related housing away from suburban sprawl (where provincial planning documents will otherwise direct it) and to bring existing Toronto neighborhoods to densities (~100/ha) required for quality transit.
- Added rental income
- Improve inter generational living options
- There are enough community resources to accommodate an increase in residents as a result of garden/laneway suites
- Garden Suites will add to the already heavy loaded infrastructure (sewerage, road traffic, noise pollution, garbage removal, loss of trees and greenspace, soil erosion, loss of privacy, more use of energy)
- Helps slow the need to build highrise in neighborhoods in the future
- Intensification allows more people to live without a car
- Garden suites contribute to over utilization of services.
- Extra space for short term or day use.
- allow multi generational families
- Assists younger people in their ability to afford a home, especially in central Toronto while providing affordable rental housing to others
- Destroy the current character of neighbourhoods!
- We are entering into a new era of WFH, and I need more options to accessibly get to work
- Don't need crowded living. That's why many came to North America for space. So why are many condos and townhouses being built and long term care facilities. Absolutely not. No privacy in backyard. There will be more noise and people in neighboring yard.
- It will not change the fact that people cannot afford to own homes
- Garden suites will make housing prices increase

- Garden Suites can support my son with Down Syndrome to have a semi-independent and good quality of life in the community he has grown up in.
- We need to allow garden suites immediately and stop being behind in the times!
- Increase affordability
- Have detrimental impact on direct neighbours and community as a whole
- The Garden suite will allow me to stay in the city allows me sense of security to travel without any worries about strangers entering the property, cutting of grass and/or snow removal.
- Garden suites put more pressure on infrastructure
- Garden suites will suit wealthy homeowners and landlords first and foremost
- Garden suites provide an opportunity for a housing product that already exists in Toronto in large scale - smaller sized rental units. Most lots in neighbourhood settings provide only small footprints of developable area for garden suites.
- garden suites can be ugly!
- Parking, noise and annoying neighbours are big problems
- it will increase home prices
- Allow affordability and independent living for adult children/ student and allow for parents to enjoy independence as well
- Allow millennials affordability in purchasing homes in Toronto before they get tired of renting and leave the city entirely.
- Decrease in neighbourhood safety
- Garden suites can be used for student rentals near higher education sites
- Garden Suites will create more issues among neighbours, traffic, infrastructure as the city does not enforce rules and bylaws
- Affordable
- More flexibility and options for people living in the city
- They provide opportunities to use land efficiently.
- Garden Suites can enable intergenerational living on the same property, while maintaining independence on older age.
- Garden Suites are essentially for Toronto's natural community growth!
- garden suites can reduce waste and positively impact the environment
- garden suites is a perfect place for my daughter to live in since the cost of buying something is out of the question for her because she can not afford the house market
- Garden suites reduce exposure to Covid compared to living in apartments
- Garden Suites can function as Granny-suites with own, independent space/dwelling
- Garden Suites can allow residents in low density areas to get more comfortable with the idea of higher density living
- Garden suites can contribute to diversity in neighbourhoods (of income, of household type etc)
- Help my older parents Stay safe and away from our family in a pandemic
- Provide a source of income to allow seniors to remain in their homes and still afford their property taxes
- Garden Suites gives City Planning and Nimbys another reason not to properly up zone the distasteful yellow belt.
- Provide housing for family members who don't have a place to live
- For neighbouring property owners it may be unfair if they want privacy in their own backyard
- Garden suites can add population and tax value to neighborhoods making local business and service delivery more viable and self-sufficient
- I will keep the younger and older on the City.
- Garden suites will can cause overcrowding in already crowded neighbourhoods and more cars parked on the street
- We need more building variety. Garden suites are cool.
- Garden Suites can fuel Airbnb instead of long-term rental stock
- garden suites negative affects- over crowding, noise & air pollution, streets with cars parked preventing hood visibility and ability to pass, children playing in streets, rented as short term rentals & Air B&B , overuse of sewer systems, electricity,stre
- stringent restrictions on size and height need to be stated

- extend living spaces
- Will allow those with invisible disabilities the opportunity to live self-sufficiently but still within earshot of family when help is needed.
- destroy character of the area.destroys trees
- the opportunity to have older family member live w us.
- Increase walkable neighbourhoods
- It will give my disabled son independence while still being close by
- Garden suites restricted to intergenerational families can enhance family solidarity.family
- Garden suites severely impacts privacy of neighbours

11. How supportive are you of allowing new Garden Suites to be built in Toronto? –Other, please specify

- I do not know enough about the pros and cons to decide.
- I strongly support, but I also strongly believe that the city should take a light touch approach. It's regulations on laneway housing have strangled supply and made it far too expensive.
- I am concerned with the rights to outdoor space
- Many changes are required for lanes, lighting, snow removal, complete street standards for lanes. No Air bnb in garden suites. Rent control for garden suites
- I think I support it, but I don't know if there are issues with it that I'm not thinking of
- Corners lots only, owner must secure privacy for neighbour, air conditioning sump pumps, high efficiency furnace vents must be on street front side
- I strongly support regulated planned garden suites with a strong emphasis on aging-in-place purposes
- I support it in general, but need more information about its impact
- Only for family with height & size restrictions & no parking.
- Only agree for multigenerational living
- Size and percentage of land coverage needs to be determined
- There needs to be a high minimum lot size specified to allow such building.
- Minimum requirements must be clear e.g., lot size, parking on street, size of building
- If use by family of homeowner, I think garden suites could be ok if noise control in place, but garden suites for rental I strongly oppose
- Each neighbourhood should be surveyed with the majority's preference followed
- Strongly opposed, especially on narrow lots where separation from neighbours is not feasible.
- Support is specific areas where access is not a problem for fire and EMS
- I would support them if they were required to replace land that is newly-built on with land in the same area that is not built on
- We are already living in an area of the city that has allowed overbuilding on often narrow lots.
- I agree, just make sure that is it not a blanket rule. Examine the neighbourhood and space around the homes.
- Kesmat's legacy has left certain neighbourhood overwhelmed with high rises so we're nervous about the Planning Dept's intentions & respect for homeowners
- Strongly support if meet appropriate criteria for the lot and neighbourhood
- I would support garden suites if there were a policy framework which would PREVENT their use as a ratchet on the way to even denser developments in Neighbourhoods.
- Fix drainage and public service (hospitals, schools, kindergartens, places of worship, parks, sports facilities, green spaces, drainage etc) - then consider increased housing and population.
- Garden suites make sense where the property backs on a laneway.
- It will increase safety concerns for adjacent properties using their yards. Especially where children are.
- I am strongly opposed to a format like Laneway Suites. Am somewhat supportive of Garden Suites in very limited lot situations and much more modest format. See them more as a suburban lot situation option vs a dense urban option.

- It would depend on the rules applicable to garden suites- mainly height, overlook concerns, setbacks, noise etc, and these parameters are not yet available. I cannot express a view without seeing proposed rules.
- Not in favor of having more people living in such close proximity of my back yard...dealing with my neighbors garages is enough of a disturbance.
- AirBnB use should absolutely be prohibited. Size must be Small like 450 sq ft. Single story.
- I support garden suites as an option for families to help family members, such as aging in place, installing adult children with young families that can't afford to rent or buy, etc. I do not support garden suites as rental property to non-family
- I support only if replacing e.g. pavement, not if replacing green space.
- I think it's a great idea and support it. However, we need to find ways to replace the greenspace we are displacing in order to combat climate change. The people who live in these suites will need some greenspace to nourish their mental and physical health.
- I would be more in favour of the city appropriating single family homes and rezoning the land for low rise apartments. That would create more affordable housing options. This is not a viable solution to Toronto's housing crisis.
- I am opposed to Garden Suites because I do not believe the City can manage how property owners will use them (eg short term rentals)
- There must be a stipulation of lot size before this should be considered. I personally would not want to live in a shed with stairs in my children's backyard.
- Garden homes lead to over-densification. The lovely diagrams show trees in every yard, because that is what communities appreciate, but Garden homes will more often than not result in removal of trees and reduction of landscaping critical to combat Global warming
- I don't know enough yet to be supportive or unsupportive I'd like to know about their impact in other cities if possible.
- On corner and through lots, I support suites similar to what is allowed on laneways currently. 'Garden' suites with no lane or road access should be smaller in scale, i.e. one-storey
- Area too cramped This is not Scarborough with larger acreage
- garden suites conflict with the food security initiatives. Additionally, as the pandemic stay-at-home orders have demonstrated, backyard green space is essential well being
- It is not possible to answer this question without more detailed information
- Dependent on what is permitted and how integrated into neighbouring properties
- Very supportive, but TFS needs to get with the plan and become part of the solution an enabler, rather than the major impediment they've been in the lane house project.
- I would support, but it really depends on the requirements for the Garden Suites - there should be consideration for many factors that will affect neighbours as well as the owners.
- i am very concerned about the impact on adjoining houses
- I would support garden suites on large properties where the suite does not infringe on neighbouring properties (privacy, shadows, noise).
- I would want to find out the rules around what can be built before supporting or not, but my 'bias' is toward support
- I much prefer encouraging Lane houses where for occupants a lane provides a walking/bike route, open space to be beautified with window boxes/plants, an alternate 'front' door, a way to chat with neighbours and an ability to monitor Toronto's lanes where garbage is dumped, drugs are sold and graffiti is everywhere (at least in my alley!)
- In what area. How close to lot lines. Noise restrictions. Size. Many differentials...what might be right for one property doesn't make sense for others.
- I believe that each neighbourhood should be given the opportunity to vote nay or yay on permitting GS in their particular neighbourhood. I do not support a city wide blanket approval. This 'city of neighbourhoods' needs to hear from individual neighbourhoods.
- Again, how can someone support or oppose a planning concept without associated policy context. You seem to be asking for a 'blank cheque' to allow you to proceed with any configuration of garden suites.
- Cautiously support this as this may allow for more Airbnb (crime as a result- random shootings) that happens when people don't respect their abode. The law has to be very firm to protect

neighbourhoods and allow income potential for families. Landlord or family member have to reside on the same property that has Garden Suites. No-airbnb or home sharing allowed.

- I need to know more ie how many units are anticipated? How will parking be managed? What is the impact on property value/affordability? How is noise of rooftop HVAC managed? Is commercial use prohibited? How will our aging Sewer infrastructure cope?
- This question assumes an idyllic world with good people. Imagine a noisy Airbnb rental with parties to 2am ... noise without policing
- I think it depends how it disrupts the neighbours. If this is in a dense downtown neighbourhood vs a quieter suburban neighbourhood.
- I think garden suites should be the exception not the rule.
- I oppose as of right suites, without strict controls on quantity, location and environmental conditions.
- Support with stringent restrictions on height 10' and mandatory green roofs
- Public transit is overcrowded and unreliable green space is inadequate it's difficult to support added density without solutions to these problems.two problems persist and continue to gnd green space in downtown neighbourhoods are already overburdened. is already What is projected impact of already stressed public transit and green space Increased density in downtown neighbourhoods
- I strongly support garden suites that allow aging in place. I am concerned about garden suites that simply result in excessive density
- I am in support for certain conditions. My concern is these properties will be used for short term rentals like airbnbs.
- I am concerned about density in our neighbourhood - I would rather garden suites than high and low rises without the infrastructure to support (schools, green space) but not just more density for density sake
- This is a niche housing option Will not solve affordable housing problem in Toronto. Yet I think that where it makes sense and with agreement of neighbours it could be useful and maybe helpful for ageing seniors. I think your next steps shld be to enact regs with some flexibility for owners but tight limits on application.
- I somewhat support the concept but oppose having garden suites as-of -right. There are too many individual mitigating factors for as-of -right permission. Individual proposals needs evaluation and approval to move forward. -right permission. There needs to be an approval process for individual proposals established his as a
- I support Garden suites that conform to size, height, and green-space restrictions in proportion to main unit and size of lot.
- I understand the need for affordable housing but I think there are better ways to meet that need
- As long as the home owners have a choice to put one on their property or not, it may be a good idea. No one should be forced to add one if they don't want to.
- I'll learn more before forming an opinion
- Properly regulated, it could be positive. I have a lot of concerns about HOW it would be implemented.
- It will have to look esthetically pleasing
- Depends on what it means to green space and/or trees in Toronto if plants/grass/trees are removed to develop a garden suite (or maybe garden removal suite).
- Concerned about increasing impermeable surface in urban core already with heat island effect. Inadquate parks and green space already. Greater density on avenues and in high-rise nodes also built with inadquate green space and outdoor amenity space.
- I am opposed unless there are safety allowances for fire department access and if the is significant property size not already occupied by a home. Most Toronto lots are too small for this to be an appropriate solution.
- I'd somewhat support with the condition to be ONLY used for a family member (ie granny suite).
- I support allowing Garden Suites in Toronto, so long as there's some measure of affordability implemented to increase the supply of purpose built rentals in the city.
- design compatible with neighborhood city needs to control out come if its it ugly and cheap then what
- I am supportive ONLY if there are guidelines for rent and protections for tenants

- I somewhat support allowing Garden Suites but am unconvinced that the authorities will take immediate, or any, action on those landlords who abuse the system.
- I support with performance standards in place including noise parameters and limits to parking spaces per dwelling
- Yes, with NO short-term rentals allowed. This isn't a homeowner enrichment plan, this is an affordable housing plan.
- This looks like it will only drive up the cost of a house further. I'd rather see more middle density housing
- There may be some neighbourhoods or properties where these would work but in general I don't support them.
- I strongly support trying it, monitoring, and assessing its impacts before deciding how far to push it.
- I support garden suites with huge stringent regulation and oversight and attention to the needs of all residents in the neighbourhood.
- My concerns are will these be controlled or come under the jurisdiction of the LTB? The pace and timelines of the LTB tribunals seriously and negatively impact landlords.
- Not all Torontonians will like this idea but I see it as a viable solution to the cities housing 'crisis' and it be limited to specific areas
- Internal courtyard views maintain privacy for neighbours - many cultural backgrounds of Torontonians have small courtyard houses
- I strongly SUPPORT Garden suites BUT I absolutely want yard and snow responsibilities to the tenant!!! A tenant in a home vs condo has a full time 24 hour a day 'pool boy' to do yard, snow, garbage etc - which is a joke!!
- It all depends on the specific bylaws the bylaws for the laneway suites are very problematic if they are the same for the garden suites, I would strongly oppose them.
- If the bylaws are properly created to permit this usage on large properties I support this otherwise I strongly oppose.
- Need more info to support as in max size, impact on neighbors, parking, green space
- Don't have enough information to give an opinion. Should be looked at VERY carefully. Not like Zero Vision which messed up the streets in our area.
- I think it's a good idea and would support this if they are built on properties whose lot size is over 130ft deep
- There must be other options available rather than using what little land we have left in Toronto that is necessary for drainage, trees, wildlife, density stress. How about living over stores if they are allowed to go up two stories above the traditional two story store. I have seen one of these on Bloor St. and see wonderful potential in this kind of development. It is my understanding that these stores are already forced to pay taxes on non-existing stories.
- There are a lot more details on operations and constructions that need to be reviewed.
- The dense population will be the eventual outcome. Do you want to make living places eventually like New York and Tokyo?
- I support the idea but the criteria should be strict and fair
- Strongly opposed unless lot size is at least half an acre and sufficient on site parking is provided
- I would like to learn more as well as the sharing of examples of where this has taken place. Have other cities done this?
- I am strongly opposed. It MAY be a good thing in highly selected areas, but this question is useless because it is way too broad 'in Toronto!'
- Unless there were severe restrictions on what people could charge, this is just another money grab opportunity for privileged people.
- I am not sure logistically how this would work and seems like a recipe for disaster
- I strongly support this, and strongly support as of right 4 plex as a minimum plus up zoning generally.
- I support garden suites restricted to family members.

12. Do you support allowing Garden Suites to be built in your own neighbourhood? –Other, please specify

- I do not have enough information
- My neighbourhood is all high rise development, so not suitable for garden suites
- I live on a laneway so we already have Laneway Suites and those have substantial impacts on quality of life of the neighbours behind or beside them.
- I strongly support the idea, but must reluctantly acknowledge that most yards here are so small it wouldn't be feasible.
- Proper lighting barrier free accessibility, wheel trans access , fire fighting access, postal service access, policing sre required
- We live in a ravine and more infill is not desirable as it will increase flooding, destroy wildlife, increase traffic. With no emergency vehicle access, it will further inconvenience abutting neighbours
- Our neighbourhood has been destroyed by increased density over the last years,leaving only three streets of houses free of high rise or commercial buildings.
- No balconies, no roof top patios, out door space must face street or owners yard. Must be accessible from street, not owners drive
- While I see the positives, I am concerned about the footprint build size and impact on flooding in certain areas.
- I strongly support regulated planned garden suites with a strong emphasis on aging-in-place purposes
- I would but again want to understand its impact
- In my neighbourhood, infill houses take up all allowable coverage of a lot ie. - there is no room for garden suites.
- The lots are too small to support such building.
- Depends on size of lot and how to be used. Do no want more green space to be consumed with more building. Not environmentally friendly. Need to consider parking as well. Good for family members..granny flat..not sure about having random folks moving in and out of neighbour hood for safety and security reasons
- They likely wouldn't work in my neighbourhood since we don't have lanes in back and wouldn't have the space due to the size of the homes.
- I support Garden suites for family purposes (e.g. intergenerational living) but NOT for rental purposes.
- Yes. If the property is large enough and access to the street
- See above
- see above-not that trusting of Planning Dept's intentions & concerned if neighbours build garden suites the neighbouring homes will be saddled with increased property taxes
- It completely depends on how adjacent properties may be affected.
- Strongly support if meet appropriate criteria for the lot and neighbourhood
- I oppose them because I know that the necessary framework to prevent the TLAB from gradually allowing even denser developments in Neighbourhoods, with garden flats being a stepping stone, will NOT be put in place.
- It destroys the character of the neighbourhood residents relied on when they moved into it.
- Again safety reasons
- As stated above, it would depend on the rules applicable to garden suites- mainly height, overlook concerns, setbacks, noise etc, and these parameters are not yet available. I cannot express a view without seeing proposed rules.
- I somewhat support laneway houses - but we live in a very dense neighbourhood with little green space - we need trees and gardens!
- Only if NO green space is lost
- Flooding is a problem in this area. Sewer capacity would have to be strongly considered for ANY additional building in the area.
- Like idea in principle and can see a million ways it can end up a nightmare for adjoining property owners. Better to allow rentals in single family detached homes or allow purpose built triplexes
- I support garden suites in my neighbourhood where the purpose is to house family
- Only if no backyard green space is forfeited.
- Need size restraints
- my neighbourhood is heavily laned

- I would be supportive if I had a clear sense of regulations, transparency issues, enforcing of proper process around informing neighbours, around size and density regulations.
- Again, this is not a real solution. A real solution would be the creation of more low rise apartment units in places that are currently single family and semi-detached homes.
- depends on size and height. while the initiative may have merit, it also is a setup for many to overbuild without consideration of impact on neighbours
- Toronto should clean up the Committee of Adjustment first. It's out of control granting variances that neither reinforce nor respect the prevailing neighbourhood character. See OP Ch. 4. Policy 5.
- What are you thinking? This will destroy my neighbourhood.
- In appropriate areas around the neighbourhood. There are many high rises around my neighbourhood so many locations for garden suites would be in the shadow, or low quality in other ways.
- I strongly support, however the architectural texture of the neighbourhood should be preserved.
- It is not possible to answer this question without more detailed information
- My neighbourhood has houses close together, shared garages, limited accessibility to backyards.
- As above, it depends on the requirements - I would support if there are reasonable requirements that balance the needs of neighbours with owners.
- I am very concerned about the impact on adjoining houses
- My neighbourhood has small yards where a garden suite would infringe on a neighbour's privacy, shadows, noise.
- I would want to find out the rules around what can be built before supporting or not, but my 'bias' is toward support
- Could we encourage Lane houses first by reducing development charges/taxes when used for lower income housing? And making the first 100 feet behind the Danforth stores/apts for 3-4 storey multi-family units?
- depends on the property. where located. size of lot. size of garden suite.
- All apartment buildings
- Yet again. What is the context? I may be in favour of 1 storey garden suites, but I would not be in favour of 2 storey garden suites. It simply is not possible to answer these questions in the absence of parameters for garden suites.
- Cities are already very crowded. Laneways are now supporting kids playing, cards, garage. More tenants= more cars= less room for healthy living. This has to be applied in the most cautious manner. Supportive of intergeneration living, showing members of the same family reside on one property
- Need more details on the built form criteria, the materiality and issues with parking requirements
- Strongly support allowing Garden suites in my neighbourhood because it's their property
- Depends on what the rules are, if neighbours worry about loss of light or privacy, their height, etc.
- this is a very mixed neighborhood with some large detached homes with large yards. A single story garden suite might work on those properties. Generally the yards are too small.
- How big is the dwelling? How close to my backyard? What about noise, shadowing, fire safety? Accessible for disabled persons?
- They would have to 'fit the property' so trees and people can coexist. Rules about the structure and killing the biodiversity of the yard would have to be worked out.
- It would wreck our declining tree canopy AND is also intensification in a neighbourhood.
- Our neighbourhood is already congested and without adequate access to public transit.
- As long as they have green roofs and bike sheds
- Need more information on how the bylaw will be implemented to avoid random ugly structures on properties backyards.
- my neighbourhood is already too dense and there would not be suitable land
- Immediate neighbourhood has extremely small backyards also limited parking, so I would not support
- N/A - I live in an area with laneways throughout. Where lots don't have lane access, they are usually too small to accommodate anything meaningful
- I oppose without strict and enforceable controls!
- Only if above conditions are met

- I don't live in Toronto but would absolutely support it in my own neighbourhood if I did and would likely have one on my own property
- I am aware of the restrictions with laneway housing and so far this survey is not providing any facts which would support an informed position on the questions asked. These include setbacks, side yard clearance requirements, density architectural control, approvals process...
- I am in support for certain conditions. My concern is these properties will be used for short term rentals like airbnbs.
- I am strongly opposed to garden suites in all neighbourhoods.
- Again, density concerns
- we already have r zoning.
- I somewhat support allowing GS in my neighbourhood, but they must conform to height, size, green space, regulations.
- Properly regulated, it could be positive. I have a lot of concerns about HOW it would be implemented.
- Houses are too big too much concrete already on land
- doesn't apply in my neighbourhood - being condoland, and living in a housing co-op.
- I don't live in Toronto, but may in the future
- back yards are too small
- I support Garden suites if the rules are very clear and access to arbitration in case of dispute is not a bureaucratic nightmare. At present it is so difficult to reach a building inspector, when builders are erecting a new house next door. I experienced flooding on my property because the contractors changed the ground levels. It was a bureaucratic nightmare.
- case by case basis
- I am supportive ONLY if there are guidelines for rent and protections for tenants
- I somewhat support allowing Garden Suites but am unconvinced that the authorities will take immediate, or any, action on those landlords who abuse the system.
- See response above
- Yes, with NO short-term rentals allowed. This isn't a homeowner enrichment plan, this is an affordable housing plan.
- I do appreciate the potential for aging in place, intergenerational use, but in my research for my neighbourhood these suites are neither affordable or used by family members. They are just high end suites on lanes, which start to impact the people on the other side of the laneway (sound noise and light).
- My neighbourhood is very high/too high density with all buildings being in the Tall category so there's unfortunately no space for Garden Suites. I come from having owned my own detached home for 40 years and would support it for residential neighbourhoods such as they're proposed for.
- Again, strongly support on a trial basis.
- I strongly support garden suites being built in my neighbourhood as long as there are LAWS making the tenant be responsible for the THEIR SPACE: yard, snow and garbage
- I support garden suites, but I don't see much space in my neighborhood for them.
- Doubtful.
- I would consider building a Garden Suite on my property for my ageing mother but I feel like the bylaws would only really help developers
- I think I would support this if they are built on property whose lot size is over 130 ft deep
- I wonder how security matters for the resident
- I think in my neighbourhood, it may not work as backyards are not that big.
- This is a wealthy neighborhood. Rich people will get richer off the backs of people desperate for affordable housing.
- I strongly support allowing Garden Suites in my neighbourhood, but I am concerned about tree canopy impacts. I think that healthy mature trees should not be removed to enable garden suites. I think the consideration of parking is a critical one here, as is increased footprints that require tree removals.
- Yes. And I support as of right missing middle. City Planning is actively contributing to climate change by obstruction and lack of adamant promotion of missing middle.

- would not want to mix a larger and larger transient/rental population with home dwellers. Totally undermines the community.

13. What are the most important matters to address in potential policies and regulations for Garden Suites? –Other, please specify

- Shared Driveway and access to Services.
- Ensuring lot sizes are large enough to have a proper living space and green space.
- There must be a provision for 'existing structures' to be grandfathered. Some existing buildings may not fit with the rules ie-0 lot lines etc. This must be taken into consideration
- Without lane access emergency access (ie. fire) may be impeded and result in dangerous conditions
- Safety for tenants, size of units, access to amenities
- sufficiently wide access to accommodate moving furniture, fire services, etc.
- Rent control
- Important to not be too restrictive about where/when/how garden suites can be built. We need to encourage additional housing.
- None of these priority issues. Seems to be something nimbys would come up with in order to exclude people
- None of these are important compared with housing affordability. Regs should be focused on health and safety only.
- Fire, ambulance, garbage n Mail/ package delivery services
- Getting busybodies out of the way and letting people build.
- Crowded backyards and increased noise and traffic
- Ensuring there isn't a reduction in the biodiversity of backyards
- Encouraging these to actually be built, not just be a novelty that will do nothing for increasing housing stock
- Severability -- more affordable for those who want to own a home in a low rise neighbourhood to purchase a garden suite
- Affordability
- Inability to enjoy personal yard because neighbour has build garden suite adjacent to my fence and not their home. Inability of Neighbourhood to accommodate population density
- Ensuring they don't increase risk of flooding by paving over ever
- Should be used only for long term housing, NOT for air bnbs
- Ensuring that they are permitted by right.
- Quality of life for residents/tenants
- Ease of building
- I have no concerns
- Affordability
- Creating guidelines that are not to restrictive
- don't want garden suites so none of the above is important. Parking is important for those who do not have garages or parking and with garden suites more on street parking will be taken up.
- Getting as much housing built as fast as possible
- Providing distance and privacy for the neighbour who is NOT imposing a laneway/garden suite on others
- That they take land from somewhere that would be better suited as an apartment building as of right
- Public safety infrastructure , police call boxes or buttons, separate servicing ie sewer/ water /hydro
- Increased speculation based on potential rental income, privileging 'homeowners' rather than exploring other forms of tenure that address affordability, equity
- Require them to meet progressive energy targets
- Emergency access
- There will be too many restrictions placed on the requirements to be unviable for most of the city
- Minimal regulations on how Garden Suites can be built

- Affordability
- Ensuring as-of-right permission and the removal of barriers to the construction of garden suites
- I'm not worried about it
- Appropriate tenant & landlord legislation that recognizes that garden suites have a more intimate impact on the landlord than units which are not near the landlord's residence
- capacity of municipal services
- Ensuring enough green space in the neighbourhood
- Respecting ravine neighbourhoods,
- provision for emergency vehicle access and escape
- Additional noise. Inability to control use of suite for short-term rental. Narrow lots (approximately 25' wide) won't permit additional building without overcrowding and congestion.
- Type of occupancy-ie air bnb
- Invasion of space that is totally contrary to the rules in place when I purchased and built on my current location
- Other, please specify
- Environmental impact with less green space and increased load on city infrastructure, since sharing main house sewer, utilities, possibly schools
- I can't believe you aren't at all concerned about accessibility issue. And access for essential services. Who is going to clear the snow a couple of hundred feet to get to the back of a property? There is not enough green space esp with all the endless massive condos you are approving. Now taking away private gardens and trees. Turning us all into condo owners with pea sized balconies.
- lot coverage, density on a lot
- Setbacks from property lines. For garden suites, both the side setbacks and back setbacks need to be increased - 7m or more, similar to the current back setbacks.
- Flooding is a serious problem not improved by adding more buildings and decreasing green spaces
- Control re: lack of bylaw enforcement
- Reducing the permeable soil in backyards thereby putting extra strain on an already over-burdened storm sewer system
- Short-Term Rentals - I'm not a fan of different guests every night in a garden suite
- All above + good design
- Laneway coach houses can add a suite on top of existing garage so that the square footage remains the same as the garage. privacy and shadowing is minimum..
- Don't like the idea
- Maintaining current degree of soil permeability to minimize impacts of major storm events
- Should never be closer to a neighbor's building than it is to the owner's building.
- Ensuring that the regulations and guidelines are clear and flexible enough that garden suites can be deployed at scale across the city.
- Build as big as possible, as much as possible. Better yet, allow more low-rise and mid-rise buildings in residential neighbourhoods. The situation at e.g. Yonge/Eglinton where 50+ story towers are a few blocks away from single-family houses is crazy something should be allowed to fill the 'missing middle'.
- No others. This isn't a good question. None of these issues really matter when we are in the midst of an affordability crisis which should take priority
- Less Green space - More flooding
- Quality of living of Neighbours, community engagement of property owners and residents,
- Models that allow for pathways to ownership of these smaller spaces
- Concerned about density, noise and ensuring Garden suites maintained at a high standard.
- increased density and demands on services ie., schools, health, fire, police peace and quiet, mental health, noise, air quality. traffic
- population density/privacy and crime/safety
- safety, security and privacy
- City being more flexible with zoning bylaws and development fees to encourage building garden suites

- That it's actually easy enough to make them so that people actually do. A perfect policy that leads to no change in outcome in housing stock is worse than no policy at all.
- destructive density in low density community
- Snow removal in laneways has caused recurring conflict, since laneway buildings don't account for snow placement without antagonizing neighbours. This includes new garages. I suggest the councillor walk through laneways after a snow storm, along with the staff who rubber stamp everything, and then escape to gated communities.
- not to be used as short term rentals
- More hardcovered land affects stormwater and creates flooding issues. Main houses may find it suitable to have family members looking in their patio windows but their neighbours will have their privacy destroyed and quality of life affected. I am an environmentalist and I predict this fad will fall into an embarrassing era for the City with more construction waste sent to landfill when these are torn down. Please add basement suites and third stories for gentle densification. Look at Europe with 3 stories
- Who is occupying..may impact safety of neighbour hood.
- Where will the rain and snow go? We have flooding now.
- Anyone desperate enough to put a GS on their property will be willing to pay the fee to get rid of the trees so what is the protection being suggested? Garden suites by definition will eliminate space for gardens, lawns, and amenity space so we won't have much to worry about. The City is already issuing parking pads everywhere. Sustainable building practices should apply to ALL development. Unless the property is huge the location will not address any separation issues .
- New innovative architectural designs that can highlight and elevate the beauty of the neighborhood and the City of Toronto
- Not overly restrict bylaws and setbacks we want to encourage NOT discourage.
- Density, traffic, environmental impact, infrastructure (sewer)
- Increased stress on aging infrastructure
- Schools are over crowded already with out increasing density
- There will be shanties and there will be micro-castles
- By-right development and NIMBY interference
- The additional cost to upgrade infrastructure- sewage, water, hydro, roads. Who pays for this?
- THE CITY DOES NOT EVEN PLOW THE BACK ALLEY LANES. WHAT KIND OF A NIGHTMARE WOULD THIS CREATE???????
- How will they be regulated - making sure they're 'up to code'?
- noise, number of occupants
- Rainfall ground drainage
- Ensuring Garden Suite tenants have adequate protections (e.g. from renovations, 'own use' evictions).
- Being fair and consistent about fsi
- Quality and safety of the building materials/methods
- Preventing short term rentals, and rooming houses
- Swimming pool will have to go. Loss of privacy.
- Ensuring the policy permits garden suites in practice and the standards are not so high as to effectively make them infeasible.
- No development charges per the policy for lane way homes.
- noise of having tenants close to the property line in the road, environmental impact of less permeable ground and loss of trees)(water run off, flooding, more paved surfaces = climate warming)
- Should not result in 'hardening' of the surface increasing runoff, should not decrease green cover, should not contribute to the heat bubble, should not change character of safe family neighbourhoods
- Not being restrictive, allowing properties to find opportunities
- Impact of INCREASED population and vehicle DENSITY in already SMALL neighborhoods.
- Safety
- The governments inability to enforce affordability of the rental units.

- Impact on services (I.e., schools, hospitals, mental health agencies) which cannot cope with current funding levels and cannot support an even larger client population as a result of this type of ill-conceived planning). Can barely walk on main streets during the pandemic. Planning to overcrowd neighborhoods during a pandemic is counter-intuitive and contra-indicated.
- Access to emergency services, eg. fire, ambulance
- Making sure that the suites are serviceable and there is increased infrastructure in community.
- Access to emergency services
- Loosening the restrictions based on fire access to allow more properties to qualify.
- Providing services particularly in areas where the water table is already high enough to cause flooding.
- The planet earth is already over capacity. Why encourage more density, when that policy is not working to restore the health of our planet? Focus on CO2 emissions reduction, use a guaranteed annual income to serve the homeless and under employed, fund education on Climate Change.
- I strongly oppose this
- Not having the infrastructure to support these additional dwellings and people.
- Bring them on!!
- Ensuring people are not paving/covering their entire lot - need permeable surfaces for drainage
- residential density the rest of the above are irrelevant
- Noise from increased # of residents next door
- Encroachment and impacts on neighbouring properties
- Neighbours should not be allowed to block the construction of a garden suite and they should be made as of right if the lot is over a certain size.
- Neighborhood density & unreported income
- No concerns!
- No issues
- Too much residential green space is being paved over already due to extensions, patios, expanded garages and parking. Building houses in gardens will take away large amounts of green space that can never be replaced.
- Affordable housing
- Safety of premises, particularly for female renters accessing unit at night (gendered experiences)
- City support and financing to help homeowners to do this so I can live in an urban yet residential spot
- Heritage
- Most of these things shouldn't be a big deal. It's more important to increase housing supply than to ensure there's no new shadows or whatever. Also in terms of outdoor amenities / yards / parking - irrelevant, it's up to the property owner whether they want those things
- noise
- all of this ensures they wont be affordable and will have to cost more to build.
- Owners should not be permitted to use garden suites only for rental income. Garden suites should be used primarily or only for related family members.
- That the location and space in backyard make sense not to affect others but for sure to allow where homes back onto parks, ravines, corned, busy streets for sure
- No more population density. Tax unoccupied condos to force owners to lease them.
- Protecting natural habitat from still more human encroachment.
- Access
- Approve this use and look at ways to get these approvals out the door with rapid efficiency. Reduce red tape, possibly as of right designs as California has done.
- loss of rain fall absorption due to more roofs and paving, additional vehicular traffic, additional sewage
- Picking top 4 issues from list above is a false choice. 1: Height, scale, overlook/shadow/separation, and character/design all have a direct impact on quality of life of the 3 adjacent neighbours. They should have a say and be protected. 2: Protection of trees and green space is already a City priority. Adding a building in backyard of small/modest lot will compromise existing trees, promote planting decorative trees, and loss of soft landscape. Lot needs to be BIG, building SMALL, separation BIG!

- This concept would create legal ghettos and devalue home prices
- Ensuring coverage by an additional building allows water drainage
- Not enough street parking if there are more residents. Also, there would be a huge amount of construction that will cause disturbance and noise pollution
- The policy should provide a clear path for approval of a garden suite, not a list of reasons to oppose an application.
- Dispute resolution if occupant of garden home becomes a problem e.g noise, parties, pets
- Regulating who can tenant the property
- Allowing them in all neighbourhoods, including wealthy neighbourhoods
- No Air B&Bs in Garden Suites please!!!
- Affordability
- Stormwater management and flooding issues due to removal of yards
- Short-term rental concerns
- That the government removes regulations. The only reason for the lack of affordable housing is the government.
- Emergency vehicle access
- Height and scale issues and sustainable practices
- In an already densely populated area, additional demands made on sewers, water supplies, diminution of already limited green space
- Affordability. If this is just a way for homeowners to charge current rental costs it's a useless project and I do not support it at all.
- there is already too much regulation. Toronto could verify easily densify and become a more resilient city if we don't overregulate our small properties. I'm reticent in choosing from the list because what defines 'height', or 'design' or 'separation'. They could be worthwhile regulations or poor ones as we currently have in the city.
- It should not even be considered, ghetto style idea
- Don't build them!
- safety in the event of fire firefighter access (2) ensuring that these are built to all relevant codes
- Accessibility for people with disabilities
- Prohibitive zoning and building that removes the practicality of garden suite construction and suitable sites
- They should not be used for Airbnb EVER
- Making it affordable by not imposing high costs to building by city fees and encumbrances e.g. tens of thousands of dollars for parks fees.
- Tax implications to owner
- Too many people
- 3) Temporary residents 4) Security spotlights and cameras aimed at our yard.
- Lower property value
- None really - my biggest concern is that they aren't severable which would make them even more useful for downsizers
- Ensuring sufficient educational capacity in the neighborhood
- The safety of the tent, the fire department ability to access the building in a timely manner with equipment.
- Ensure no required parking for accessory suites
- I don't care about any of these issues. The Toronto housing crisis is well past the point where we get to worry about things like shadows and design. We need more affordable housing now. Garden suites won't solve the problem.
- Fire safety
- Access to Garden Suites for Emergency Services (Fire and EMS)
- Development charges and hst due on new build rental units
- Allowing conversion of garages to garden suites.
- Ingress egress routes to the suite
- Parking on the street - there already isn't enough without these extra suites
- How to allow this to happen quicker to help affordability crisis in city
- Speed from application to construction completion

- Adequate 'infrastructure'
- Safety access issues in case of fire and the ability for neighbours to rent via AirBNB for parties leaving neighbours to deal with the issues as we all know that the City will not be there to enforce any rules.
- Reducing parking mins
- Every one of these is a serious concern. I guess by only allowing 4 choices, one can claim that there are only 4 top concerns...Bad survey design
- Overall look of the suite should be acceptable in accordance to the neighborhood or make it prettier
- Impact on soil, water drainage
- Fire suppression natural ventilation habitat for animals and birds rainwater drainage and removal
- Neighbouring garden suites will negatively impact the value of my home.
- Policies which are easy to understand, a streamlined approval process
- How easy it is to get the proper permits and approvals
- More concrete/buildings mean less permeable soil which can cause drainage/flooding to neighbours & fragile lands ie scar bluffs need protection against overbuilding
- Flexibility in design and location.
- High level of use as short-term rentals could create major problems
- This reads like a NIMBY wishlist.. my priority issue is the ease of building them! Reduce regulations where possible to encourage maximum development of this kind of housing.
- Too much density
- Plumbing, sewage and water supply
- Flood prevention.
- Keep bylaws flexible so that owners are not discouraged from build much needed housing in the GTA
- None
- If these are meant to be affordable housing there should be subsidies to promote their construction and regulate the rental price.
- improvements to laneway and municipal infrastructure for safety and a quality of urban spaces
- aesthetically pleasing and enhancing the neighborhood look!
- Ensuring affordability of construction and ease/streamlining of approvals process
- Use of garden suites. Family or rental. Not Airbnb
- Keeping the rent below market rate
- Lack of parking, strain on power grid, sewers, etc.
- Safety. Safety is #1. Strong regulations around fire alarms, carbon monoxide detectors, etc. As long as safe, I have no problem with garden suites.
- providing more rental housing to improve affordable housing options in residential neighbourhoods
- The impact of additional rental units (especially the possibility of an Air BnB) on the quality of life of the neighbours.
- I actually don't think any of these are major issues
- Building as much housing as possible
- No parking minimums
- accessibility of the units
- On-site rain water retention as impervious area increases
- Connecting to utilities need to make sure done properly and tiny home builders are appropriate to consult in space saving designs it would be nice for city to offer some kind of modular building that could allow for customization but hassle free install
- Making approval fast and automatic
- That restrictions aren't so great deterring people from wanting to build these. Even with the current lane way suites there are lots of restrictions no the cost is high to challenge
- Managing drainage/run-off by ensuring permeable surfaces or green space
- Access to financing to help people build them

- Reducing almost ALL of the restrictions listed above. (This question should not have been YES/NO - it should have been 'Rate the Importance'). Make Garden Suite approvals EASY.
- Ensuring emergency personnel and vehicle access
- Imposing more realistic fire access requirements that don't immediately disqualify the vast majority of interested applicants.
- The increase in noise, conflict and light pollution coupled with the loss of privacy and personal space will destroy the refuge most people find in their own homes.
- Making it as easy as possible to build a garden suite. None of the issues noted in this question are a priority compared to the imperative to quickly build more housing.
- safety, over crowding in neighbourhoods, lower grade units becoming the norm for acceptable living in the city
- Providing more affordable housing for Toronto residence
- Rules and regulations put in place that are policed. Variances that will be asked and deteriorate from the allowable. The situation will become worse than that of boarding houses, if that is possible. Neighbourhoods will become crowded. My drain pipes had to be dislocated because we were covering too much land and not allowing for proper drainage. what will happen next. Our neighbourhood has cars parked on the street all night because there is no room in the driveways. Etc., Etc. Etc.
- Parking is should not be prioritized and definitely not be made a requirement. (Also height and scale is very similar to privacy and shadow impacts, as survey answers).
- Assuring safety of the building for those who will be living there.
- Managing cohesiveness and some consistency of neighborhoods (e.g. max of 3 units/property - avoiding 7 unit SFD properties, maintain existing lot coverage, etc...)
- Noise - of people waking you as they walk in alley adjacent our house at any hour. The impact on property values.
- The most important is the impact on the neighbourhood amenities caused by increasing the population density. Are there enough schools? Parks? Are the roads too congested already? How are more people and animals going to make the space BETTER for the existing residents? OR will it make it worse? Should there be a cap on how many in an area can act as rentals?
- Maintaining Sewer and water services
- risk of garden suite becoming a party house, running a disruptive business, reduction in privacy for neighbours
- destruction of remaining greenspace.....hello, global warming!
- Overcrowding on the streets. Already too many people living in aingle dwelling on the street, bit now they will also 9vercriwd the garden suites, causing too many people and cars on the street, possible flooding and electrical overload/blackouts.
- No place for rainwater to sink into ground. Removing mature trees. High taxes on residential properties is in exchange for having some privacy from neighbours.
- This would make a farce out of the existing soft landscaping requirements.
- This developer-driven initiative will make things worse for affordability, infrastructure, noise, & character. Studies show main impact of new permissions for accessory units is *general increase* in unaffordability via generally increased property values/taxes. Toronto's sewer infrastructure system is drastically overburdened. Noise from air conditioners will disturb backyards. And 'one size fits all' as-of-right permissions means affected neighbours will have no say about what gets built.
- Context - the challenge with garden suites is how to deal with the wide variety of lots and neighbourhoods - regulations, like the zoning by-laws should allow for a variety of solutions based on the context of the project (ie limiting height to 4 and 6m in tight downtown lots may make sense but would not make sense in areas with larger houses)
- Appropriate living space for tenants
- I don't support it
- impact on neighbouring properties
- None
- Promoting affordability during planning & construction, e.g. by waiving DCs and expediting permitting process.

- Ensuring enough park space for residents overall in a community (since densification will increase toll on current parks) and ensuring that there is enough drainage (since more buildings will reduce drainage options through covering soil).
- high density living and COVID-19 spread or future pandemics
- Providing adequate permeable space.
- minimal dimensions to allow comfortable living climate control
- zoning as of right use same as public laneway housing
- Affordability and how that is implemented/determined
- Management of noise/water access/garbage etc
- If can be used for AirBnB. Impact of reduction of lawn to absorb water which could depend on size of lot.
- None, these are all STUPID reasons to oppose Garden Suites, what the hell?
- ensuring that owners must be living on the property when building a garden suite.
- There must be a clause in place for existing structures that may not fit with current set-backs etc. Mine has a Zero Lot line and this was severed in the early 1900s and should be Grandfathered
- As the current project is completed, the contracts who have been littering, urinating between our garages, working on sunday illegally, blocking my garage without the decency to leave a note, and working before 7am, I don't wish to go through this stress again, for the sake of another greedy absent landlord, who will make my life miserable with unpredictable tenants' behaviours.
- have no issues
- Ease of obtaining permits
- impact of noise, extra garbage, nuisance, density increase on neighbouring proeprties, decrease of resale value in such neighbourhoods
- shrink the lawn but protect the plants that provide life for wildlife/insects/birds etc. Parking should not be an issue here. These suites should not require parking to come with them. Allso, the style of the suite should match the house/neighbourhood somewhat
- exploitation of renters by owners who can afford to build a garden suite who won't need the income from the property. priorities should lie elsewhere for building affordable housing
- flooding as it removes grass or gardens for rain to be absorbed into
- higher density with no improved city services. A tax grab by the city!
- They will be misused as Airbnb are. No accountability. Will generate many more complaints among neighbours. No assurance of them being owner occupied resulting in absentee landlords. Too much stress on infrastructure (sewers, roads,hydro etc). THIS IS A NIGHTMARE WAITING TO HAPPEN.
- minimizing overregulation to keep costs low. the city ruined laneway suites by making it too complicated.
- I don't agree with Garden Suites. As far as I'm concerned there is no discussion on any of these matters.
- I think we should have minimum dimensions. It's important to build out places people want to live in and support as big as possible with other issues in consideration.
- fire access
- Density and care of property
- Privacy is important to me, but shadow impacts are not particularly important to me
- Ensuring garden suites are not used by short-term / AirBnB renters.
- Garden Suites have the potential to over populate a quiet neighbourhood.
- The wording here suggests to me that the City of Toronto has already decided that this intensification is a good thing.
- Affordability and population density for infrastructure
- make them useable units. make them severable (or long term leasable tied to property as a lien that transfers rights if property is sold)
- Making them easy for people to build.
- Parking should not be required for any rental or house in the Core
- Ability to create outdoor amenities on the roof of garden suites
- Safety (access for emergency, Air B&B rentals), excess noise, excess pets on one property,
- Why do I have to be negative?

- N/A - more permissible regulation will have greater outcomes for densification and housing affordability
- my lot is very large and none of these really apply
- We need to have controls in place to limit the amount of rent these owners can charge - to aid in overall housing affordability in the city.
- Site servicing costs and additional infrastructure burdens. Can garden suites be constructed en masse in areas that weren't designed for it without significantly raising infrastructure spending
- The freedom of the home owner to be able to do what they wish with their property, within reason.
- Density and population effects
- Negative impact to neighbours. The benefit seems to be at the direct expense of others.
- City development charges and costs for new services, if any. Process needs to be as of right.
- Must be 'As of Right' and not involve Committee of Adjustment
- Inability of electrical and water/wastewater infrastructure to accommodate additional load
- Lack of privacy in backyard. Noise.
- Noise overcrowding on already small lots impact on schools transportation and libraries.
- No.
- Protection of existing green spaces
- Should have rooftop gardens
- Where will rain soak in with so much hard surface?
- garbage, recycling, litter and waste handling and storage during construction and when occupied
- I'd also check arch'l design, shadow impact, and trees. In the 15 years of living here, I have seen at least 50% of nearby backyard trees disappear
- I am opposed to turning houses/lots into rental multi-family units of any kind.
- # of bedrooms in the garden suite should be limited to 2 max
- Noise from yet another unit
- City needs to make the process of building accessible and affordable.
- Garbage collection and utility issues. Children's and seniors' safety due to the increasing car traffic
- Over-crowding in neighbourhoods
- Noise and loss of privacy for neighbours
- bylaws for lights, noise, safety and access protocol for emergency responses.
- I do not think any of these issues are significant.
- None
- Taxes and other necessary amenities
- Too much density. Our neighborhood is already too dense with numerous rooming houses, with multiple unrelated families living in the same house..
- this is more of an opportunity to have a rooming house property - just adding more bedrooms - the people who rent rooms or garden suites generally are doing manual labour for companies that don't declare revenue and the people working are paid very low wages and generally they don't care about the neighbourhood - just about getting a room. There is increased littering. There is increased traffic in the neighbourhood as these people are often picked up - and the vehicles picking them up are speeding
- personal safety, community safety, health
- There is very little to be considered. Just do it already!
- traffic impact of potentially doubling housing density
- density of people in a neighborhood, noise.
- Accessible to emergency vehicles.
- Over density, crowding, fire safety, drainage capacity and potential flooding due to high occupancy density, high potential for Airbnb and other short term rentals in single dwelling neighbourhoods
- Density, our accepted way of life and built form
- All of these are really important aside from the on-site parking.
- Increasing residential density and impacting the neighborhood character
- Adequate lighting

- Separation at property lines. Zero setbacks could be provided with proper fire rated assemblies. The use of sprinklers to mitigate restrictions should be considered (unlike laneway housing)
- Make it easier to design and build garden suites. Stop putting so many difficult restrictions in place. Don't allow neighbors to have an influence over the process.
- Ensuring affordable and long-term housing for all residents of Toronto
- Affordability and access to long term rentals (not vacation rentals). Ensuring they're subject to all tenancy laws.
- All of the above - a bad idea - need independent solutions to housing issues not infill
- Disturbance from construction noise.
- Increased local traffic
- Noise, dirt, debris and improper use of the home by renters or lazy landlords
- Bringing more crime to the neighbourhood disproportionate share of low income trouble
- Opposed to the Increased traffic in the neighbourhood, noise, opposed to the additional cars parked on the street,
- The effect on the value of properties. Not everyone would want to buy a property with a garden suite in place.
- By allowing Garden Suites, there is the potential of having significant, negative impacts on the appearance, quality, tranquility, safety and dynamics of an established, family-friendly neighbourhood with airbnb's and/or short-term renters
- It won't be aesthetically pleasing and will make a neighbourhood look too crowded.
- noise
- I do not want my neighborhood to become a Gypsy shanty town for the sake of affordable housing.
- Being big enough for people to live comfortably
- these suites will degrade neighbourhoods
- I do not wish to have the Garden Suites built
- Having enough permeable soil for storm water evacuation
- Rental affordability
- Sewer and utility hookups
- Security-using shared walkways between houses and garden suites to the main street.
- Thin edge of the wedge to overpopulation relative to all amenities e.g. green space public transport over stressed infrastructure
- Regulations and responsibilities for both, owners and tenants
- It must be clearly understood that Garden Suites, and their impact, are significantly different than Laneway Suits.
- The conditions of the interior of the so called Garden suite.
- Increase in crime
- planning and approvals- needs to be quick, also energy efficient buildings that don't emit ghg's
- Keeping the rules and regulations simple and easy to implement
- Noise management
- water/electrical/gas lines to be sourced for the Garden Suite.
- Privacy
- Current and near term density is inadequately supported already. Additional density will continue to damage the well-being of Torontonians. Why in the world would additional density be supported to exacerbate the damage to well being of Torontonian. The Yonge line was dangerously overcrowded before the pandemic and will get much worse once the Crosstown starts feeding its passengers into the Yonge line. Why? Greedy interests without meaningful concern for the well being of Torontonians.
- I am concerned that Garden Suites will be used for short-term rentals and will not contribute to Toronto's long-term rental housing stock.
- Providing flexibility in the relationship between the Garden Suites and the original house.
- Availability for rooftop gardens and small balconies or patio areas
- Servicing, emergency access, parking, enforcement. The current by-law enforcement process is ineffective and in many cases non-existent does not work
- Additional hard surfaces affecting runoff

- #1 is ensuring NO NEGATIVE IMPACT on neighbouring properties. #2 is ensuring that this does not cause the demise of the street and neighbourhood -- something that you in fact cannot ensure through policies. #3 Ensuring that the Garden Suite is NOT ALLOWED TO BE RENTED OUT FOR SHORT-TERM ROTATIONS EG FOR AIR BNB-TYPE PURPOSES.
- ensuring residential roads can handle traffic from increased density.
- City planning reflecting increase population in neighborhoods
- Reduce alley crime
- due to lack of enforcement of building permits with respect to zoning, our light and space has already been encroached by infill homes
- Maximizing density, minimizing curb cuts and parking (should be a strongly enforced parking maximum of 0)
- Security & Safety & Noise with increasingly mixed income levels residing so close together on the street
- I've read about other municipalities in U.S. that have approved specific models for garden suites. Homeowner can simply pick from a selection of pre-approved homes and City approves them immediately. Some are modular, pre-fabricated and can be approved and installed extremely quickly. That would be phenomenal in T.O and could create thousands of affordable rental units in the next few years.
- Density of population
- Rent protections, affordable rental
- over crowding and resulting stress , loss of green space to prevent flooding, lack of infrastructure (schools)
- Services such as water, power, and traffic, parking
- providing vehicle parking, if not in walkable neighbourhood. also emergency access.
- Extra strain on sewer systems, electrical grid, already lack of street parking in neighborhood
- The same issues as those in recently built laneway houses according to new bylaw permitting their constructio.
- building/construction impacts on neighbors
- Bike parking
- If we are to increase living density we need public transport and similar infrastructure to support, otherwise won't work.
- Crime. Don't want them. Congestion
- The ways in which Garden suites enable the already wealthy and privileged homeowners to increase their wealth. It add more rental stock but doesn't necessarily make ownership more affordable. In fact it increases property value to the point where even fewer people could afford to purchase the property.
- Balancing and improving other environmental considerations (e.g., rainwater management, embodied carbon, enclosure performance and operating energy)
- Managing stormwater run off
- Regulators should scrap this stupid idea. Take our tax\$ and build affordable housing in unpopulated communities in Northern Canada
- Make the garden suites lot size appropriate. Some large lots could allow for 2 smaller dwelling units for far less cost per unit.
- Like with all new units I worry about the consequences of increasing population density without adding to municipal infrastructure. Specifically with garden suites I worry about emergency access and landlords cutting corners.
- approvals process should be simple and accelerated.
- mental health issues when space is taken up by the suites
- Noise, amount of people, decrease in value of my property
- Developers will have bidding wars for single residential properties for income properties pricing home ownership out of reach of toronto residents
- creating more hard surfaces, increasing storm water run off, prefer density in low-rise multi-unit buildings
- Safety and water runoff. Many have already paved over their lawns
- Security and crime
- Noise, increased traffic

- Tenure - protections for renters, etc.
- Oppose increase in density of occupancy
- Easy access to city inspectors and property owner has to inform neighbours beforehand.
- Solve fire access issues that prevent development of many laneway suites today. It is only an effective policy if lots of properties qualify.
- Affordability and availability of microgrants for homeowners.
- Changing the face of the neighbourhood as it was originally designed
- Height and scale with limit on percentage footprint and volume of combined main and garden units.
- Depends on the architecture
- too many people and too many cars on one lot
- Rent Control (garden suites will only contribute to affordable housing/housing stock if there are reasonable limits to what can be charged for rent)
- Fire and other occupant safety considerations are the only issue that matters. Build, and screw the paper millionaires getting precious about neighbourhood character..
- Absolutely oppose!!!!
- Height and scale, separation from other buildings, design, trees
- Ensure there is sufficient soft landscaping and vegetation/trees to permit habitat of wildlife within the city.
- Do not allow short-term (R-BNB type) rentals for Garden Suites, only one-year+ leases
- In my neighbourhood - heritage characteristics should be considered in the design and planning
- Expands and accelerates the wealth divide
- Noise
- Protecting the natural green spaces in Toronto
- make the application process and fees simple and accessible, do NOT bend to NIMBY sentiment
- Affordability, financial support/grants for development of garden suites
- Front yard parking should be allowed if it's for an electric car
 - Flexibility in design.
- Privacy only. Shadow impact should be listed as a separate and desirable small scale impact and not the usual planning fetish it's made out to be
- The city is too full and crowded. This will bring crime and traffic in the neighbourhoods
- altering the character of single family neighbourhoods
- AirBNB should be allowed for Garden Suites
- NONE ! THIS SHOULD NOT BE REGULATED. If the point is to build more housing, do not be prescriptive with materiality or height. Yes, make sure it's separated from other Garden Suites and that it's not too big. But if you are going to do this - make it easy.
- No requirement for parking. We should have by-laws which regulate the maximum amount of parking that can be provided as opposed to the minimum required.
- Servicing - allow for separate municipal servicing
- Is this a list generated to help codify objections to garden suites? Why can it not be a priority that policies and regulations are supposed to make it easy for garden suites to be built and increase housing stock in the city? This list is like NIMBY clickbait.
- There should be minimal barriers to building garden suites so that more supply can be added to the rental market.
- We do not need piecemeal interventions like this - single family housing needs to go and be replaced with mid-rises. This is simply a move to enrich, those that are already wealthy. It makes me sick.
- Transient renters & Airbnb type arrangements Enforcement of restrictions in height, scale and lot coverage
- Safety for tenants and making sure they are covered under the Landlord Tenant Act. Allowing better land use instead of people having massive lots.
- EMS access for things like fire hoses and stretchers
- House parties, noise pollution, additional strain on water and water relief
- You should be allowing more space efficient housing options such as plexes and low rise apartments. The status quo is unsustainable. Aesthetic concerns are a front for prejudice and crude self-interest at the expense of people having a place to live..

- Not used for original intent, ie Air BnB
- NO short-term rentals allowed. This isn't a homeowner enrichment plan, this is an affordable housing plan.
- Not addressing the main issue - housing is too lucrative an investment
- Amending street parking by-laws to allow on road parking (permits for long-term/monthly) street parking.
- Fire safety and access by firefighters
- How will this affect rental prices and housing costs
- Landlords must be compelled to maintain a high standard of cleanliness and repair. We have too many 'slum landlords' in the City - including the City of Toronto. Also density. I am aware that cities must increase density. The infrastructure to accommodate increased density has to keep pace. i.e. parking (the City can't keep limiting parking options while increasing the number of people in a neighbourhood), cross walks and pedestrian safety, green space, traffic movement/congestion, transit availability.
- Noise becomes an issue when decks are built on top of garden suites, voices, music and more air conditioning noise travel much farther with nothing to stop the sound waves.
- Impact on services such as water, power, sewage and garbage.
- Providing sufficient habitable area for prospective tenants.
- Safety considerations are important. So are water, sewage etc. Policies that expedite and streamline the approval process are important so someone can move from concept to execution quickly. Parking is important - if not possible on the property, then rules should be changed to enable street parking (one per unit) - however, I don't believe parking should be a requirement of a garden suite, just that it shouldn't be denied because of a lack of parking and a solution must exist for parking - e.g. street
- None. We have a housing affordability crisis. We need as much development as possible. People having a place to live is more important than neighbour's concerns about shadows.
- Noisy tenants
- Water, flooding from less grass and more roof area
- Reconfigures surrounding uses. It brings added front of house traffic to the rear yards for existing and surrounding properties.
- All of the above plus creating getos.
- Municipality Supervision and Permitting of these structures.
- Protect naive trees, but invasive species like Norway Maples can go if it means replacement with a garden suite. Inject some nuance to the protection of trees policy.
- Allowing for versatile situation
- Too dense in population. People do not behave it will be a mess, looks like a slum. You can see it now with multiple tenants in the house. Will be a great disaster. Develop outer skirts for these new immigrants or young people.
- That both buildings are not rentals, that it doesn't only benefit investors, that there are caps on the number per street or neighbourhood, that the surrounding neighbours not be impacted adversely.
- Ensuring Garden Suites are kept up to code and are safe and livable for tenants, not enabling/tolerating bad landlords the way the current system does
- Laws need to be improved in order to protect Landlords who rent these suites. Currently the wait times for hearings at the LTB are completely unacceptable. If the city wants more homeowners to be landlords and provide affordable housing options the LTB MUST change in order to support small landlord. The current system causes landlords to have to deal with issues for MONTHS without resolution such as complaints, damages to property, non-payment of rent, and squatting. LTB MUST be addressed for garden suites.
- limiting availability of on street parking, ensuring adequate private outdoor space for garden suite,
- In my opinion, prices of the permits and water connection fees. (you need at least \$300,000 to build a Garden suite)
- Space in the garden suite
- Height is not a problem if there are no outside wall windows to overlook neighbours - small footprint tiny courtyard houses can be like huge tree trunks

- some homeowners do not want a yard, as aging seniors can no longer cut it, so let them design their yard and garden suite with style vs. a certain percentage of yard - sustainability solutions DO NOT support green lawns anymore and sooo should the city bylaws accept greener options!!! as tenants rarely will cut the lawn or take any responsibility and homeowners are getting older!!!!
- addressing height and scale impacts from sloping lands - suites built on higher ground than neighbouring properties
- Must be some way for a small portion of the renter to be able to gain advantage with Housing skyrocketing like partial or full building asset for renter. Provide a tax incentive to property owner to make a cheaper option more important.
- Ensuring that sufficient garden suites, together with new laneway suites, semi-detached homes and lot splits actually happen in existing neighborhoods to satisfy all GTA demand for ground related housing without any Settlement Area Boundary Expansions.
- Semi detached homes have small backyards to start. I do not want another building near my backyard. I feel closed in already with the additions that are put on top of homes, now this, NO thanks.
- Ensuring there are enough investments in local community centers to ensure there is sufficient programming to meet the needs of a greater number of residents
- Safety/flooding, changes in neighbourhoods' character/density study maps helping severances to be approved
- Safe and private access to the garden suite for its tenants
- social impact of increased density and introducing non-permanent renters to stable neighbourhoods
- Ease of sanitation flow (without obstruction)
- Ensuring it will not be used for short-term rentals, like airbnbs
- North Rosedale is a Heritage protected community. I would like to see Garden Suites that also compliment and support our heritage look and feel of the neighbourhood. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.
- I believe single detached homes should be for families raising children. I think these will decrease safety of our neighborhood because they will be rented out and will be greater turnover in suites
- Affordability in rent - laneway units are often very expensive, garden suites will likely also be expensive to rent.
- Change the character of neighbourhood
- overcrowding and congestion
- All of the above.
- Maintain character of neighbourhoods and value of existing properties.
- I know with laneway suites there are regulations about how much you can charge for rent, which is great! I don't want this to be another way for me to make money off my property. But I do wonder how to get started if homeowners don't have a lot of capital sitting around -- it would be expensive to build. Maybe grants that help homeowners, that they'd have to pay back w/ the rent they earn for a while?
- allow commercial uses
- Affordability
- Overcrowding, strain on sewers, electrical grid, more chances for airbnb
- Ease of permitting
- Regulations should not be so onerous/expensive that only high-income home owners can afford to build garden them.
- Access. There has to be another way out of the backyard that's not just through the house.
- Opposed to backyard suites.
- Affordability ie: prefab, sustainable and accessible designs are important.
- sewer
- security and house condition for the garden suites
- Bring in low income problems into neighbourhood
- restricting height to one floor and the garage site footprint-As it is called a garden suite, restrict it to one suite only - restrict use to owner occupied or long term tenant only.tenant
- Traffic congestion.
- House density would increase eventually, no good. That will lead to dense population, no good.

- Bad landlords/tenants, turnover in rentals
- Ensuring they do not become yet another source of income for landlords, wealthy homeowners etc, And that they do not become another addition to the hyper-obnoxious monster houses that have been allowed to infest the city whilst youngsters and immigrants cannot afford to buy.
- Reducing red tape and regulation so that these can be built quickly and at reasonable cost, not limited to those with the patience, expertise and money to pay for a lawyer, planner, architect, engineer, etc. to do tons of extra work for one small garden suite
- parking, overcrowding, lack of green space, lack of services to fill all needs
- Other, please specify
- Garden suites will take away from private outdoor amenity space, which will increase demand on public outdoor amenity space, which is already in short supply in Toronto
- Minimum sq footage
- There is enough opportunity elsewhere for development than debasing the appearance of a nice neighborhood.
- Population density resulting in increased annoyances of neighbours, increased street traffic
- Size of backyard and level and height of property backing onto another property
- Price maximum for rental suites
- Density in smaller neighborhoods
- Affordability accessible
- Land leasing for tiny home owners
- Oh my god. Why isn't affordability on this list? This is not about affordable housing. It is about making rich people richer.
- i would like to have room with washroom as bachelor apartment for my old age so i would stay in my property not in the long term care-home.
- Considerations for neighbouring properties
- Allowing for prefabs that are cost-effective & time-saving
- Simply allowing these to be built to allow parents to stay with their children longer, and out of long term care facilities.
- Discouraging short term rentals ie, air bnb
- Making it easier to qualify for
- It's difficult to imagine this as anything but an eyesore, with our neighbours having people live in their backyards.
- Fire department access in an emergency
- Safe housing conditions for the tenants
- Infrastructure impact sewers, garbage, etc
- Reduction in approval time for building
- Concerned about population density in low rise residential areas
- I do not want a concrete jungle. The lot must always have green space in the front and back yardstick can never be bigger than the house.
- Government program like the laneway house to ensure the owners don't overpriced and commit to fair price
- Allowing flexibility of design, not over-prescribing everything and cutting bureaucracy
- Prevent Garden Suites from becoming short-term rentals
- If the current residents of a neighbourhood want them in their neighbourhood
- I'd like there to be better design more loveable buildings built in Toronto.
- Ensuring that any rental income that is designated for these units is not increasing the overall cost of rental housing in the city
- Limit restrictive policies they hinder implementation.
- Garden suites would spoil the privacy and enjoyment of one's own property and should not be allowed
- Overcrowding in a quiet neighborhood
- Should be in future designated/zoned areas NOT infill.
- Garden suites should be consider on an individual basis to allow for creative options that are appropriate for the space.
- noise issues

- Water sewer power supply
- Garden suites will be a voyeurs dream. They can look right inside my living and bedroom areas.

13. Which of the statements most closely reflects your opinion on parking requirements where a Garden Suite is built? – Other, please specify

- at least one parking spot should be required on every lot that permits two homes to be built
- Fully eliminate car parking requirements for Garden Suites and for all residential buildings
- Need to be flexible given the the variety of parking options and limitations especially in older neighborhoods.
- Parking requirements are very regressive and backwards looking. Who cares! Let people figure out their own vehicle storage, both car and bike.
- not sure
- i think this requirement could vary across neighbourhoods. eg car dependent outer burbs would still require a parking space
- Street parking cannot accommodate the burden of Increased population density in my neighbourhood
- Allow for parking pads on property
- Eliminate car parking requirements in areas with high walkability scores AND require bicycle parking
- don't want garden suites
- HAVE NONE OF THIS, AND NO NEED FOR PARKING
- Create a public (electric) car share system to move away from private car ownership and the inefficiencies of onsite parking. Build more transit and bicycle infrastructure.
- Improve public transit in areas with garden suite. Do not require parking
- Stop eliminating parking for bicycle stops not realistic it's hard to find parking and putting in bicycle spots for a car spot is not realistic
- I would prefer zero car parking requirements for the garden suite, but require bicycle parking.
- zero requirement for the garden suite
- Ensure garden suite creation does not allow additional on street parking access and increase street congestion
- Who wants their streets cape to look like a parking lot?
- A single lot should not be allowed to hold more than two occupancy units, and at least one parking space should be required for each lot. Between residents, visitors, tradespeople and retail shoppers, there's already too much demand for street parking and not enough supply.
- Require a parking space for every unit AND owners cannot apply for additional street parking permit
- I know the only thing that counts is bicycles. Hugely discriminatory to older (the supposed beneficiaries) or disabled. Agism is the only ism that is ok now. I looked after two ill elderly people. Insane to stick them at the back of our property and to somehow get them to the street for medical care, esp in winter. More hardscaping and more paving of front and now backyard (illegal) for parking. 'Garden' suites with no gardens. Classic naming for something that has been destroyed.
- Difficult to answer this as much depends on location of the property, public transportation availability and individual need for and type of transortation.
- No parking for garden suite, no expansion of driveways, no parking on lawns,
- No garden suites, no parking. Period.
- Paved parking reduces the permeable soil for percolation of run-off water thereby putting a strain on an already over-burdened storm sewer system
- This neighbourhood is car focussed. Transit is woefully inadequate and bicycling is not for the faint of heart. People already illegally widen their driveways. This whole idea is a disaster that will only benefit speculators.
- This would be hard to monitor. How do you know if a car parked in a driveway belongs to the owner of the house or the garden suite? We already have places where there are 4-5 cars in 1 household. They park wherever they like - on the lawn, on the street - it looks like a parking lot instead of a residential area.

- ?
- No additional street parking permitted.
- Where laneway garages exist build housing suite above. Where garages don't have rooms above and attached to the house all separate suite to be built on top of the garage. Insulation in the floor and walls allow reduced heating/cooling costs and solar panels. And maybe rainwater or grey water for toilet to reduce water demands. On demand system for hot water.
- Parking is already a problem on our streets. This will make it worse
- Do not issue street parking permits to occupants of garden suites
- Consider the neighborhood, existing street parking and size of the lot
- Require zero parking AND DENY additional parking
- not sure although I am aiming ay only the main house should have parking
- Eliminate parking required if within 5-10 minute walk to public transit
- Depends on lot size.
- not sure
- I don't know
- Either fully eliminate car parking requirements or reduce landscape requirement to allow for parking (and have parking spot made of permeable material)
- I do not support Garden Suites
- Parking shouldn't be a determining factor by itself. If someone wants to turn their detached garage into a garden suite and not have parking, why not let them?
- Allow additional space out front if needed, but not required. Expand parking by a % of hard surface.
- No parking or bike spot required
- Garden suites will fall out of fashion and become unused for rental, instead becoming storage space with more hard surfaces coverage. When they are torn down, all that waste will go to landfill. Look at Europe with 2 stories of rental over shops on busy streets we can add more stories to existing businesses on Bloor, Danforth, etc all near public transit
- Wouldn't it depend on the neighborhood? There is mostly only street parking in mine. If the home doesn't have a driveway to begin with, how can they create parking for the Garden Suite? I think it should depend on how good the TTC is around the neighborhood.
- Don't build them.
- Parking on lot continues as a requirement for the main house. Parking for Garden Suite as the lowest priority i.e. spaces can by 'bumped' by as spaces are required by other main houses on the street. Uber and public transportation should be the primary sources of transportation.
- This could create parking problems for residents in the area who need to park on the street and create resentment.
- Please do NOT reduce parking spaces. Neighbours have fights over parking spaces. Serious community divides because of lack of parking. Bicycles don't fix everything - wake up! This is the Beaches and people FIGHT over parking. Stop sitting your ivory castles thinking you know what we need
- What about lots with no parking on site?
- N/A
- Our streets are already congested. To eliminate parking would impact the safety of pedestrians
- Eliminate car parking req'd. Bicycle parking needs to as secure as the unit (not outdoor).
- Home should have at least two parking spots to have a Garden Suite. (Depending on the size of the garden suite the inhabitants may have multiple cars - and the main house may have multiple cars.
- Continue to require a car parking space for every unit on the lot AND DO NOT ELIMINATE STREET PARKING PLACES BY WIDENING DRIVEWAY ACCESS FOR PARKING PADS
- Reduce or eliminate parking: especially along transit corridors
- PROHIBIT any additional vehicles by owner/tenant.
- Instead of thinking that no parking spots NEED to be provided, you should be thinking that no parking spot will be available. This would increase street parking. Just because a person might live in this type of unit does not mean they don't have a car.
- How would this be provided without impacting cars moving around. Sounds like a bad 'mutual drive' situation.

- Changes to parking requirements should not depend on whether there's a garden suite. Generally except for people with disabilities, car parking in the city should be expensive and difficult. Bike travel should be encouraged by requiring bike parking in homes, apartments and workplaces and having bike paths everywhere. If one can't cycle, one should use public transit, and that should be more frequent and subsidised by car users in the city by the use of tolls on city highways especially, and roads in gen
- All cars should have to be parked on the lot, none should get street permits. Alternatively, street permits for all cars should be much higher than they are now.
- parking requirements should relate to neighbourhood and site characteristics re lot size, availability of street parking
- Not sure I understand the question.
- Continue to require a car parking space with a refuelling station for electric vehicles.
- above are irrelevant given total opposition to this dumb idea
- bicycle spots-eliminate. I think the laneway occupant should be able to pardon the street with a permit
- Eliminate all parking minimums - we should be moving away from car dependency
- I don't think parking should be a requirement, or a requirement to eliminate it. If there is space for one and the owner wants to keep it, let them keep it.
- Allow for street parking
- unsure
- I don't fully understand this issue, I don't think. In my neighbourhood most people in my type of housing (single detached) have driveways/garages. I think parking for laneway houses could be accommodated by the existing driveway space or by allowing on-street parking overnight.
- Eliminate all parking requirements everywhere. It's 2021.
- Reduce car parking limits for both garden suites and residential units, regardless of garden suite or not
- If the Garden Suite renter owns a car, he must have a parking spot.
- Stop with unnecessary requirements.
- No opinion
- Ease up on front of house residential street parking. Not should be ok for residents in that area to park in the street
- garden suites should have no guaranteed parking on the lot.
- Not sure I know enough about this issue to answer
- Don't build!
- house parking should be flexible depending on the neighbourhood and street parking availability. but garden suites should require zero.
- If parking exists allow it. People will need to charge their electric cars on site, don't push them out on the street for no reason.
- I think parking space is a nice to have, but on my particular street, there's plenty of available street parking, and I currently have a driveway, so I may be biased. I'd eventually like to have my mother stay in the garden suite, and she currently drives, so I would personally want a parking space on the property for her.
- The main house should have enough capacity for the garden suite resident. This might be answer #2 but the wording is not clear.
- do not allow garden suites to be built in the first place
- Maintain at least one parking spot (not per unit, just one)
- Allow street parking for one car.
- Give preferential treatment to lots who eliminate parking spots
- Eliminate all parking space requirements. Embrace any and all measures to make the city less car friendly. This is an environmental imperative.
- WE already have a problem with providing adequate parking for single family detached residential home. This proposal would augment the problem and green house emissions from the additional home and car.
- Our house doesn't have a parking space at all, we pay for a permit to park on the street. So, a requirement to have a parking space would not make any sense. Our house is very close to TTC, bike lanes, and groceries in walking distance. A car is not needed.

- The question is confusing because obviously not all lots have parking to begin with. Therefore, unsure how to answer.
- Do not allow garden suites
- unsure
- Allow for larger driveways or an additional driveway to be installed. For example, on corner lots there could be two driveways. One in the front yard to service the main floor and basement. Another driveway on the side yard to service the garden unit.
- Some parking is required
- I think this should be dependant on the location of the suite in toronto and whether that area is well served by transit. If in a transit rich area, parking may not be required. but in a place where there is limited access to transit, it might be a good idea to require parking or allow for street parking - some streets in the old cities of toronto do not have on-street parking permits and are stuck in limbo right now
- I believe that homes which originally had parking should not lose their parking because they're able to convert a garage into a garden suite. I believe that there should be parking incentives or opportunities whether on the property or in direct proximity.
- Parking will be a great problem. I wouldn't allow it. Who wants more cars on their property? Why would I want renters walking through my garden to get to this ugly shed?
- Eliminate car parking requirements for all lots. Why would they be required?
- Fully eliminate car parking requirements on a lot where a Garden Suite is built, would be ideal, but only in walkable neighbourhoods.
- prefer having at least one parking space for main house but would address each application on it it's own merits. Perhaps have a point system for taxation which rewards less parking.
- Don't build garden suites
- Not sure
- Up to home owner to have and provide parking on property for themselves and garden suite tenants
- Remove requirement for parking on the property and raise cost of street parking
- neighbourhoods with mostly onstreet parking with already at maximum permits
- Judgement based on size of unit & existing residence otherwise you favour double garage large homes which already have ample living space
- at least one parking spot should be required on the property to be shared by the two units. This spot should not be on the front lawn and should be included in the % of hard landscaping permitted
- Fully eliminate car parking requirements AND must provide two bicycle parking spaces
- I have never owned a car. I think my opinion would be uninformed.
- Undecided. Street parking in TO is a nightmare.
- Eliminate the rules. The market will take care of it. A unit without parking will rent for less.
- Downtown, or near rapid transit lines, I favour reducing or eliminating parking requirements and replacing it with bicycle parking. But where transit options aren't good, like in the inner suburbs, I think you have to grandfather the requirement for at least one spot for the main house if it is already present. New builds, maybe not if there is street parking available.
- I'm not sure I understand the difference with some of the options. I feel that the main house should have parking for people who live in the main house but that there should be no requirement for the garden suite to have a parking space.
- Parking requirements are anti-climate
- There should be flexibility depending on the site location. I.e if the lot permits/has space for parking it should included. If the lot is in a fence area where transit is available, no parking needed. Also if parking is required on a lot, non-permeable material should be used and this spot does not count against landscape requirements
- No parking for garden suite, house keeps whatever is there. Make front pad parking spots easier to install
- Eliminate parking requirements on lot AND permit 24/7 on-street parking. You can't do the former without the latter.
- It depends on the location (compactness, walkability, transit access, interference with Toronto's ambitions for Complete Streets)

- Generally agree with removing parking minimums but recognize this may be impractical in areas of the city with less robust transit (eg Scarborough)
- Depends on lot size - a spacious suburban lot may have space for two vehicles inner city may have no parking space.
- There should be no parking minimums at all, for residential land uses
- Introduce maximum 1 parking supply on the lot (regardless of unit count) and require min. bike parking
- same as for laneway suites.
- Main house still has to provide parking and require zero parking for Garden Suite, but in my area I am not in favour of introducing permit street parking to allow Garden suites to have street parking.
- You guys are missing the point here. Everyone who builds a garden suite isn't going to rent it out. I want to build one but I have no intentions of renting it out. So 2 things happening: 1) the right to build a garden suite and 2) the right to rent out a garden suite. If I want to build a garden suite for my personal use (ex. office with kitchenette & plumbing & heating) I shouldn't need to have a space to park a car. If I am going to use it as a rental, it should be mandatory.
- No parking space for garden suite.
- parking requirements should be based on the size & design of the suite or provided by main house on their driveway
- whatever you legislate, car owners will be trying to park their cars in the area.
- in this neighbourhood the lots are too small to add additional parking spaces anywhere
- decouple housing and vehicle parking entirely
- Case by case, eliminate or reduce based on the owner's will. Also City should provide better public transportation.
- There's no one-size-fits-all approach here it will depend on the location.
- This requires further study
- Adequate transportation needs to be available. Perhaps this needs to be community based. If there is low public transportation in an area a parking space could be critical. I suggest there be a cutoff depending on neighborhood walkability, bike-ability, and public transit scores. If the scores are high (resident can have access to everything they need without a car) then the car parking spot won't be required.
- It depends on the configuration of the neighbourhood. Parking is anti-trees. But some streets are all parked up, as here.
- A mixture of the above should be considered based on proximity of a lot to public transportation or requirement of an additional parking permit if garden house resident requires/adds to parking allowance of a lot
- PROHIBIT the ability to have a parking space added with the addition of a garden suite.
- in the annex there is much multiple housing and most of it cannot supply parking. the concern is number of permits for street parking which is very limited.
- In our neighbourhood, most home owners have two cars, and the street is already full of parked cars. Adding garden suites would make the parking problem even worse.
- Parking will be a huge issue. Most homes already have one car per adult in many neighbourhoods.
- Not sure as much would depend on the lot size and configuration
- I don't understand the question. My vote would be that garden suites should NOT be required to include parking for the suite
- I would need to see the data that car ownership is on the decline.
- Stick with the 2 bicycle parking requirement.
- there should not be any parking requirements of any kind for low rise neighborhoods.
- This would only be practical in my area if the convenience and speed of public transit was increased tremendously. Aging parents with mobility issues need car access not bicycle access. Provision for on street parking as an alternative should be considered.
- If no parking include additional landscaping
- provide option for parking but do not make it a requirement
- must facilitate parking, eg, legally handicapped who rely on vehicle. Bicycle not an option for handicapped.
- No Garden Suites!

- dont know
- Fully eliminate all parking requirements we are trying to encourage transit and biking
- Don't add additional barriers by regulating garden suite parking.
- not sure - don't know enough about this
- Bicycle and car parking are clearly not interchangeable. There are areas of the city where one is much more viable than the other. For example, would you bike from your garden suite at Jane/Annette to your job at VicPark and Sheppard?
- Bicycles are not a viable year-round solution to transit in such a large city with winter weather and sprawl. I would not support fully eliminating parking from a lot but rather would encourage maintaining existing parking on a lot if possible.
- Firmly oppose garden suites
- Require at least 3 parking spots. There is already a parking problem at a house with 4 people owning a car. Adding more living space will increase the problem. We have winter in Toronto, so bicycles are completely impractical as transportation.
- Access to, and need for, parking is very different neighbourhood to neighbourhood. This is should not be a one size fits all question.
- in downtown Toronto where people are close to TTC there should be no parking requirements
- Eliminate parking requirement but non-car infrastructure must be supported and built (cycling infrastructure including more protected bike lanes), more frequent and accessible bus services.
- Car and bike parking requirements are unnecessary and increase housing costs.
- NO Garden Suites should be allowed
- I am opposed to the garden suite - how can there be a car parking requirement for a garden suite when the current parking requirement in many cases is not met. There are often more cars per dwelling than will fit in the available parking spaces, so people park 3 cars across, or they park on the lawn, or they park on the street and the City does not properly enforce the by-laws in this regard - so the neighbourhood looks like a slum with cars parking everywhere. In the winter especially it is a problem
- There is high probability that Garden Suites would increase demand for street parking, which is already in short supply
- No car parking must provide bicycle parking between house and suite, not infringe of house
- i will need to think this one through.
- Cars are not necessary in much of the city. Bicycles should be considered instead
- Not sure
- Do not support garden suite idea at all so none of the above!
- This varies by neighbourhood. Continue existing requirements whatever they are for the lot but require two bicycle parking spaces. The bicycle spaces are of course totally non-enforcable!
- In downtown Toronto, there is no need for any parking requirements. My tenants NEVER have cars.
- Bad idea. I dont support
- Why complicate an already problematic parking issues by building additional housing on existing lots
- Ban all garden suites so this question is irrelevant
- I think there should be some consideration if the lot is on a street with good public transit. A car space would be less of a need.
- Parking is already a problem and trouble to school children
- Prefer no garden suites - parking would be a problem if there is no driveway into the garden suite
- I oppose lane way suites all together
- Don't build these suites and do not allow them to have parking pads
- enable street permit parking for garden suite at a minimum or use of half of main house drive if double driveway exists
- No place for this to happen
- If an exemption has already been made for the principal home to not have ANY on property parking - do not allow a Garden Suite. Parking and traffic are already an issue and it will encourage property owners to maximize their lot coverage with no consideration for parking issues

- Garden suite is a very bad idea. We don't need any more crowding in Toronto. Apartments are empty. People can't afford. Increase wages and build roads and subways so that people can commute easily into Toronto. Not built tiny rooms in the backyards. We are too populated now. Please don't make Toronto like NY. it
- Follow neighbourhood conditions (areas not with, or requiring parking), but do not remove existing parking where it is presently.
- Do not allow garden suites to avoid parking issues.
- Unsure
- What's the point of any parking regulation when it is apparent that the roads are inadequate for the population, public transit is utterly inadequate for the population, bicycling is generally a mortal hazard and even walking is becoming a challenge.
- In general there should be more flexibility in the by-law about providing parking spaces on a residential property. This is particularly the case for two houses on one property. Bicycle parking does not need much space, and does not require a provision in the by-law.
- Maximize street parking by physically marking the spots on the spot to maximize space. Often 1 bad Parker can ruin 2 spots
- This question is based on a false premise in much of the city. Many homes have no parking now. These schemes will increase the parking pressure on streets which are already losing street parking due to infills with driveways in these neighbourhoods. Seniors downsizing into a Garden Suite will not be biking.
- Allow for flexibility based on lot size and current parking. One parking spot, two, or none, whatever works
- None of these choices is realistic. Providing parking spaces reduces green space. Not requiring parking spaces results in overcrowded on-street parking.
- If a car park is required on the lot you may end up with a lot of front parking pads and a lot less green space. There should be a minimum requirement for green space on the property and limits on the car park space.
- Provide a parking space if required by occupant of the Garden Suite
- have it be optional to the homeowner but use highest and best use practices, if it's in a dense area and they don't need the parking, let them eliminate it
- No garden suites
- I really don't care.
- where it is practical, enough parking should be made available for both dwellings, particularly where parents may be moving to the garden suite and their children taking over the main house. The parents probably already have a car.
- if space allows, provide for additional parking space on the property in addition to original single space.
- absolutely do not agree with garden suites
- Allow existing homes to more easily be converted to a duplex, triplex or fourplex, where the existing building envelope permits it.
- NON Issue . Garden units should NOT be allowed, due to noise, privacy and pollution. Period .
- It would depend on the location. This is not a one size fits all situation.
- Even after building a Garden Suite, there is enough room for a car in between the house and the suite in my lot.
- Need parking spaces for main property and choice if tenants have a car must have some for it if not no space required
- Be able to have parking for main house is desired and a garden suite
- I think that context is key (i.e. does the lot have a garage AND driveway to park on). if neither then there may parking implications. However, autonomous cars in the future may lessen personal vehicle ownership. Therefore, parking should be decided on a planning area basis since not all areas have the same parking requirements/availability of space to park
- Tenant of the garden suite would not be provided with a car parking spot on the property nor be eligible for a street parking permit.
- Parking requirement is outdated and elitist. My experience as a landlord is that bicycle and other storage is more important, even for wealth tenants.
- Allow street parking not paving of front lawns

- DO NOT ALLOW GARDEN SUITES OR BOARDING HOUSES EVER
- Prohibit parking on lots with garden suites. Strengthen zoning requirements for permeable landscaping. Not enough permeable surface for both. Neighbourhoods with semi detached housing have shared driveways. no on-site parking is possible with building in the back yard, except by paving over front yards...will lose even more permeable green spaces. Prohibit front yard parking if laneway or garden suites are allowed.
- I'm not sure - but my concern is that adding extra housing without taking parking into consideration is problematic. It is already difficult to find parking in the neighbourhood and in winter - it is worse.
- need to provide parking since basement units went in there is little or no parking available if they are cheap no high end definitely and the city cannot control that
- parking is already bad in my neighbourhood, this would make it worse
- Parking in our neighbourhood should not be required for more than one car. Right now there is no enforcement when someone puts in a secondary parking lot. More housing: more parking = no green space and water problems
- Absolutely oppose !!!
- Allow for zero parking for the garden apartment.
- Perhaps I don't understand this, but I'm thinking there need not be any parking requirements. Very few homes in my area have any parking at all.
- Performance standards re:min size fire code requirements that address life safety
- Allow front yard parking if it's an electric car!
- Eliminate Parking requirements for the lot entirely regardless of garden suite or not
- ELIMINATE PARKING MINIMUMS THIS IS A CITY!
- Retain existing grandfathered parking provisions of the property
- Eliminate parking requirements completely
- eliminate car parking requirements
- People need to drive.
- Continue to /allow 1 car parking space if the space allows...if not then still allow the garden suite to be lit, make space for motorcycle or bikes. It there should still try to be one parking spot for a vehicle.
- Ensure adequate public transportation is available within 5 minutes of the Garden Suite with regularity of at least every 10 minutes or maintain car parking and ensure adequate space inside the unit for at least one bicycle.
- As long as there are street parking permits available, I don't think this should be a major concern. It's more important to have more affordable housing in the city.
- Prohibit garden suites so that parking and congestion is not a serious issue.
- If the city reduces car parking space requirements for every unit on the lot there will be a parking logistics nightmare in this city
- As per previous message, lack of parking should not be grounds to deny a garden suite - so don't make it a requirement. Prioritize people over parking (e.g. garden suite enables people to live). However, if a gdn suite owner needs parking, it should be available - change street parking rules to allow parking on the street if none is possible on property land itself
- Homeowner keeps own parking spot and all permit street parking for suites.
- Do not agree with garden suits period
- I rent the city easement for 2 car parking on my site. Live alone and own one vehicle. This should be included in the considerations. However, the main building should maintain one parking space and allow for bicycles.
- Neither increase or decrease parking spaces. *(By the way not too many Seniors bike around the City.)
- Require one space for the entire property (which could be used by any of up to 3 units -- main, secondary suite, garden suite) plus some bicycle parking
- Leave it to the discretion of the main house if they want to provide vehicular parking. There should be biking parking but beside the Garden Suite.
- Allow 1 parking spot per lot. Reducing it to zero removes parking for the whole neighbourhood
- Find a parking solution that does not clog the property or reduce the residential feeling of a neighbourhood so that the entire neighbourhood is a parking lot.

- Not sur
- Allow parking pads in front of the house. Street parking is much more of an eye sore than parking pads. Too much red tape to get parking pads on your property in the city.
- Who cares. AirBnB guests will use Uber.
- Not sure - possibly site specific
- We are in a democratic country: It have to be to owner criteria. TTC is providing a good service, more a more people are selling their auto and using other ways of transportation
- Provide street parking wherever possible.
- CARS are NOT going away!!! even though I love to ride my bike, most folks are not safe bike riders in the city and cause accidents and do not follow proper bike or car rules. So, car parking is still needed and bike parking can be added. IF you are trying to get more bike riders then perhaps the Clty needs to implement bike liscences so folks know the rules of the road and I honestly believe pedestrian and cyclist accidents will go down!!
- Eliminate parking will put on more stress on city permit parking spaces, adding a Garden Suite the rain run off will put more stress in Toronto water intake with more flooding of residents homes.
- this is a really tough one. making parking a requirement will likely impact the ability of these being viable as a policy approach for addressing lack of housing options in toronto, but you could argue that if your site can't accommodate at least one parking spot and a garden suite then the site is not suitable for a garden suite. That being said, the city seems to have already set a precedent with the Laneway house approach.
- I don't agree with Garden suites so I am opposed to any parking related.
- Zero parking for the garden suite.
- Require zero parking where close to transit
- Car sharing - no need to eliminate parking if there is a lane - no need to supply extra !!
- Offer the option of a single parking space for the Garden Suite in addition to the zoning allowable for the main dwelling.
- Support adequate parking requirements but perhaps not all streets have the same need.
- don't know
- Someone should really think about this seriously - enough congestion at the moment without adding to it.
- Eliminate car parking requirement only for lots located in neighbourhoods within MTSAs
- Don't build garden suites
- Opposed to backyard suites. Where is the environment being taken into consideration? More density in all respects more buildings, cars, loss of green space. .
- Do not allow street parking.
- Limit 2 car parking for each property
- Only require a single uncovered parking space anywhere on the lot if there is 3 or more units on the property
- It. depends on how spaces the lot is. The density of houses and people are major concerns. Parking is another problem.
- Building garden is totally depend on the need of the family, each family has different situations,
- There should be sufficient parking to accommodate all of the cars of all of the residents on the lot. Street parking should not be allowed.
- limit # of cars per unit and need to continue to provide car parking on property. Not allow cars to be parked on road.
- property has driveway. could park two cars on it without interfering with either dwelling.
- depends on the area and transit of that area. If north of the city and or suburbs, we function mostly with a vehicle as our #1 mode of transportation.
- Completely dependant on area of the city. Generally, less parking is fine. But if we're talking York mills and Don mills, there has to be parking. Don't assume that renters/those living in small spaces don't own and need cars too.
- site specific condition. in some locations parking may be required.
- I don't agree with garden suites
- Our neighbourhood streets are jammed with on street parking because of multiple vehicles per house, 2, 3, 4....

- Unless disabled person must drive
- Depends on availability of street/permit parking in area immediately surrounding property
- I think having a spot to park your car for each unit would be ideal but not a make or break item.
- parking required depending on size of the garden suite
- Nor sure
- People who require a housing in this city likely won't have a car. If this proposal for garden suites was about affordable housing this would not even be a question. What about requiring a parking spot for a zip car or safe bicycle lockup's?
- I am closest to 'reduce or eliminate car parking requirements on a lot where a garden suite is built, as long as it's replace with bicycle parking.' However - bikes are stolen all the time, cable cutters are cheap. It is very difficult to secure bikes. So I am interested in what is required, bike lockers or just bike parking. I would prefer a much more secure method to make permanent bike parking safe, without another structure for secure locking, (the structure may also not be that secure).
- not sure how this would be able to work vis a vis space possibilities
- I don't know how to respond to this. Loss of garage or yard parking space could present a problem.
- In my view, parking or no parking would depend on your geographic location in the city.
- There is not space for all cars and people now
- Reduce or eliminate car parking requirements - consider availability of on-street parking options, proximity to transit etc
- prevent garden suits from being allowed to purchase street parking.
- Require zero parking for the Garden Suite only and the main house would still have to provide parking. Provide exceptions to allow certain Policy Areas to replace required vehicular parking with bicycle parking, or when within certain distance of a major transit node (GO station, subway station, LRT station)
- No parking allowed....rent only to those travel by bike, TTC, taxi
- This should be up to the homeowner and homeowner needs/the building type, as well as dependent on the parking restrictions/allowances in the streets surrounding the units. For ex: a multi-unit building that builds a garden suite in the back but still has two parking spots in front of the building should not be subject to the same considerations as a single family home (attached or detached).
- All households today own 2 cars so a minimum of 2 car parking on the property not the street fir garden suites!
- CANT ANSWER AS I DON' T SUPPORT THE GARDEN SUITES
- Why should it be so strict? If it's possible to provide a parking space, that's great. If not, that's fine too. The garden suite should be responsive to the environment that it's in, that's why the city reviews permits, right?
- There should be some consideration for parking requirements. Particularly if Garden suites are going to be used to assist with aging in place or other additional accommodations for family members, there may be mobility issues to consider -- and a resident (in main house or garden suite) may require access to disabled parking.Presumably this (& need for addit'l parking) can be considered where there is street/permit parking available. There are many locations within the city where there is no parking at an a
- Onstreet parking, where it is in demand, should prioritize main house owners

20. What types of uses do you think should be allowed in Garden Suites?

- Personal Service Uses
- Residential Housing
- Intergenerational living, for families which are actually occupying (i.e. not renting out) the main house. Also renting to third party renters, but again only where the main house is occupied by the owner (i.e. not already a duplex or triplex)
- Office Space, Recreation Room, Rental unit
- Anything the home owner would like to use them for.
- Long-term living

- Residential and work live space
- Personal use office
- Primarily housing
- None don't allow them
- None. They should not be allowed.
- Office, Studios (Artists, Recording, Photograph), Personal Services (Barber, Massage, Yoga)
- Living, working/studio
- Any use that does not interfere with the quiet use by other tenants, owners or neighbours.
- office, gym, play area
- Small office or quiet place
- as main home owner work or studio spaces only
- live in Nanny, home office.
- Work from home
- Not sure.
- Home office space. Airbnb should NOT be allowed
- Residential
- Anything the homeowner wants that is legal.
- Up to 3 person rental accommodation, inter-generational accommodation, office related work from home space
- Additional living for family only. Not rental. Not short term rental. Not Airbnb!
- Residential Unit
- Office / Studio space
- Home offices, home gyms, home entertainment, short term rentals
- Affordable housing
- Home office, art studios
- Residential use only
- Residential and commercial. Mixing commercial uses into existing residential neighbourhoods could add vibrancy to the city - imagine a granny suite cafe or art gallery
- Living space, working space.
- Intergenerational families work from home space rentals.
- Home gym, office, studio
- Home office or workshop, workout space
- Living accommodation/storage for items or car
- Space for ageing, pure rental, home office, downsize option for main home owner.
- Work spaces or to house family members only.
- Bike repair shop, salon or barbershop, home office, or light commercial uses.
- Home office, workshop, light manufacturing... Any use that could be allowed in a main home.
- Residential only
- Work from home, band practice, storage, short term rental
- Accommodation and limited working purposes but not commercial offices or other businesses.
- home office, workshop/studio, guest accommodation
- -
- Home office or studio, residential rental
- Anything that doesn't endanger neighbors. The city has no place regulating what people do on their own property unless it endangers others.
- work from home space
- Perfect for individuals who are retired or suffering from a disability and must remain on ground level.
- Rental , multi family
- Any use that doesn't negatively impact neighbours.
- Home offices, "man cave" entertainment areas
- Housing, office space, small shared/co-working space or shared artist studios, daycare, school houses for homeschooling or small alternative education programs

- I am opposed to these but if they do go ahead I would only want office space. It's amazing the hoops you have to go through to put up a shed or new fence but this will be allowed and even possibly fast tracked. Unbelievable
- Rental use
- Almost anything, including commercial purposes, but red tape should be much looser if intended use is rental unit
- any home based business that is current allowed to be run out of your home I see no reason why that use couldnt be allowed in a garden suite
- residential, work from home
- Residential not for renting as a work space.
- Homes, offices, bars, brothels
- living space, office space
- Home occupations that don't have any nuisance impact on the neighbours. For example no construction contractor workshops but an accounting office would be ok.
- All of them! We can deregulate this quite a bit and allow people to build what they want on the property they own, so long as it's safe. As long as a garden suite will be safe, it should be allowed. Even if it has more than one unit!
- Rental units
- Home office, studio, jam space, workshop, ..., no airbnb
- additional living space, long-term rental space, allowing seniors to age in place
- office, artist studio
- Home based business
- Art studios, play or wellness space, builder space
- Artist workshops, music studios, professional work/live space
- Office. Commercial as in daycare.
- Pretty much all uses and home based businesses that do not impact neighbours.
- Living, work from home, gym/yoga room, playroom/entertainment, library, part living/part storage shed.
- No restrictions
- I am worried garden suites will end up being extra living space for already wealthy residents and not end up as rentals or income properties, basically just free reign on building a detached addition to a house
- Residential, office, studio
- small businesses of all types
- Residential and or Office
- Office, light commercial uses (ie workshops), not any sort of industrial uses.
- Work from home, workshop, Rec room
- Small Business
- It should act as housing only. Otherwise, this is an opportunity for folks to add studios, offices, and expand their property for their own use, rather than contributing to increasing rental units on the market.
- Office space, home gym,
- Rental housing, and maybe work from home. Not sure of the implications of that. I wouldn't necessarily want the space rented out to another business (not owned by homeowner)
- there are many other ways to deal with affordable housing issues besides using up the green space in cities.
- Any - retail, services, residence, light manufacturing
- Residential, commercial to support small businesses (ie one-on-one fitness studio), small kitchen, artist studio
- WORK, LIVE
- supplementary income, intergenerational living accommodation, work from home
- guest house, office, small business
- work from home, artist use, work/live space, small childcare space
- commercial, residential, long-term rental, extra accommodation for the home owner, etc.

- All uses that are permitted within the zone the garden suite is located on. The suite is ancillary to the primary building and should therefore carry the same allowances as the primary building from a use perspective - this fits with allowing elders to age in place and all those with a home occupation to use the suite to augment their permitted work/home model.
- Housing or work from home space. It should not be used for commercial or retail endeavors.
- any living, work or employment opportunity or requirement provided that the location does not become a point of direct sales for products.
- I would say anything as long as it doesn't have a big negative environmental or noise impact (i.e. pollutants, heavy foot traffic)
- living, work, exercise, meditation
- Work space, fitness, breakout room, rental living, coworking
- home office, artist studio, NOT for commercial factory shop with mechanical machines, not for office with staff - ie not alot of foot traffic and not for public visits
- long-term rental, remote working, in-laws suites, short-term rentals
- Rental, home office/business
- Rentals, also short term rentals, intergenerational living
- Up to the owner
- home office, child care, recreational space
- Rental office space, artist studio, nanny suite, private daycare
- Gym, work from home office, children's playroom, art studio
- Home occupation, work from home and dwelling. Units
- Work from home office, granny suite for aging parents
- Personal leisure, extended family / guests, rental property, and work from home
- Work from home spaces, garden sheds, activity spaces
- Gym, Work From Home
- EXTRA BEDROOM FOR GUESTS, PLAYROOM FOR CHILDREN OF MAIN HOUSE, OFFICE SPACE ETC.
- Additional living space for home owners or other non-commercial uses (potentially including providing proximate housing for aging family members or adult children saving to purchase their own home).
- Living and possibly working from home
- Studios for the arts
- All types
- no garden suites should be allowed - who came up with this - do you actually live near a laneway
- Any uses
- Work, residence or a mix of both.
- Quiet occupation
- Working from home.
- shared work/home space
- Just Housing
- home office/studio
- seniors, retired folks
- Residential only
- Living only.
- Short term rental perhaps which could be transitioned to long term rental stock
- office, music studio, yoga studio, art studio, personal gym, flex space, meditation room, daycare/children's school space, residential with full kitchen, bathroom, laundry facility
- I can't think of any restrictions unless, like any other residence, breaking by-laws etc..
- Office, consulting rooms, yoga studio etc
- home offices
- Live-in studio space, Live-in office space, Live-in workshop space.
- Work space.
- Residential
- If built only living
- residential living

- Guest Suite for out of town visitors
- residential arts-related live-work studio
- Work from home classes getaway space music practice art studio etc.
- Housing, Backyard Community venues (ex. small entertainment shows like music etc.)
- APARTMENT
- Home office and Long-term rentals
- Dwelling only
- I DO NOT WANT THEM ANYWHERE FOR ANY REASON
- office space, work from home, studios for artist
- work from home, studios for arts including music, rental accommodation
- Work/live spaces, gallery space,
- Living
- Home office, home gym, nanny suite, retirement suite, art or music studio
- home office, professional office, site for allied health practitioners (massage therapy, physical therapy etc.)
- Living, office space, rental property
- Barber shops, tattoo, massage and other personal care. Certain artists and artisans
- Two storeys, residential and home office, workshop, studio
- I feel that one should be able to live and work on ones own property
- A residential space for extended families or renters. An office space will not increase the number of people living at address. If office spaces are allowed owners will want the option of having a separate garden suite. Don't want to see a garden shed, a WFH office and a garden suite. And let's not forget the chicken coop and doghouse.
- Granny suite,artist studio,low capacity (no more than 2 people)
- Many
- rentals, inter generational, studio, work from home, low income house, rental space
- Residence, office, studio, workshop
- Guest house, gym, office space, rental unit, commercial use depending on neighborhood
- Work from home, living, multi-generational living, studio space, rental
- Any
- Anything the landlord/owner wants it to be that is legal.
- art and craft studios
- Residential
- Any really as long as its legal
- Office
- Living-work
- Office
- Anything legal in other buildings
- owners only work from home, residential rental
- Work and commercial and residential
- Home office, short term rental, long term rental
- Intergenerational living or storage spaces
- Work spaces, residential, studios - but not for public businesses to be run out of.
- Living, workspace, office
- Low rental
- Home office
- Residential
- working, parents home
- Home office
- Studios
- Not any use that impacts neighbours
- Rental apartments, home office as secondary
- All residential and commercial uses
- Any which would be allowed in the neighbourhood.

- Residential. Home office.
- Office
- All uses
- Living, working
- Small scale commercial activity with public sales (i.e. art gallery, home bakery, etc.)
- Housing
- live/work, affordable rental space, age in place space, small workshops
- Office, studio, workshop, with legislation that limits the noise, smells, human traffic etc.
- Living, home office, craft /art studio, canning /food prep, wood shop, neighbourhood tool library, the list goes on ...
- Affordable housing is most critical
- home office, granny flat, short term rental
- Parents house
- Anything the home owner wants without eliminating parking for cars
- Residential spaces only.
- Rental. Supplementary work space. Should be flexible.
- No sounds louder than conversation...
- Gyms, home office, living
- Home Office or employment that does not require high traffic- no retail.
- Home office, extra living space for owners of property ONLY. NOT tenants etc
- Rental, Age-in-place, regular/quiet office environments (i.e. not a business which requires loud sounds or music regularly)
- I am against garden suites so the question is irrelevant
- home office / studio, support for seniors / extended family, residential rental
- Home, work and granny suites.
- Home office, studio, workshop. Short-term rental, long-term rental, in-law suite.
- Residential, live and work commercial
- Small businesses (e.g. RMT space, accountant office)
- Intergenerational family residence, rental residence, work-from-home space, guest accommodation.
- dressmaking, tailoring, shoe repair, sign making, teaching classroom, day care 3 to 4 kids, commercial art and or writing studio, home office, rental apartment,
- A work from home space would be a great garden suite opportunity.
- affordable rental units
- dwelling units
- Work from home.
- primary living and office work
- Office, light industrial and residential
- Who would want to have these structures beside their property? Extra garbage, noise.
- Air BNB
- Office, housing
- Rental living at-home workspaces, i.e. therapist's office parent suites
- Living. Literally just that.
- same as in other residences
- They should not be allowed at all.
- not sure
- Art studio, writing shed. NOT heavy machinery or clients visiting.
- Living and working Rental
- Residence only -- no commercial business other than 'working from home' for another business off-site
- work from home, artist space, musicians
- residential and home office
- living rental aging in place multigenerational NO Airbnb!
- office, recreational space
- I'm opposed to Garden Suites so my answer is 'no uses'.

- Residential for sure, possibly employment provided it is not disruptive to the neighbourhood generally.
- Strongly opposed to the entire idea
- Work from home.
- None. I don't think they should be allowed.
- Offices, workout studios, living space (studio, 1 bed, 2 bed rentals), playroom
- Home offices, art studios
- Your questions suggest you have already determined to go ahead with Garden Suites. Is this really aiding to the quality of life in an already congested core area of the city ?
- Art studio, office, home gym/fitness, small business, residential rental, guest house, additional living space to main house.
- workshop, art studio, work from home, exercise space
- Offices, studios, storage (and put the living space in the snout house's garage instead), gyms
- Extra living space, work from home
- None - they should not be allowed in current residential areas only in new developments where everyone knows in advance
- Home office / Workshop / Studio
- Work-from-home, studio, workshop
- Long-term housing only, (no shorter than a year), (no short-term like AirBnb, no offices where employees come)
- NOT BE ALLOWED IN ANY PART OF THE CITY
- Work from home
- Workshop, hobbies
- none
- For residential use, or by owner for personal use. Not vacation rentals.
- None. I am completely opposed to them. This questionnaire is designed to get people to agree to something they don't support. Choices are only offered as if the person already supports them. I don't. It will destroy the precious little quality of life that is left in this city. No wonder everyone who can is leaving. People should be allowed to have some private green space. You are destroying this city with all the condos and endlessly squeezing more people into tiny spaces. All that counts is monetizing space. Greed is ruining this place. And you folks are enabling and encouraging it.
- Office/work from home
- residence, work spaces
- None whatsoever
- Live and work
- residential only
- None
- Affordable Housing/Rental multigenerational household (aging parents) Student rental long-term rental only
- Living, office, medical practice, childcare
- work or living such as grandparents or family member etc.
- Rental unit, flexible work space, overflow space
- Residential, home office, home gyms
- non commercial non retail (i.e. no traffic no clientele visits)
- Residential, office, small, quiet business
- Gym, office
- There should be No Garden Suites allowed
- all - don't think it is the City's or anyone else's business to regulate what happens in garden suites
- Same uses as the main property. So residential - stays residential.
- She sheds and work spaces.
- All uses, up to the user / builder
- Housing! Not sure about anything else

- In family/extended family housing and work or studio place within noise/safety and environmental regulations
- strictly full time family extended family or other renter no air bnb or hotel or business uses
- No garden suites - this will not be monitored well by the city and will be a catastrophe for neighbourhoods
- Work from home, extra family room (ie non-income generating uses)
- Offices, gyms, 'hangout' for teens
- owner occupied office/work/studio and/or living space only
- Art studio, up to two tenants,
- none
- do not agree there should be garden suites
- They should not be allowed. It is a ridiculous idea that will cause chaos such as: overcrowding, noise, parking issues, no green space in your own backyard, no privacy.
- I am not on favour of any garden suites. I am not opposed to laneway suites.
- living or live/work
- Garden suites should not be allowed in this neighbourhood and this and the previous questions imply consent to the concept.
- Home gyms, offices, storage
- None
- None. Regardless of what is regulated they will be used however individuals choose use them especially if they are 'hidden' in backyards. where only neighbours suffer the repercussions.
- Residential only
- Only for 'work at home' for current home owners
- in addition to residential, work from home office, perhaps light industry (i.e. bike shop, hobby business)
- Short-term rental
- anything allowed in a larger residence that is legal
- Live and work
- Space to be used by the residents of the home
- residential use only for privacy of other residents or non-traffic work
- Home office, small business (art studio, daycare, medical practice space)
- Intergenerational, nanny suites, income property
- Anything but band practice and animal slaughter? I guess a retail store would not be good, so any residential except short-term rentals.
- Not as an airbnb or shortterm rental
- Medical, artists, professional, etc
- single family residences
- None
- I don't like them at all.
- Personal use for the owner such as work from home space or living accommodation for direct extended family member
- I strongly oppose Garden Suites
- Residential living quarters only. Office OK for the person(s) living in the garden suite.
- residential only !
- Residential only
- Whatever they want? I mean, let them build it and do their thing as long as they aren't violating general bylaws.
- I don't think garden suites should be allowed this city cannot enforce existing laws as it is. More people and more congestion will only make life more unbearable.
- Studio, Offices.
- Home office
- living space only, not short term rental units!!!!
- rental, work from home, small artisan shop
- self-contained living space for owner of property or their family, or monthly or longer tenants (number of tenants limited no AirB&B no businesses)

- Home studio or office, accessory dwelling family, limited commercial
- In-laws, parents, caregivers, grown children, Man Caves or Women Caves, home office/studio, self-employed
- Work from home, intergenerational family living and/or rental to subsidize mortgages and crazy Toronto house prices
- only office for home owners- no rentals or for relatives
- home office, studio
- Fundamentally residential, but work-at-home is fine as long as it doesn't involve retail or similar traffic generating activity.
- elderly, grown children or work space
- Office for detached home owner on first floor, rental apartment on second floor
- None
- none
- living, rental, arbnb, working space
- Office, studio, child care, airbnb, family guests
- Residential only (with no short-term rental permitted)
- Work from home space only
- NONE
- None other than residential linked to the main dwelling.
- Recreational, guest room
- Work, family living, one year rental minimum
- 2 people maximum
- Work from home space
- Greenhouse, shed, barn
- Home office/work from home, home gym
- studio, workshop, housing, light manufacturing,
- Living and work from home
- NO to Garden Suites
- In-law suite, multi-generational living, rental, personal use.
- residential
- Work spaces and living places
- work space, living space for either homeowner or renters, inter-generational living, short term rentals
- All
- home office, gym, rec room
- living space home office studio
- Residential, commercial, recreational
- Work-from-home/office, extension of main home (eg: kids sanctuary), studio space
- None
- I am concerned about the increased density in my neighbourhood. Allowing any type of garden suite is a slippery slope to people congestion. My concerns about density centre around infrastructure of the neighbourhood. I already cannot comfortably walk to a corner store, pharmacy, school, etc.
- If this is about creating more affordable housing then creating work space rentals should not be allowed..
- Work from home, small business (eg home daycare), living unit
- Long term rental or living situations . No Airbnb rentals!
- Residential, live-work
- Work from home, residential, recreational
- Everyone. Build more housing, and fill the 'missing middle'.
- Work and small business spaces
- If the building is a small 1 story 'shed' that is part of the home then the use could be flexible. If it's a 2 story fully functional building then the function should be clearly defined.
- Residential, home occupation/home office, livework/studio space,
- Accommodation

- None
- Whatever the owner wishes as long as respectful of area and neighbors
- This is a loaded question assuming we support Garden Suites - we do NOT support garden suites. They will negatively affect communities.
- intergenerational living caregiver living for aging-in-place
- In-law. Work from home. Studio music/art. Day care. Short term rental.
- Need to be limited to permanent residents- no temporary rentals like AirB&B
- Living and office space please.
- There should be no limit on 'uses' so that entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic diversity is encouraged to create strong communities. There need only be some reasonable limits on externalities, like pollution or excessive noise.
- Home based business / home office / recreation
- Single senior home living granny or nanny suite
- intergenerational living, rental and guest cottages
- should not be built. Overcrowding already an issue in many areas. Overly populated areas should not allow these to be built
- Small businesses micro breweries
- Not sure as I do not know enough about this
- None. I don't want any.
- Any use that limits the amount of human traffic.
- They absolutely should NOT be permitted AT ALL!
- Living and/or working
- dependents and extended family residence long term renters home office/workshop
- I am against garden suites
- Family living
- Torn on the issue of work-from-home as, in many areas, this really amounts to blowing open coverage limits. It may be useful for garden suites to provide rotating staff housing for personal support workers serving many local seniors at home. Would be some kinda weird variant on rental/commercial use. Could go sideways trying to legislate that as intended.
- Only full time living accommodations. No short term rentals. The number of people living there should be regulated. I.e. only one person in a garden suite
- Housing rental, office and studio
- nothing, no suites!
- Living, office, home gym
- Same as residential uses. Home office, hobbies etc
- Workshops, Art Studio, Daycare, office,
- Granny, rental, home office
- residential home, home office, small business
- young adult family member residential
- I do not want to have Garden Suites at all.
- workshop, office, sunroom/tearoom
- office/studio makes sense
- Residential or home office
- Other than a living space (NO AIRBNB), work place for the owner's family with a limited number of visiting clients.
- extra housing for intergenerational family, rental property, home office
- Anything that is allowed in the principal dwelling in that Zone
- Living 1-2 people and same for work space depending in overall sq ft
- work from home
- I don't know
- none. how can you even ask these questions.
- Multigenerational family homes. Not for rental
- Arts studio, work from home if business requires no or limited visitors (i.e not high traffic businesses like retail, restaurant etc)
- office...studio....granny flat

- work space that doesn't have explosive or noxious fumes, up to someone imagination
- I do not support thus
- Home work space, in-law suite, long term rental
- Self-contained living for low-income people (maximum 2), family members
- guest house (known visitors), workspace, long-term rental, extended living room
- Whatever people want. Maybe not air bnb
- housing, work from home
- Living
- Housing, workspace
- No garden suites should be allowed in the city.
- None they should not be permitted at all
- Accomodation only !
- Anything goes
- Only permit them for family members eg with disabilities or aged members. Do not permit rental use.
- Indifferent
- Personal office space. Residential only. Storage.
- Retail
- None
- None, no Garden Suites ar all
- Work or hobby
- Anything that build more housing stock
- Home office , art studio, granny suite
- I don't think we should allow garden suites in the first place.
- None
- Resin tail or office
- Living accommodation
- Living Spaces for Family or Office Space for Working at Home
- None!
- Home business, workshop, studio
- Not Airbnb, but otherwise rentals allowed or used as additional space (workshop, etc)
- work space
- Long term rental.
- Self contained residential
- They should NOT be allowed. f they are used for ANYTHING other than rental garden suites become a rich man's way to avoid minor variances to build bigger garages/storage and will damage flood prevention programs
- Residential, office,
- Home office, space for adult children or grandchildren. No short term rentals.
- residential rental, maybe an artist/musician studio
- Residential rental, work from home space
- Residential and home office.
- Anything but a rooming house.
- residential or small business offices
- office for services
- Home office. Art studio
- the same uses that are allowed in a 'regular' house
- The same uses allowed for the main dwelling on the property
- Residential properties should be used for residential uses only.
- Garden suites should not be permitted. Your survey is biased.
- Inter generational, home office/studio
- One story office or den, not full living quarters.
- Garden suites are a terrible idea and will contribute to noise and flooding.
- Only for the use of main home owner or their family

- Have to evaluate each suite and location
- Old age (parents) retirement home, a separate living accommodations for the kids (teenagers), home offices (especially during the pandemic where many are forced to work from home). A workshop, a potential for business establishment ie (design studio, law, dental office, etc...)
- It's private property, so as long as it is not use for illegal or criminal activities, this should be decided by the lawful owner of the property.
- Office space only for 1 Story, otherwise only permanent residential by couples.
- Living space only
- None
- Affordable housing
- None I strongly oppose Garden Suites. They are not the solution to affordable housing.
- Personal or family use only
- Work from home
- It will be virtually impossible to regulate any activity unless it produces loud noises or noxious smells.
- Home office, fitness suite, Dining.
- Work from home office, studio for art
- Art studio, office space, living space,
- They should not be allowed. These are residential areas purchased for family use. Don't allow this project to go forward. You're changing all of the reasons we purchased our properties to begin with - houses not too crowded together. Ample street parking. Nice neighbours who don't fight with each other. You're changing neighbourhoods on our behalf to something we don't want and didn't sign up for!
- None...family can live in the home..this idea will create overcrowding...noise...misuse...loss of green space....no thanks
- Small-businesses, living, commercial. Allow for the return of the 'corner store' and eliminate food deserts.
- None. I am opposed to them.
- There should not be garden suites
- living accommodations only.
- NONE
- Store garden tools and equipment
- Offices, gyms, yoga studios, vehicular (auto, motorbikes, boats, etc.)
- Work space, guest house, inter generational living, rental suite
- Leisure, work suites (non-industrial, non-polluting), family accommodation.
- As long as there aren't 10 ppl coming on and out of a unit, I don't care if it's used for living it for work.
- nanny suite, elderly suite, fully accessible suite, WFH suite
- Residential
- Home office only for property owner.
- residential
- Long-term rentals only (no AirBNB).
- Gyms, offices,
- elderly and infirm family, with undertakings & guarantees by the main family
- None
- Office space
- Aging parents, gym, office
- Work from home, elder housing, housing for children of home owners
- Residential or home office (not a commercial business).
- For immediate family use of homeowner only or for guests of homeowner, home office or workshop, home gym
- Small businesses (e.g. classes, small daycares, etc).
- Home occupation
- There should be no Garden Suites. They would degrade the aspect of our beautiful city. We should learn from others' mistakes and avoid them i.e., Europe

- None. It will cause over crowding in our neighbourhood
- Living spaces only
- Long-term rental, short-term rental as long as the main building is the owner's main residence
- HOME OFFICE, EXERCISE AREA
- Guest spaces, offices, gyms, studios
- residential, not AirBNB
- office, studio, guest room
- Granny flats, studios, offices
- The intent is to provide RESIDENTAL suites.
- Work from home. Limited small commercial. Workout area.
- None.
- Home or possibly office space
- Living home office NOT commercial
- Long term rental only.
- Any non commercial or non industrial. No business use should be allowed.
- there should be no garden suites
- Dont care dont want this idea.
- Office, small business
- A place to keep garden tools etc.
- Studio, work space, bunkie
- residential only
- Only residential renting
- Uses that supplement existing residential use only, i.e. additional bedroom, work or recreational space for use by main dwelling's household.
- Allow for creativity!
- Extended family only. No air b&b
- First requirement of any use other than rental would be that the main house *is* fully used.
- Home offices, professional offices, artist studios
- residential properties for rental, no commercial use
- Housing for relative of homeowner, office space for homeowner, art or exercise studio for homeowner, online schooling for children of homeowner.
- home office / studio
- Long term residential, no short term rental, comply with noise, light, tree protection, minimum lot size, and any other relevant bylaws
- Working space
- Living accomodations for family (intergenerational), rental units for residential purposes.
- Home office, gym, nanny suite
- Residential use only unless they owner is using it as work from home space.
- Home office, studio activities where the use is not loud or noxious
- in addition to habitation, the only other use should be home occupation by occupants of the garden suite only
- Realistically, any will happen once the structure is there. No one will enforce any restrictions. Even if they're AirBNB Brothels or loud metal workshops, the city will let it slide once the structure is up. Don't kid yourselves otherwise.
- Art studio, live/work space, small business, greenhouse / food growing
- To house students or young people.
- NONE.
- I hate the idea
- Work from home, guest house, gym, s/he shed
- residential and work from home
- residential long term rental
- Home office,
- I don't think garden suites should be allowed generally. They will detract from the desirability of the neighbourhoods
- None

- No airbb
- Garden suites should only be the size of a shed or similar that might allow craft or work shed space, not work from home or a granny suite or rental unit.
- Home office or living space.
- art studio
- None
- living space or work from home space
- None
- Work, visiting guests, creative space, personal space
- Residential
- Work from home, personal gym, music studio, extension of primary living quarters, short term rental (AirBnB), long term rental
- fitness, work from home
- My neighbours are already using one and two storey garages as offices - so the cat's out of the bag on that one.
- Home-based business, rental, gerational/in-law/nanny suite
- Studios, work spaces, exercise space, children play space, granny flat, tiny home, etc. A garden suite is much less offensive to neighbourhood than the massive, tall condos and rental units changing the character of our neighborhoods.
- Long term Rental, work from home, extra space for guests, extra space for living
- Residential
- Just living and perhaps a home office.
- Work from home, studio, short term rental
- Residential, work from home, small-scale artisan-style manufacturing
- bedroom/ office /business
- Family only, worry about air bnb ect., short term rental.
- rental, Adult Children, Senior family members, Students
- Not short term rentals
- Additional family living space, artist studios, owners office space.
- Affordable places ot live
- There should be very few garden suites allowed.
- Garden suites approvals should be exclusively limited to accommodation of elderly or disabled family members
- Same family usage, ie work or studio space, granny flat, etc. Long term rentals of minimum 6 months
- Studio / work spaces. Not for industrial.
- Home office
- Living space
- Family rental
- ONLY use by owner of main property as additional living (work from home/office, child play area, overnight family/guest sleeping like cottage bunkie)
- Nanny suite, home office, play space, in law suite
- probably residential only
- Work space only
- Residential, extra office space.
- family
- Work from home space.
- intergenerational families compact and accommodating for senior living student rentals
- None. I am strongly opposed to this
- Doesn't matter because landlords will take advantage of this opportunity.
- residential, office, light industrial, institutional
- Ideally a Garden Suite should be one storey only, with a living/working/eating space, sleeping space and bathroom accommodation for working or occupation by one or two individuals.
- For living only

- I strongly support garden suites, but they should not be used just to make houses bigger - there should be some requirement that they support independent living of some kind (not just office space or rec room).
- Rental or studio
- residential and/or similar - work from home, and potential small retail only if compatible (does not require loading of goods, quiet hours etc)
- housing for family members only
- Anything, so long as it doesn't effect neighbours, eg with industrial type noise or fumes
- Work + Leisure, additional living space and this type of density is unnecessary. There are more intelligent opportunities to densify the city.
- Whatever is within laws/bylaws
- home office, home gym, artist studio, 1 apartment
- Types of uses, including no garden suites, should be decided neighbourhood by neighbourhood, not in general for all of Toronto.
- None. I am very opposed to the idea.
- **THEY SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO BE BUILT**
- Residential
- There should be no Garden Suites period. Let the free market figure out where people are going to stay.
- Home office, small business, short term rental
- None
- Art studios, work space, additional housing space for property owners and their families, long term rentals.
- residential, home-office with no visitors, senior care, art studio with noise limitations, energy consumption limits
- Rent, use by the owner as guest house or office
- Work from home, residential and small office rental
- Studio (i.e. dance, music, exercise, painting, etc...)
- none
- Living or working
- Live/Work space, Recreational, Social, Studio, etc
- Work from home office, no client visits etc
- residential
- If have to allow then only Family members and work from home space
- Living and or work space .
- office and/or recreational and/or living
- living accommodation only as I hope the intent is to provide reasonably priced housing in a low rise neighbourhood for seniors aging in place or lower income families
- Bnb
- place for a bed.kitchen.bathroom. living room only
- Home offices, craft room, leisure space
- Residential only
- None. I do not think Garden Suites should be allowed at all.
- Work, live
- Garden shed /green house .
- Work/live or residential
- none
- Recreational, for raising livestock and poultry
- Rental. Guest/visitors suite. Home office. B&B. Additional family space such as an art/crafts studio because of the smell.
- A separate space for work from home. For creative work, eg. writing, painting.
- Generally I am not supportive of Garden Suites. While they may begin for good reason (e.g. enabling accommodations for elderly family), it cannot be monitored and will become rental or AirBnB solutions
- Home spas, work spaces and suites for inter generational families

- For sure: residential, work from home/home office. Hopefully one day: low impact retail (ateliers, coffee shops). No industrial or heavy use. Limit hours for non-residential use. Integrate living areas!
- work from home, family use, rental, allowance for multigenerational family living, rental work studio space
- Residential, Work from home, retail, even small commercial kitchens with the homeowner's consents
- ??
- Whatever the property owner chooses.
- Any residential
- Studio space, guest house
- They should not be allowed.
- Living accommodations and work from home/home office. No home based businesses should be permitted
- commercial spaces, studio spaces for artists,
- residential + work from home
- long term rental, short term rental, work from home space, studio space with no conflict with residential zoning
- housing unit
- home office, gym, den
- garden suites should only be allowed in un-congested, larger spaces
- Residential
- A home for aging parents downsizing affordable housing for adult children.
- None. They should not be allowed. The City should liberalize its permit and zoning process to allow for easier construction of low-rise apartment buildings.
- None
- Residences (rental and owned), work from home spaces, artist/artisan studios
- Guest house
- Residential Exclusively
- small offices
- Immediate Family residential only
- Office, design or photo studio, professional practices (ie: architecture, speech therapy, psychology). NOT woodworking.
- office, residential
- There should be no garden suites.
- Normal living activities
- live, work, home gym, maker space/workshop
- residential and office
- Office, multi-generational living, rental, gym
- Work/live
- Garden Suites should not be allowed for any reason.
- Anything non industrial
- small business
- None
- Work space, artist creation space
- I am opposed to Garden Suites unless the acreage of the property is so large that it makes sense to permit an additional dwelling.
- I am very concerned about the negative impact of garden suites on privacy, noise levels, lights on existing homeowners. Alos very concerned about how garden suites could be used such as short term rental, party houses.
- office space
- none - i object to garden suites
- Housing, light industrial, single office, corner store, cafe
- Living, work from home, studio
- Extra workspace, leisure space

- small office
- light manufacturing and low impact commercial uses should be allowed. for example welding shops, bicycle repair, retail, etc...
- Owner only no tenants!
- Home office and chicken coop
- anything quiet, odour-free, not a nuisance to neighbours
- Only a use that is subordinate to the use of the main dwelling, and used by residents of the main dwelling. A garden suite should not be rented as an air B and B, or used by third parties for commercial purposes.
- Typical home occupation uses, like small offices, barbers/salons, tutors, music instruction, dance, yoga fitness, mini retail, coffee shop...
- Residential, home office, and small business (small cafe, restaurant, home office)
- Living
- Home office
- Long-term rental. Prohibit short-term rentals and other uses.
- Home or home office
- Only living. No Air B and Bs
- Living
- Extended family to live rent-free work from home
- Living and work
- Workshops chill spaces. Whatever people want to use them for
- personal work and rental
- Living and working
- Home businesses
- living and working
- All
- Retirement living or downsizing, student rental or office space.
- None, don't allow them.
- Artisans, small professional services
- Rental for people or working spot
- Non-polluting, indoor.
- Anything that increase the housing supply in the city and gives renters options other than condos or basement suites.
- Office or living space
- Residential
- Housing and or workspace
- Office space, guest suite, additional recreation space
- Home, workspace, spare room
- Any, including running a small business such as a gym (considering impact on neighbours)
- Residential living only. No Air B B
- wOrk from home or caring for elders
- Work space for only person who lives in main house or residential use
- Live and work
- None. The city is full of housing it's just unoccupied. Tax unoccupied condos to open them up for housing
- I think this is an ill-advised initiative.
- The question is loaded: it already assumes that garden suites are a done deal.
- daycare drop in, office space, housing
- Don't allow loud work or hobbies (eg compressors)
- Residential only
- Residential and home office but not offices of professionals serving clients
- Guest room, home office, rec room, tiny house, rental apt for family, rental apt for non-family
- Housing for elderly family members
- Live work space, personal office space , art studios, living space
- sleeping/living

- Living
- Office type work, secondary residences
- living only
- Granny flat, room for visiting friends, room for family in main house to spread out, eg teens or adult children, fitness studio for home owner, art studio for home owner. The options are endless and should not be limited to rental.
- Rental, coop living, work space, hobby space, cottage in city,
- Residence for Extended family
- Residential only
- Commercial, hobby, short term rental
- Extended family, home office,
- Artists studios
- Studios / work STATIONS, Rental for non commercial use, parents or children's living area, Household servant living area
- Commercial uses (where multiple customers go to the Garden suite) should not be allowed as this will change the neighborhood feel (e.g. no garden suite retail stores)
- Double wide, double long garage - Workshop Spaces - Disabled person accommodations, senior live in suites, nanny live in suites.
- Work and live
- Exercise space
- Residential, office, single client service (tutor, seamstress, etc), rental.
- Office, bunk house
- To support intergenerational living in an arrangement that allows aging grandparents to live independently (their own space) while benefitting from being in close proximity to their support system.
- Home office, home based business, elder care, student rooming house
- ONLY affordable living space. NO short-term rentals. If any work at home, it should NOT involve any increase in activity in neighbourhood, e.g. personal services, sales, client visits, supply delivery, etc.
- Aging in place unit (rent main house), rental property unit, home office (but no incentives for just this use)
- Living and business
- Other than living accommodation, suites could be used for office space, studio space, etc.
- Residential for a limited number of people- no more than 2 on smaller lots
- Residential
- Living unit, home office space, indoor amenity space such as a yoga space, artist studio etc.
- Any type of work / live arrangement. Cities are diverse and as long as noise / smells are not an issue than all uses should be considered.
- Office space , day care , senior gatherings
- intergenerational living
- Gym, home office,
- Maybe work from home office space for owner
- Should not be allowed
- In areas where affordable housing is needed. I live in Lawrence Park and I can guarantee no one here will be renting their garden suite as affordable housing. It will be pure income and profit, just like the current infill homes are. This is not NIMBY - if we lived somewhere the suites would contribute to housing, sure. Here? It will be strictly builders who live in Woodbridge trying to make the most money they can.
- yoga, long term rental, short-term rental, a space to allow an elder senior to reside in and be taken care of easily
- Artist studio, workshop
- Artist retreats, short term rental
- Office, Recreation
- Residential ie long term rental. No Air BandB!
- Residential, work from home, workshop

- Office, creative space, sports training, studio space for creative endeavors, small business
- unsure
- Working from home, in-law suites
- Home offices, green houses, elder homes,
- Home office space, 2 bike parking space, reduce 1 car parking, garden lot
- Housing, yoga studio, non-toxic or non noise-polluting activities
- None
- anything that can be done from the home, like a personal service, barber, salon, tutoring, music instruction, yoga studio, dance studio, karate studio, small cafe even... why not!
- All uses allowed in residential zones.
- Single occupancy, residential use only preferable age in place/family member international/student
- nannies home
- Residential, office, retail/services (but only if visible from street)
- Home studio, workout space, in law suite
- Residence or a work area
- Wfh for small businesses, family tenancies, art studios
- Small office, small artisan workshop or artist's space, private by appointment gallery space, hobby use space, short-term rental
- Housing, personal
- Any residential or owner occupied office
- Residential, but no Air B&B-type rentals.
- Residential, employment, commercial
- with work-from-home conditions, it makes sense for small business owners to have an office also great for small living spaces
- Full use Residential
- renters, family, work space
- 1 storey only.
- No airbnb
- gym, home office, living area, etc.
- Just stop selling off Toronto to developers and allowing foreign investors to own the city
- Work from home spaces, studio/small office space for rent, second unit accommodations for rent, keep use as flexible as possible as long as can be demonstrated that any negative impacts have been mitigated
- Family ONLY
- A beautiful environment
- Living accommodation and home office only . No retail or commercial activity. No group activity. No short term rental
- residential/home office
- Whatever the property owner wants. The government doesn't own the land why should you tell people what to do in their own backyard!
- No Garden Suites
- Air BnB
- They should not be allowed to be built at all
- Abandon the idea of allowing Garden Suites: does not solve the Toronto housing issues and create many problems for existing homes.
- Rental intergenerational accommodations office space (very popular option in the UK!)
- Mainly Residential
- Affordable and subsidized housing. Only.
- Residential
- Work space, work shop, light commercial, small retail
- Accommodation for different household only. No 'scattered McMansionization'
- Office, long-term rental accommodation, nanny or granny flat, yoga or pilates studio, artist space.
- offices, studios, art spaces, yoga studios etc.
- Housing

- work from home, granny suite for seniors replaced to primary home owner, zero AirBNB
- Should never happen
- living/rental units. Office & work from home.
- Artist studio, registered massage therapist, psychotherapist, work from home
- teen retreat, work from home office, overnight guest accommodation
- Living, working + allowing older family members to stay in home
- All of the reasons listed, work space, living space, small businesses that are approved by the city
- In-law suite and home office
- Don't allow them to be built - there are illegal basement apartments now breaking the law, can't imagine what these will produce - slums!
- nothing with adverse environmental impact or that would negatively impact the quality of life of neighbors
- Office space, granny flat, living space for adult grandchildren who cannot afford rents or purchase of condo.
- Living space with no commercial activity other than work from home to prevent increased noise and traffic.
- Residential, Live/work, small art studio, crafts
- Rental and Studio
- Working studio space
- whatever the homeowner chooses. it's none of the City's business.
- Act as a separate dwelling residence, and allow owner to use as see fit.
- Just not Airbnb or anything like it. Only people who actually live on the property or their guests should use them.
- Residences, workshops, studios, office space
- whatever, but with limits on noise, light and number of people
- Long term, short term rental, work space, home owner/family residing
- Live, work, residential, art studios, design studios, office space, small footprint retail
- Affordable housing
- Pretty much anything.
- Living, or work that does not disrupt the neighbourhood residential atmosphere or bring more people into the neighbourhood during the working period
- Not heavy commercial uses
- Studio or guest accommodations for main homeowner
- Work from home, fitness
- None
- residential only
- live or work
- Work from home space
- Gardens should not be allowed to be built
- Either residential or office type commercial.
- Rental, inter generational living, office
- Accommodation, studio space so long as sound proofed
- Rental Property Only
- Living, working, but not commercial
- Residential, work from home, with limited number of occupants
- Work from home space (not client facing e.g., not physio or hair salon, or commercial e.g., bakery), fitness space, creative studio
- Office space
- Long term rental accommodation (NEVER short term rental), senior living, work from home (including light industrial/small production kitchen) applications
- office, studio
- Workshop or office
- living, work/art studio
- Rentals or for older family members only
- Income potential for seniors who want to remain in their own homes.

- live/work
- Residential
- Any
- Home office, spare bedroom, art studio
- none
- Home office
- non industrial uses
- Housing, self-employment, childcare, agriculture, community initiatives (eg. tool coops)
- They could be used for small scale businesses like beauty industry, massage therapy, or other sectors that don't need a huge storefront and don't create noise or pollution.
- any sorts of uses - residential, office, small business - whatever. As Jane Jacobs said (often) zoning bylaws are archaic and unnecessary
- I don't care. None of this is going to solve any real problems.
- Rental or owner residence
- Home additions for living space (for intergenerational living). (But do not allow them to become rental properties)
- Residential - primarily to increase the pool of affordable units, but also supportive of the idea of inter-generational living
- I am opposed to garden suites
- Home office, guest bedroom, nanny flat - whatever the owner wants as long as it doesn't create noise issues for the neighbours
- Anything that isn't illegal or infringes on others in ways that aren't permitted under local bylaws like loud noises. That is the one specific thing I think should NOT be allowed at any time - use as a music studio or other type of work that is very noisy (full time workshop versus a weekend warrior doing projects now and then). OK as a garage / shop - not OK for full time constructing or noisy actions.
- Dwelling Units, Home Offices, Artists' Studios, Pool Houses, etc.
- Perhaps office/studio space. I think that short term rental should be discouraged.
- Living, and work-from-home. No short term rentals!
- As living space used for justification for allowing
- Work from home office with its own toilet - no kitchen required - would need hydro & plumbing
- Long term rental or multi-family living
- Elements of small scale retail
- office, personal gym, studio, rental, extra room,
- The same uses that would be allowed in the main house. Home based businesses. Clients visiting? not sure about that.
- Housing, Home Office, Hobby/Music space
- Uses without or only very limited customer traffic
- Residential living and home office use.
- Limit the hours but otherwise anything works
- Residential, home office, independent practice office
- Nothing. No garden suites
- Living accommodation only
- Residential only
- Gym, office, business
- Commercial, residential, retail, office, flex office, light industrial neighbourhood scale
- Indoor small (personal?) gym/recreation spaces
- Occupancy restrictions
- Self contained living for inter-generational family full workshop/ office space rental suite/apartment
- All purpose except for commercial use
- Anything that doesn't generate significant levels of dust, noise, and visitors
- Residential units, live-work units, offices and studios (home or otherwise), neighbourhood and convenience-based retail (corner lots), and maker spaces (corner lots).
 - Rental 2) accommodation of family member or friend.

- Home office, home gym rental accommodation,
- They should not be allowed at all as most residents will use for short term rental and will not be considerate of their neighbours.
- Living, Working, Studios (eg. Art), Leisure Spaces
- Workshop, Home Office, Gym
- Home, Office, Small Business, Separate Kitchen Facilities, Playground, Laundry, Recreation
- Garden suites should NOT be allowed at all - no uses
- Residential, work from home (in a garden suite), B and B or Airbnb
- Home office/small commercial
- Studios, work from home
- Anything
- entertainment
- Not storefront retail but other business use
- Home gym/office
- Studio, office, rental
- multi generational only
- Office, workout studio, art studio, performance studio
- Home office,
- Office, craft studio, additional sleeping quarters.
- Home office or rental
- Living accommodations
- Residential only for now.
- residential only
- office, gym, workshop, recreation, cooking, spa
- Work from home, home gym, living space
- to provide rental housing for family or public.
- Living, home office, flexible second living area for existing homeowner
- Residential, Commercial.
- Nothing, should not be allowed.
- they should be habitable spaces either for the main home as additional living/work/leisure space or to convert as a secondary home to rent out.
- home office, work shop,
- Don't build them at all. Can a renter start a store in them? Have a grow up? One renter had large pigs living in house and city took a year and a half to evict them.
- NONE. i DON'T AGREE WITH GARDEN SUITES!!
- For living space only. If other uses such as pool house, music studio, art studio are planned, it is not a garden suite.
- home office - rental suite - shared living space
- Accommodation and "office" work, no manufacturing
- Rental unit or owner personal use
- Home gym, home office, guest accommodation
- I think they need to be restricted to predominantly residential or you're defeating your own purpose. If you propose to allow the creation of these to help deal with an affordable housing crisis, in fact, I think that one thing that needs to be managed it to ensure that they don't get built and then suddenly convert to service or other uses which can be done in these locations. I also think that, if you're giving incentives for building these for affordable housing, then you have to be able to make that a continuing condition of the unit, regardless of whether or not the property changes hands. It's just too obvious that 'someone' will build one, let it out for 12 months at the affordable rate, then turn around and start running circles around the LL&T Act to get that person out and hike the rent to 'market' rates. So, the idea is good, but it's important not to lose sight of human nature in building the framework or the 'ideal' will have nothing to do with what you get - and, by the way, generate a lot of hostility towards this program along the way. Also, you didn't ask about noise. For many people, preserving a 'quiet' neighbourhood is going to be a priority and their bogeyman will be the trope of 'young people' moving in and partying till the wee, small hours, to the great inconvenience of the neighbours. How do you plan to address this so that you

can deflect that objection, since it's a pretty fair objection, in fact? Lastly, with all due respect eliminating parking requirements is naive. Even pre-pandemic, Toronto was a city of drivers and I expect we'll see more when we're finally post. The city is about 60 years behind in its public transportation planning and apparently either lacks the vision or will to make Toronto the 'world-class city' that we love to pretend it is by providing adequate public transportation throughout the city. Bikes are a lovely idea but I'm 62 and would probably have a stress heart attack trying to pedal to work with the aggressive Toronto driving population. I don't think I'm alone. Speaking as someone who used public transit for many years to get to work, there was always a car in the driveway for weekends. I don't think eliminating that space will eliminate the sense of entitlement to a (fictional) parking space.

- Home office.
- Living, Working, Gardening, Farming?
- Resi commercial light industrial anything!
- It's a bad idea. Please stop trying to increase density in Toronto. Studies have shown it is bad for mental health. We hardly have enough green space as it is and you want to create more structures on properties.
- Work from home, living space
- Affordable rental housing
- Storage
- Work from home space or studio, though ideally with a design that supports conversion to a rental living space at a later date.
- A wide range of residential and commercial uses, and with flexibility to provide a mix of uses
- Any legal use that doesn't cause undue disturbance to the neighborhood.
- I am against garden suites generally - they should only be considered if property has adequate greenspace & lot size so as to not negatively affect neighbours and environment
- rental housing, home office, artist studio
- Artists studios, offices, long term accommodation
- Any use that adds to the housing supply.
- home office, studio, garage, workshop (limited uses) as well as or in addition to residences
- Only day use no amenities
- Long-term (6+ month or more) rentals extended family use
- Living, recreational, office
- Office, Workshop
- Additional family dwelling for aging family members, home office space during pandemic
- Any kind should be allowed since its the property owner's land, but housing should be prioritized through incentives previously mentioned
- Work and jobby
- Living, Rental units, Work from home
- only for current users as an office or separate room. definitely not for renting out to non family members
- home office, studio, guest space, music room, entertainment
- Work Space, Artist Studio, Home Gym, Home Daycare
- I do not think that garden suites should be permitted at all. If they were to be permitted, I think that they should only be permitted as a 2nd dwelling and the city must verify that the usage is residential and that there is a legitimate tenant or resident on a regular basis.on a continuous basis.
- not being in favour of Garden Suites, none.
- Should not be allowed, removes further green space
- It should be a dwelling which would be a home or an office.
- Virtually anything provided it doesn't impact noise or air quality (office, micro-manufacturing, etc.)
- They SHOULD NOT be allowed. Stop stacking the questions
- Office
- As living accommodation in order to increase Toronto's affordable housing stock.
- living/working
- live/ work/ play/ exercise space/ living /studio green house etc

- Studio space, workshop space, rental apartment
- Study, work, hosting, renting, cooking, plumbing
- Residents and work from
- all
- Homeowner living, rentals, small business consultancies, tax consultancies, arts, artisan, and musician creation, gallery, and store space, computer training centres, meal prep and catering services, horticulture and vegetable and flower growing, renewable energy, wellness centres, ebusiness,
- Workshops, home offices, home gyms, guest bedrooms
- Any really but I'd initially limit it to living and small business non retail.
- Anything permitted in a residence, and food + bev selling.
- Any residential or low impact (e.g. office, personal service, small medical) non-residential use
- Extended family members home, home office, studio
- All kinds of work
- Living, work from home, STR, LTR
- intergenerational living, office, child care space, workshops/studios, student accommodation
- residential or commercial or light industrial
- art studio
- Living only!
- parents, extended family, office use, rental,
- living, working, art, music, gym, etc
- Home occupation, retail and commercial space.
- Offices, commercial space, retail. Noise should be limited. otherwise at the owner's discretion.
- Not sure the exact categories, but I would think they'd have to be uses that are totally private. For example an office that does not host meetings from people who do not live within the household.
- Living, Home Office, Studio Space
- Live/work
- Residential, work/office, small retail, gallery, studio, and literally anything else as long as it doesn't harm neighbours
- Studio, Office, small workshops
- Don't want them. This survey is slanted
- home office or residential
- none
- Any uses already allowed for under the current zoning of the property (i.e. residential, home work/business, ancillary work space, storage, etc.)
- habitable living spaces, work from home (office), shed, sun room, guest house (no kitchen or only a kitchenette)
- WFH, artist studio/workshop, light manufacturing
- In light of the pandemic, individuals should be allowed to work in their Garden Suite
- Work from home, studios for music or arts, typical uses of garages such as storage, rentable work spaces for small business or small fabrication
- Live, work,
- living space for people other than those currently living in the house
- office, residential, studio/art/maker space
- none
- Home office, study space, living space
- Living, office, yoga studio, artist studio, massage therapist
- in-law suite, working from home, rentals, 4 person office suite
- Home office, Rental, Family member accommodation, Nanny/Care giver suit
- home office, playroom, studio, etc that does NOT offer/operate service to the public
- Building more livable units if space is available.
- Commercial space.
- Office space, guest house, recreational space
- Rental
- only living - I guess I should have said that. but maybe studio or something.

- Virtually anything.
- Work from home, for the home owner, with occasional meetings with co-workers
- Residential, office, workshop
- Work from home offices, small scale workshops, etc
- Residential
- Live and/or work
- Residential, live-work, studio spaces, galleries quiet non-commercial uses
- Offices, art studios, childcare
- Work, Retail, Community supportive institutional use such as daycares
- I'm mostly interested in their ability to provide an affordable and sustainable way for my parents and in laws to live within close proximity to our family especially during a pandemic when it may be difficult to travel and see them.
- Office space, workshops, art studios
- No commercial usage but living.
- Work-from-home, elderly care, temporary and long term rental
- My priority at Matthew House is affordable housing that supports refugee claimants in finding friends and community that lasts
- mostly residential
- Dwelling office space for charitable organizations
- Anything reasonably quiet
- residential only
- Extended/intergenerational family, low occupancy rental
- Residential only
- living an at home work
- Family room, work from home, age in place, rental unit
- Living (e.g., family members), short and long-term rental
- Any
- small business
- None.
- Other than living? Daycare, hair salon, spa treatments, dog daycare, dog grooming, bakery, tea shop, yoga studio, yarn shop, art classes, tattoo parlour, massage studio, music lessons, physiotherapy studio.... I could keep going.
- Respectful community living quarters, particularly for seniors
- Home office, fitness studio
- None. We need separation between houses to allow for green space and privacy
- Artist studio, private office
- All uses up to the homeowner. As long as safe to the homeowner and other homes.
- Single family unit dwelling. Not for commercial use.
- Home office . Live / work. Gym
- Live in it and/or work in it.
- Work from home
- rental property, work from home space, business space
- Office/Studio, Rental
- all uses permitted in R zones
- Office, TV room, game room, living quarters
- work from home office, arts / exercise studio space
- If they are to be allowed, they should only be permitted for related family members to eliminate the possibility of them being turned into a rental or Air BnB unit.
- one client at a time businesses - hair dresser, accountant, beauty service, pet grooming, etc.
- None. I'm not in favour of garden suites.
- Anything but commercial (working from home should be fine, but not running a store or fitness studio)
- Home office
- Apartment rental (long-term), family use, age in place, work from home

- Almost any. Performance based zoning vs uses is the correct approach. If my neighbour runs a small business and needs some light industrial nsoave I am fine with that as long as noise and pollution are controlled.
- All uses
- residential work from home/sokr proprietors business
- Any non-commercial use
- Only a home office used by the tenant
- anything! we can already regular things like restaurants via licensing, as long as the use is safe why restrict it?
- Residence, and work from home
- Work from home, small business operations
- increase density
- living, working, arts/studio activity, recreation - any use as long as it is not overly noisy or polluting.
- any use should be permitted but not with incentives toward housing or fast- tracking permit
- Working, studio, sanitary, sleeping, living
- Aging family members/ shared family living/ long term rentals , not short rentals.
- Work from home
- Live/work
- Stratification of the land ownership and allow for people to OWN garden suites.
- Multi generation living and affordable rental option for families especially those who are new to Canada and need time to save what they can it should be combined with work or study programs
- Work space, eg home office, artist studio
- Art workshop, small family gym, home office
- work places such as artists' studios, private workplace.
- Art studio, creative work space
- Small rental units. Home offices.
- dwelling, working from home (as long as the nature of the business would not disrupt neighbours), guest house, solar energy source
- Living, work and recreation.
- Residential, personal home office, arts/creative studio. Possible light business as long as its not disruptive to neighbours.
- Family dwelling
- Residential, office, studio
- Living work-from-home sound-proofed music/band art/writer studio
- Exercise areas - weights / road bike trainers / etc
- All residential and commercial uses but not heavy industrial
- Any uses
- Commercial uses potentially, but I am a little concerned that that could be used as a work around for homeowners that just want to make their house bigger.
- Residential
- What ever is allowed in the area.
- Existing coach houses
- Home offices, workshops, space for home daycare/tutoring and other modest home-based businesses
- rental, business, work from home
- for multi generational families, renters, short term rentals
- Only residential
- Renting and family
- Intergenerational, guest suite, home office, kids room, man cave, rental income,
- Use performance based zoning - minimize noise, smell, heavy traffic, ppl need flexibility in post Covid recovery
- Should not be used as warehouse or offices
- Residential, work from home for person living in garden suite (not as a separate work-from-home space for residents of the main residence)

- Housing, rental
- Living-Space (Residential), Home-Office, Studio, Kitchen.
- Living accommodation. Work / studio space (for owner or rent), Short term rental.
- No plumbing permitted or living in it
- Housing, extra bedrooms for main home
- Whatever is allowed on the lot that it is on.
- office, personal services,
- Affordable housing
- Living space, low impact business, such as a private office or studio where there are few to no visitors expected.
- Not Airbnb, only Long term rentals
- They should not be allowed - period.
- Residential
- residential only, including work from home space
- Increasing the density of buildings in our city is not an advantage for anyone. Green space should be our priority.
- Accommodating elder parents
- Home office, recreational space
- rental housing, home office - NOTHING NOISY
- Home office, art or music Studio,
- intergenerational living
- living, long term family visiting (like, out of country family), work from home, studio, student rental accommodation
- housing, work from home/office space, NOT short term rental/airBnB
- Office, hotel / Airbnb suite
- Office space, fitness space, art studio
- Work from home spaces/home for a limited number of residents ie. no more than 4 persons
- art studio, quiet workspace
- Office for working from home.
- Whatever house owners want / need.
- Home office, owner occupancy, rental occupancy, day care
- Residents, work space
- housing, work from home, studio (art, fitness, etc.) space, short term rentals, multipurpose conditioned space
- Housing accommodation
- Any! Work spaces, light employment, fitness, etc.
- All non-commercial activities
- mini homes for extended family members, offices, creative space -- definitely not rental to strangers
- None, they should not be allowed. People can rent their basements.
- home offices, studios (art, yoga)
- Work from home, guest quarters
- Live/Work Spaces
- I thought the idea was to enhance housing available, therefore this question seems irrelevant
- Living, work from home, supplemental income, caregiving for elders, living space for young adults.
- Dwelling and office work.
- Rental, work from home, artist studio
- office
- Home office, storage, workout space
- Studio space for working artist
- Home office
- None
- residential only
- art studio, exercise studio

- Garden Suite should not be allowed.
- Multigenerational, home office, studio/workshop
- workshops (e.g. wood, not commercial / toxic), artist studios, yoga studio, residential, home office, greenhouse, live/work, anything quiet & not-smelly stuff
- Office, Studio, Workshop
- anything that one would do in their home, since the point is to provide housing for more people.
- family members ie elderly parents, older children needing support
- Work from home for occupants of the property only (not rentable), small professional practices operated solely by occupants of the property only (eg Registered Massage Therapy, Legal, personal trainers etc)
- Rental unit, studio, office
- None
- living/work - intergenerational, affordable (supportive housing) and work
- residential and home office.
- Sleeping, eating, bathing,
- Consultant office, personal business (hair/nails/massage), artist, writer ...mostly quiet fields
- Additional guest only accommodation, kids play area , wellness area or home office (non commercial) added space only
- A roof for our adult young children that can no longer afford to purchase a home/condo in the City of Toronto. This would allow them to save for a downpayment while paying min. rent.
- If no infringement on neighbours with privacy, shadows, smells or noise, the suite can be used at the homeowner's discretion.
- Housing for persons with a disability who require care but can live in a semi independent supported environment
- Office or Studio
- home office, studio, downsizing from main house
- Residential, WFH space and Non Residential
- Office space
- Don't think they should be allowed.
- Living accommodations, including kitchen/dining, bathroom(s), bedrooms and living room only.
- Whatever can be done in the main dwelling. Rec room, office, exercise room, etc. I think if you want to rent out your garden suite, you should have to register it with the city. If you just want to use it personally then you should be able to do what you want with it as long as it meets zoning requirements.
- Living, working
- primary use should be housing for family/seniors/low income renters or everyone will be building a 'man cave' on their property
- Residential, work space,
- Rental units or space for family or recreational area for home owner
- To allow a family to rent the space and/or allow other family members to use the space
- family only
- Housing for elderly
- I don't think Garden Suites should be allowed at all
- Like a bunkie at a cottage- one small bedroom for visitors
- Free rental and no capital gains tax upon selling of property. How would you regulate an empty garden suite, or one used by the owner? Or one used as storage? And how do you reassess property tax? Sounds like an impossibility to regulate and enforce.
- no retail living for your own family (parents)(newlyweds + child) (older child) (office space)(studio or personal hobbies)
- living only
- Living only
- None should be permitted
- not sure
- Office, live-work spaces
- Any

- Live. Work. Artist Studio. Light Manufacture.
- residential unit, studio, workshop (with appropriate sound insulation), home office
- you have worded much of this survey so that we are forced to agree to aspects of garden suites - do we have any ability to stop it or is it all decided? This reflects greedy development with no respect for residential rights.
- Self contained suite, Home office, workout space, secondary living space
- Work from home, studio, bunkie for university age child living at home
- Commercial activities
- depends on the neighbourhood and what the residents believe
- Residential only. No commercial or office use (i.e., no use that does not add to residential supply in the City).
- I just don't get it, the City has well-intended zoning regulations and here the City is saying many zoning restrictions don't actually matter. It would be the beginning of developers having justification to ask for even more variances for too many changes to building and zoning regulations, the City is saying here that anything goes, no need for soft landscaping, no need for lot coverage restrictions, cover the whole City in concrete and brick.
- AirBnB, rental, home office
- Living space office space
- Rental accommodation only
- my prior is that fewer strings should be attached since land use requires SIGNIFICANT deregulation however I recognize the concern that garden suites may be used as additional living space for the well-to-do rather than additional housing units for those who need it.
- affordable housing for new comers, seniors who is not suitable for senior homes.
- Rental for income office space helping adult children save money for future home purchase additional living space.
- I can say what uses should not be allowed---namely Airbnb uses or event uses, which are likely to even more disrupt and disturb the backyard situation of proximal neighbours.
- Light commercial usage that prohibit customer physical visits and limit merchandise deliveries.
- Provide only basic living requirements with small space to work from home. Limit number of bedrooms to one, maybe two at most. No basement.
- temporary rentals, business office - anything that is not disruptive to the neighbourhood.
- mixed use
- None. I am completely opposed to these. I am already surrounded by condos, shadowing my yard and looking into my property. The lots are small so increased density would only make the problems worse
- In law and office
- Home occupations/ home business
- Office
- All, this is great idea for affordable housing that is not tiny awful condo with elevator
- Rental or private use only (e.g. personal office, gym, bedroom suite)
- Very interesting question. Definitely think a wide range of uses could be considered (with CofA approval?) I think that owner or tenant of main dwelling must own any business using the ancillary building
- Rental Living Unit, Home Office, Artist Studio, Exercise Space,
- Unsure
- At home work that does not involve clients coming to the property
- None. They are a disaster in Vancouver.
- Residential only
- There should be NO garden suites!!!
- home, office for personal use
- Work from home or small quiet business, residential rental to long term, not Air B&B tenants.
- Flowers and vegetable
- Accommodation only and limited numbers of rooms and bedrooms
- studio
- Living spaces, exercise, work from home

- Should not be allowed
- Home office space, fitness space
- working from home ie small office
- Any personal use (renting, use as studio, family living, running a business) that doesn't increase noise
- Any light use should be allowed, at least housing to promote gentle density and contribute to improving housing affordability
- Live/work, small-scale commercial, daycare, supportive housing (any use that does not require a change to a more environmentally harmful use)
- Living, working, exercise
- rent, workshop, its your proprety do as you see fit
- I think that being able to create a pottery studio or art space (hobby spaces) or woodworking spot should be allowed. However, I am not sure if this falls into other categories of structures people are already allowed to build. Moreover, I think the actual usage of the space may be very hard to control.
- Full additional apartment to be used for the owner or for Rental Income, Office Space, Entertainment area, Home Gym
- Living
- Covid says flexible work-life architecture is wise for future housing. In general, non-intrusive activities of all sorts are good.
- anything legal
- residential
- Long or short term rentals, care giver housing, small business, office
- Only uses that are currently permitted as ancillary uses in Residential Zones.
- Residents
- Residential Living, or use as office space
- Studio/workspace business office residential appropriate small business use (ie. Daycare, Salon, Counselling services, Food Prep kitchen etc)
- Live/work
- all: residential, commercial, short-term rental
- Hopefully affordable rental or extended family living. Not commercial. But could be studio or other office work space.
- working from home, living space for elderly parents or kids going to university or living at home.
- I think that its primary (and maybe sole) use should be as a dwelling — these should be to increase the housing supply, especially in neighbourhoods that are zoned as single-family residential.
- Personal work shop or personal work from home / office space.
- studio, work from home
- Use the approach of live work play from the Garden Suite just like public Laneway housing
- work studio, dry storage, living space
- Additional housing for family members, Granny Suites or office. Not to be used a solution for affordable housing.
- Living only. No loud live music or industrial loud noise.
- Office, Home Gym, Entertainment Space
- Small office and other home based businesses that are already permitted in the primary dwelling and a massage therapist.
- Seniors housing, residential uses, small scale neighbourhood retail on corner lots, e.g. a coffee shop - No parking requirements or loading
- exercise space, granny suites
- Living accommodations work-from-home offices small teaching studios for things like painting, yoga, RMT services, etc.
- Residential only
- studio, home office, work shop, guest suite
- Work from home
- Office suite, artist studio, gallery, community

- None
- Home office or rental unit
- Living, Work From Home, Small Office
- Live / live work
- Office, home office, workshop
- Art studio, in-law suite, home office, nanny suite
- domestic homes
- I don't agree with garden suites
- studios for artists, etc.
- Same as the main houses.
- office or studio
- Office, artist studio, living space, things you would normally do in a house
- Maybe use for your own family.
- Residential space only.
- Any personal use, rental as accommodation - short term or long term, or office. But not running a retail business that could result in unwanted constant customer traffic.
- small work space and small residential space
- Rental, home office, studios (art, yoga, etc)
- family member dwellings, rentals, home office
- Garden Suites should not be allowed.
- Affordable housing. Preferably for family member but of course once built, it is built.
- long term rental unit or family unit
- Rental, home office
- Living? You know, we have a housing crisis.
- work from home office, recreation, light industrial,
- Residential (ownership or rental), or live/work style units but not exclusively non-res (work)
- Noises that create potential noise pollution or other direct impacts to neighbours should be limited or excluded. Need to minimize impacts otherwise NIMBY (or NIMNBY - Not in My Neighbour's Backyard) sentiments will boil over.
- Rental Residential
- residential, working from home, studio space
- It should be mainly focused on resolving current rental crisis, given the changes revolving around Covid 19 this will allow the homeowner to rent and still be able to social distance from the tenants.
- They should be small and not encroach on neighbours. Maybe 2 bedroom suite for older people or single parents
- Housing, office or guest room
- Work, long term rental
- No industrial use, noise and time restrictions
- Uses should reflect those that would normally be permitted in the main home.
- rental accommodation, work and office with limit to occupants, family
- age-in-place, rental, office/studio
- residential, work
- i think the most important thing is that owners are living on the property. i am concerned about the impacts of people buying property and renting it out and simply using Garden Suites to increase rental income. overall, i believe buying property and renting it for profitable income is quite problematic.
- Anything within the law and that does not disturb neighbours. ie Art suites, music studios, wood working etc
- Granny suites, office, s/he shed, yoga/exercise room, doggie and human daycare, recreation room, homeschooling etc...
- Long term rental only ... Not short term rental as this would lead to noise and safety issues with no effective control
- office, spa, gym, art room
- Residential or work from home only

- Offices
- I don't believe garden suites will contribute to Toronto. Huge potential for abuse and problems related to human behavior. Planning issues, misinterpretation and uses of the units will result.
- Home office
- anything you want
- residential & home office / remote working
- Small offices, studios, rental units...
- I really don't favour Garden Suites, but if they are permitted uses should be the same as for the existing home on the lot.
- Residential or private office/studio work space for residents only
- all
- Shouldnt be allowed period. There is so little green space in the city. The pandemic is really showing people how important a yard and a bit of green space is to our humanity.
- Long term rental, intergenerational Suite, home office.
- Accommodation
- office space, arts & crafts, gym, dog grooming, pet hotel (NOT AirBNB!!!)
- Work studios, small business warehousing, professional services service offices with own addresses, indoor swimming pools
- rentals, home office, studio, living space, atelier, home business
- Strongly opposed to Garden Suites altogether
- Not allowed
- Housing for immediate family members to enable families to live close together to care for one another.
- I don't support garden suites due to existing density issues, parking availability, accessibility of waste removal (garbage bins). Our space is overcrowded.
- rental for people who can't afford this city, rental to one's kids who can't afford living here, Granny flat.
- personal only. it allows too much room for disproportionate profits to existing owners rather creating opportunities for new ownership
- Work space. Commercial office for small business.
- Housing, Senior living, multiple generations, office/work space, nanny suite
- home office, art studio, family member only
- Living space only to prevent people from using it as a way to enlarge their house.
- Given the close proximity to other homes and homeowners, the suites should be strictly for residential use. Not commercial, home office etc.
- Housing
- none
- Housing.
- For family members
- small retail
- extension of space available to homeowners (for whatever purpose: art studio yoga studio small efficiency apartment etc.)
- Living, Art Workshop, Creative Space, Home Office, Small business (health) i.e. Counselling, therapy, massage, physiotherapy etc.
- Rental unit
- Accessory use to main house only.
- residential/ home office/workshop
- Not allowed. City lots are small to accommodate garden suites.
- anything allowed by zoning. home office, workshop, storage, whatever. the city should not care.
- Work from home, exercise or art studio
- I am looking for a granny suite where I can live and my kids have the main house so they are close to provide support when the time comes
- in-law suite to allow increased care with family, home office, long term rental housing at low cost i.e. not AirBnB type short term rental
- Art studio, design space, exercise studio,

- Rental for living or office
- Office. Inspected kitchen
- work at home, art studios, greenhouses/food security, start up businesses with no more than 1 other employee
- Green houses
- residential
- residential only. The impact (traffic, deliveries, business related materials, types of vehicles ie trucks) allowing it to become a work area is already seen with COVID restrictions.
- Art studio - I.e. non polluting uses
- Rentals on the open market, occupation by family members esp. the elderly, home offices
- Work from home, studio
- None!
- Online home work, low traffic in person work like therapists/coaches, low noise work so no workshops
- rental, seniors of same family, work from home
- Same as main home.
- residential, work from home, hobbies ie. carpentry, woodworking, art, music
- living accomodations, work from home
- work/business , art /wellness studio
- Living Accomodation, Work from Home, certain Commercial Activities
- Home use, full independent living dwelling this is the only way it should be allowed. Extra office space is not that useful in terms of improving livability.
- Full rental accommodation , work at home space. Not a business use
- Work from home space, studio space.
- living in it or washroom
- All uses allowed in the residential Zone.
- Live, work, recreation/hobby
- live / work units (combining both a residential and work space together - ex. for studio space for different trades and artists)
- Love, work, small business covering broad scope
- offices, studios. Noise levels should not disturb neighbours, and no harsh chemicals.
- I do not support garden Suites!!!
- Artist studios, design studios, community kitchens, meeting spaces, micro-galleries
- Gym, office, studio
- Living, Working
- Community space, learning space for kids in that area if online learning becomes the norm
- Garden suites should not be allowed. Your prejudice is revealed in the wording of this question. You are attempting to manipulate the results of this survey.
- Residential, studio space (art)
- Residential office some types of commercial,
- Independent living space for property owner or tenant
- Residential. Mainly to help downsize aging owners.
- Do not support having Garden Suites, therefore no uses.
- Residential
- Live / work like artisans, small businesses with limited staff, workshops that don't make smell/excess noise, normal rental suite
- Work/live
- only accomodations
- work from home and grandparents use
- home business/office, co-working space, rental housing,
- Accommodation - to fill the need for affordable housing
- Residential
- None. Garden suites should not exist.
- Studio space (artists and designers), residential living quarters
- Single family living, small office space

- home business day care
- any use that does not cause a noise or odour issue for neighbours
- Personal home office
- I am strongly opposed to garden suites for any use
- Fitness Studio, Art Studio, etc., work from home offices
- None
- Home office, studio, workshop, anything - anything that is not going to cause air or water pollution.
- Not in favour in my neighbourhood
- Seniors residence, work from home, rent out garden suite or live in your garden suite and rent out your home
- All types, rental suite, garage, pool house, additional square footage for main residence, etc.
- Living, renting it out, having family stay there
- living only
- Garden suites should be considered as an extension of the existing main home - so that it could be used in any way a main home could be used: secondary suite, office, guest room, rec room, gym, etc
- Home office, studio-like space for yoga, training, paramedical pros (physiotherapy, etc), as long as the activity is minimally disruptive (low noise levels, no nighttime businesses).
- none
- Homeowners discretion as long as it is environmentally friendly
- Typically a tiny house depending on the space availability. With retirees downsizing and wanting to lead a simpler life this would be an ideal solution for independence and their own space to live. This would also provide an opportunity for their adult children with families to occupy the bigger/main house on the property. An ideal solution to live in their own space and maintain their own lifestyle.
- living, working, hobbying - basically anything short of industrial
- Dwelling (including home office) and parking
- Living space, bedrooms, working space, rentals
- NO AIRBNB! Should be only allowed for rental to arms-length party for affordable rate
- anything so that they are not being kept vacant.
- Non-industrial uses (e.g. home studios, offices, etc.)
- Work from home, part of the existing residence, not a new additional residence.
- Extra living space for extended families and retirees
- work from home, small business
- Small business that doesn't attract significant foot traffic. I.e. professional services
- Any and all uses, other than manufacturing
- Home office, short term rentals
- Living/ working
- I strongly disagree any type of Garden Suites.
- Sauna, gym, workshop, office...
- Home office, gym, in law living space, art studio, kids play room, work shop, hobby room,
- Residential
- Residential
- Home office or studio
- Anything but industrial
- living
- Residential, working from home, housing for family members, rental
- residential and work from home
- No garden suites
- Rental, extended family accommodations, airbnb, workspace/office/studio/
- unsure
- Any short of heavy industrial and pot shops
- A place to live, nothing else. Why does this survey assume those filling it out want a garden suite. This seems like a biased survey.

- seniors, families, anybody
- Tenant or personal use of main house resident
- office/studio, small day care, low noise impact repair shop, such as bikes, upholstery fabricators, anything that is not polluting, noisy, or requires too much traffic, small neighbourhood club house, pottery, furniture craft studio, dog day care,
- home office, residence
- Rental properties, family suites, work from home office (but not commercial rental)
- Housing and office
- They should be dwellings.
- Any use! Flexibility is key. Example: intergenerational housing could be used as additional office space at another time
- Office space play area entertainment space gym art studio library etc
- None
- Short and long term Rental accommodation, home office, home studio
- housing
- home office
- Living spaces, home office space.
- home office
- anything but commercial use [noise , pollution etc...]
- any/every legal use.
- Personal office space, hobbies such as fitness, woodworking etc. Personal use only
- small business
- work from home space(s), rooftop balconies...
- Solely residential.
- home office, additional recreation space, kids play, etc.
- office /work space
- Senior living options & additional affordable rental properties in Toronto
- Rental properties, inter-generational living. Garden suites should be build to code to allow people to live there to create more rental housing
- residences and work-from-home spaces.
- The opportunity is to develop more affordable housing stock... so I say no to ancillary applications for the site homeowner.
- Any uses deemed necessary or desired by the owner of the land, within reason.
- Residential, office work, small carpentry shops or similar not for business with improved soundproof insulating and ventilation filters.
- Rental office space should be allowed.
- Residential rental only - no short term rentals to allow affordable housing for Torontonians
- Living space, small business/ studio, fitness space, indoor greenhouse
- They should primarily be for residential use but if the data supports it, perhaps they could be used for other purposes.
- long and short term rentals, small business, artisan shops
- Home occupations
- Garden suites should not be permitted in dense, downtown neighbourhoods.
- Offices, intergenerational living, rental income
- Residential only
- Home office, small business, exercise studio, art studio
- Work from home offices. No retail or manufacturing uses.
- no restrictions
- Rental and/or recreational space for home owner
- Work Space, Office, Rental, Family, Inlaw, Senior, Student
- Garden Suites should be for living and not short-term AirBnB rentals
- Should not allow garden suites at all. This is a disaster idea to ruin our city.
- Home office
- Work and Living
- For rental space for home offices

- Year around rentals,
- Sleeping, eating, cooking, working, showering, laundry
- All uses should be allowed. If the city has desired use (e.g. housing) those should be positively incentivized rather than specific uses being precluded
- Residential only
- Day care, workout space, office space, tiny homes
- Home office
- Home fitness space, art studio space, kids playground
- Living and work
- Small business, artist studio
- Office/art studio/ gym...
- A Garden Suite should have the flexibility to be either a living, live work space, or dedicated workspace. The most important aspect is that it should provide flexibility to expand the availability of housing in dense downtown corridors that are not highrise developments that disturb Neighborhoods
- None. I don't agree with Garden Suites AT ALL
- Living
- Home office, workshop, studio apartment, psychotherapy, accounting or legal practice.
- Studio for artists
- Residential apartment, additional home office space
- I don't know that we should have them
- Rental, offices, use by owner
- Units for rent, home offices, inter generational housing
- Work place, artist studio, child's indoor play space
- Office
- only for storing garden tools. No living space.
- Ridiculous suggestion considering most current infrastructures do not accommodate the current neighbourhood structured, traffic exits in case of emergency.
- Places of business also. Such as entrepreneurs who want a live/work space and will also be employing people to work there. Do it. Great idea.
- None
- Nil
- These types of suites are incompatible with the small lots so many homes are built on.
- anything as long as the usage doesn't contravene pollution (noise/smells), or other by-law regulations applicable in residential zones
- None
- Office work, carpentry workshop - but only for the residents of the main building
- leisure, office work in harmony with residential area -
- Living quarters. Work-from-home ok, but if it becomes a rental property for business, there will be increased parking issues
- Rental living space, Work From Home, artist/craftsman workspace/studio
- Live/Work
- Office
- If allowed, these units should be only for the purpose intended, creation of affordable suites. I think this policy will be exploited. I think it will result in homeowners charging market rents. I don't believe creating a profit center for development-inclined homeowners, builders and speculators will lead to increased affordable housing stock since there doesn't appear to be a mechanism for controlling the amount of rent charged and greed will be at play. I think this policy will effectively destroy the character of established neighbourhoods while failing to achieve the affordable component sought in this equation. Apparently the Official Plan is supposed to afford some protection to stable, so-called 'character' neighbourhoods. Will these neighbourhoods have any rights left at the end of this process. Once it's gone, we can never get it back. There doesn't seem to be attention being paid to preservation of distinct neighbourhoods and the rights of existing property owners to keep what they have. It would appear that this policy may also threaten the protection of designated heritage properties.

- anything that doesn't create excess noise or excess traffic impact.
- Housing, office space
- dwelling unit, home office, artist studio
- residential, home office by owner
- I think Garden Suites are a bad idea period. They junk up the neighbourhood and turn it into a warren of houses and people.
- Both residential and commercial uses
- Work from home
- same family dwellings *only*
- Offices
- Home office, retail spaces for home-based business/artisans/artist/etc
- quiet ,respectful healthy ,options
- None. The official plan and zoning bylaws were purposeful to protect single family homes, rear lot consistency, % of green space for drainage. These homes will only increase issues with neighbours, with noise, privacy, overlook, shadow of structures, absorbing rain water and subsequent drainage, removal of mature trees that breathe oxygen into the environment. Putting stress on the sewer system, and on the police and 311 when neighbour disputes become problematic. This should not be a contemplation on any lot under 100 feet in width
- permanent housing
- Not sure about what the range of types are current
- None, they are the worst thing possible. I live next to one and it is an eyesore and generates lots of noise from prior airbnb customers
- I'm very open. Even retail and even light industrial - providing it does not disturb neighbours. A mixture of uses can be healthy.
- Any that support small business, including low level production/crafts/creation uses any that fit an office type use small scale food production and distribution etc.
- None
- Living space
- Only residential
- None
- None
- live-work, home office, light retail (limited)
- Residential, Home Office, Small commercial like a cafe, small restaurant, Small workshops - with noise requirements.
- Greenhouse
- Not commercial
- Office, living, anything that is not noisy, actually
- Work space
- anything that is not going to disrupt neighbours
- Only living - no business
- Living/dwelling.
- None. They should not be built
- I am not in favor of Garden Suites. Why not raising the neighborhood height and density limit to allow low rises developments for those who are looking for more units in their house? We can introduce proper entrance to each house and keep proper common green space for all users. Also, these apartments units, like 10 units max in each building, be owned by different owners and be managed by them directly.
- Studios for artists, or offices for NPOs
- Housing , rental or for family members in need. Home office, storage,
- should not be allowed
- Workspace
- None.
- none
- Residential. In home office. Thought to accommodating families.
- Should not be allowed

- living, studio
- live/work, small business commercial use
- Multigenerational, in-law, or rental
- Office space
- Granny suite only, no rentals , are b&b
- res / commercial
- None...no garden suites
- None
- art gallery
- Only living accommodations
- Legally permitting certain services based business to operate in garden suites like consulting, tutoring, planning, photographing, IT/web/graphic design agency etc? It would be a game changer for some self-employed for sure.
- Rent out, family members living close by, home office, etc
- daycare , neighbourhood meetings
- Consider affordable housing only. I've thought about a lane way house project whereby I'd rent it to an affordable housing society to rent out.
- Home office, studio
- As wide as possible.
- Residential
- Home office, gym, workshop, entertainment room
- Residential, live/work
- office, studio, residential
- I'm open to whatever helps improve this city's quality of living.
- work, studio, seasonal living
- Small commercial uses for DIY Etsy type businesses
- Home office/studio
- residential only
- Pretty well anything that is currently permitted in the Main Dwelling
- Similar to any uses found in an apartment.
- There should never be Garden Suite.
- Only for children to play
- None, I don't agree with building any garden suites at all.
- residential
- Use as a Cabana for the swimming pool.
- additional living space only
- Not sure
- Do not allow Garden suites
- None
- none
- All types
- NO Garden Suites, they should be illegal
- primarily residential
- work from home/ studio/ workshop/ home schooling
- no uses, Garden Suites should not be permitted, for all the reasons stated in this survey
- parking, store, plant
- these should not be allowed to be airbnb - they should be for long term rentals (minimum 6 months)
- Not AirB&B or any short term rental
- Living accommodations only.
- home office, artist or cooking studio
- any type of use
- I'm opposed, so the answer is 'none'
- Residential of course, and then also as extra living or work from home space. I mostly think it's up to the property owner.

- home office
- Residential, commercial (office primarily) only if it's not overly disruptive in terms of creating a lot of new traffic in an area. It could make for a great work-from-home space.
- None, they are not wanted
- All uses that would not disturb neighbours
- residential, office,
- Work from home, relative or any guest accommodation and to provide rental accommodation to expand Toronto housing
- Live/work, light industrial, studios, office, residential etc.
- studio, workspace
- office
- Residential
- permanent / long-term housing only
- Living quarters, office location
- residence for people other than those who live in main house, i.e. not some extra rooms for main house
- living, one person office, one person studio
- Work space, studio space, community space
- Housing artist studios office space
- Work from home, yoga studio
- Personal work space, rental space, family living space
- It depends on the size of the lot. And the type of use. Someone running a business from suite that creates noise would be a problem for neighbours.
- Living, renting, short term renting (AirBnB), work from home, small business operations
- Do not allow garden suites at all. Who came up with this insane idea? Will become our main issue comes next municipal elections
- Living and working
- Small businesses, art studios, community kitchens, business incubator for poor folks
- Landscaping
- Office space. studio space. Doctors office health clinic
- Uses that don't involve noise, traffic issues
- None
- rental only. as many people should work from home as possible. however the need for affordable housing trumps any one person from having a 'bonus' area. it is absolutely crucial to have ECO sustainable housing for low income families
- Residential. Work space.
- Not allowed
- residential
- Some bikes
- Artist studios and workshops, work from home/small scale offices, other recreation space like a child's playroom or other hobby space for the family, in-law suites, indoor garden/greenhouse/water garden, exercise space
- None
- Storage
- Gym
- In addition with rental, anything living, work, gym, home school, any uses the current house has should be all considered.
- Live, work, recreation
- I am not a fan of garden suites in Toronto. I think you need to have a fairly large lot 200ft (long) to make it nice for everyone.
- Residential, short-term rentals, long-term rentals
- Residential
- Work, studio, daycare, workshop, whatever someone feels like using it for provided it's safe.
- Workshop, office space, residential
- Rental accommodation only

- live/work space great for artists, musicians, and those who work-from-home
- Residential
- Work - but not with high traffic business- no shops/ no restaurants/no car repair/ no high noise such as carpentry. Maybe no work use as this seems like a long list of potential problems and hard to police.
- Garage below living above
- Residential live/work. Your By-Law officers are not presently enforcing blatant non-conforming uses so a complete waste of time to think you can control. Restrict the permitted uses whatever you think is the solution of the day and residents will do whatever they want as at present. If there are complaints, than you act.
- Anything. Why place restrictions at all? Let homeowners do what they want with it. The whole permit process is so difficult.
- Residential or commercial - people can use this space as a home or maybe as an storefront or office.
- Bad idea
- Rental, granny suite, workspace
- Work from home, art/craft/trade studios
- None. I disagree with the concept.
- Office, rental residential property
- Multigenerational living, work from home, rental units
- Don't build garden suites. A bad idea and creating more problems than solutions.
- Extended family primarily and rental where suitable.
- Residential, home office only. Not commercial
- Only living
- Aging-in-place, working, artist studio, storage, rental
- non-rent, family member usage
- Residential use only
- residential
- To accommodate a living space
- Anything that doesn't disrupt the neighbours. Live and let live.
- Quiet uses
- extended family residence, home office, guest house
- should have the independence in planting trees of their willin variety
- Workshops, Offices, Studios, Therapy centres, Garden Daycares
- Long-term rentals
- office, living, work/art studio
- Work from home
- residential -- not sure about anything else
- Studio and Workshop space, home-office use, Granny flat usage, Caregiver/live-in accommodation
- A place to store bikes, garden tools etc.
- only owner occupy for heavy loading family member only.
- NOt a good idea for Garden suites - the land can only sustain so much - living - parking - green space /tree are already significantly decrease - detrimental impact. Families can live together within the existing home.
- Nothing commercial. Nothing illegal.
- residential rental unit, a work from 'home' space (including workshop, storage and bathrooms, etc.), in-law space, guest house, despite not being attached it should still be able to be used as an 'addition' like a rec room, man cave, kids playroom, hobby room...whatever.
- I oppose to the idea of garden suites
- Living work from home hobby space
- res, work , and live in worker helper,
- work from home
- None I do not want any garden suites to be permitted these will result in shanty towns in our nice community

- Work from home spaces, Artist studios, Small business- showroom/retail shops, Anything that is not loud, dirty or disruptive to neighbours
- zero. i disagree completely.
- Home offices, small commercial businesses (i.e. local boutique), artist studios
- I am strongly OPPOSED and will move out of TORONTO if this is approved
- Opposed 100% against garden suites
- Living, office or artist work, exercise
- Leisure
- I don't think they should be allowed at all. I oppose them entirely regardless of their use.
- Rental, living, home office...home gym? This allows supply to increase in Toronto.. eventually lowering rental rates.
- Art studio, music, recording studio, guest suite
- I don't think there should be garden suites!
- nanny/inlaw/grown child suites, coach houses, work from home office
- One person dwelling for extended family only
- Immediate family members only. No rentals outside immediate family.
- Primarily a living space
- Rental
- Residential is a priority I wouldn't want to see people building extensively to increase their own living space.
- grandparents living, graduates of the family who can't afford to rent/buy elsewhere yet
- Work from home Home daycare.
- Extended family only. No rentals.
- Not for business using
- None... they should not be allowed period. It's a terrible idea of people can't afford to live here in Toronto they must move away
- business
- All
- Home work space and rental space only
- Residential only
- Living accommodations, work from home, exercise or art studios
- Home office, Art Studios, Workshops, Exercise Rooms etc.
- Office, studio, rental
- Everything but short term rental.
- rental, office
- Self contained living as well as office space.
- -limitations on use related to 3rd party use for storage or work other than knowledge workers, handy-work workshops, noise concerns related to hobbies, building, music, parties/group size, minimum age supervisions for overnight sleeping, minimum security standards (bars/ locks/ alarms) for inhabitants safety, street awareness of suite with address sign, to alert neighbours to monitor normal comings and goings (if deemed more safe) , + use includes, nanny suite, in-law/granny, home office, expanded family room, young couples/singles saving for adult life, NOT drifters or S/T rentals (AirBnB etc)
- Living, work spaces for the residents only. Not short term rentals.
- Office, gym, recreational, residential
- I understand that the sole purpose of these suites is to provide affordable rental housing.
- What was originally planned.
- none as I don't wish to see them
- Everything
- Rental, Grand parents, Adult Child, home-office space.
- None
- Live and work
- Home, workspace, studio, counselling/physio - dependant on privacy and not impacting neighbours. NO NOISY uses, nothing that produces smells like a commercial kitchen or raising animals. Needs to not impact the neighbours in a negative way

- residential, home-based occupations
- Living or working
- living space, work space
- Residential and low neighborhood impact commercial
- Gyms, work from home, other recreational use
- Rental, in-law suite,
- anything quiet, not combustible-say an office, art studio as opposed to a welding studio
- accomodation, work from home
- residential, office space, studio
- Home office, guest of homeowner temporarily accommodation, accommodation for family members of home owner
- residential uses
- Work live space. Studio space. Rental apartment. Family guest suite
- non business
- Housing, work, workshop(owners already do it)
- regulate the number of occupants per square footage .
- Anything the home owner wishes, within city bylaws.
- Retreat, Office, Nook
- Living place. Office type of work is fine, but not a workshop or similar using equipment and/or noisy tools that could bother people around.
- Offices, guest suite, kids play area,
- Only residential use
- Own personal use (i.e. not rented out)
- I do not believe in Garden suites. No GS! I lived in one in Germany as a student and it was disgusting and I was ripped off!
- Rental, nanny suite, granny suite, in law suite, work from home.
- Living, working from home, storage, and recreation.
- Artist or crafter accountant author online commuter -- e.g., software, etc.
- None
- Living space
- Personal but not for income supplement (i.e., an illegal basement apartment rental)
- Home office, home gym, art studio, living accommodations for family members
- storage shed, cabana
- I disagree with the idea entirely.
- Whatever the property owner wishes.
- No garden suits at all please focus on building subways and more roads. People are running away from this conjured Toronto. Why do you want to make it worse?
- everything
- Work from home, workshop space, play room
- Home office.
- Gym, rec, work
- home office, art studio, play room
- residential work from home (office space or artist space, but not manufacturing or retail). Not keen on a garden suite being rented out for commercial activity that would attract customers coming to the property (i.e. high traffic, lack of privacy). Fine with the homeowner using it for their own office space.
- Living space, office space, quiet activities
- Rental income or work from home/office
- Living space, PRIVATE work space (office, art studio, etc. that doesn't allow access to the public). NO music studio unless 100% soundproof.
- Work from home or small office area. Small businesses that have minimal environmenral impact. An example would be a professional kitchen that can be rented out to other small businesses. A business that would have toxic waste or cannot be contained within the suite should not be permitted.
- Home office, daycare

- office, art studio
- Gym, storage, workshop, office
- Long term rental, family use, downsizing
- Residential, non-toxic, quiet business uses
- In-law suites
- Residence for extended family members. Work from home space.
- I need to be able to work from home. I can see some artists or writers wanting to be able to work from their suite. I do think it shouldn't be heavily trafficked work though, like clients coming by regularly, etc for yoga classes, doctors, etc. As this is a residential area.
- working from home , guest space
- Residential only
- Not for it
- Work from home space, office space, workshop
- Home, office, guest house, entertainment area
- residential living only!
- office space for owners of the main building, multiple generation family living
- secondary residence (tenanted) guest space/work space, definitely NOT Air BnB
- work, exercise, storage. needs change with other changes in life/society. My dining room is my office during the pandemic, if there was somewhere else to work, like a garden suite, if there is no tenant or family member living in the space why not.
- intergenerational living only
- Do not allow garden suites to be built in Toronto.
- residential, small office
- retail, restaurant, office, housing, daycare, dog grooming, hair salon and more
- Strictly residential
- Senior living accommodation only.
- General living and work from home
- Residential only
- work from home, inter generation
- Storage only
- work from home
- Limited number of people allowed to live in an additional garden suite. Worried about slumlords filling up space.
- None. Will increase density in already dense residential neighbourhoods.
- None! Should not be allowed.
- work from home business
- Home office
- extended family use
- Not shortterm rentals
- Living
- Home office, exercise space
- For homeowners, home office and entertaining.
- They need to go to the committee of adjustments like a garage
- Work space Studio Housing
- Residential only
- Residential renting & or work from home by property owner.
- Rental, work from home, spaces for grown children or elderly parents, extra living space for visitors
- Children's play room , office, rental, inter generational home
- None, opposed to them.
- work from home or rental, either one would do.
- all uses
- Garden suites should not allowed until there is sufficient transit and infrastructure to accommodate the excessive density we have and will have.
- long-term rental or intergenerational housing

- residential, uses permitted under current by laws
- Main residence (with original house used for rental etc) rental with specified flexibility accomodation for family members (parents, children etc) accomodation for care-giver(s) guest accomodation studio space.
- Office, additional space
- living. micro businesses?
- Living, working from home area
- park cars
- work/study space
- Indifferent. Could be residential, WFH, workshop, maker space, etc.
- extra space for family visitors , children work space art space etc if we pay for should use it fir what we want
- Studio, office, quiet work space
- living
- Any, except some that can disturb due to visual, smell, noise, etc.
- residential only or hobby workshops providing there is no excessive noise that would disturb the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties
- Recreation space, workshops wtc
- family, seniors
- Priority is single person affordable rental, then work from home space.
- None. What happened to the City's commitment to green space?
- Residential. Workspaces that do not interfere with the neighbours reasonable use and enjoyment of the property. Businesses which do not attract high volumes of people or create noise and noxious fumes. i.e. no dentists, palm readers, nail salons, drum studios, etc. etc. Nothing which creates additional parking load for the surrounding area.
- Office, studio, tutoring, music lessons, therapy
- Housing, workspace, additional space for family expansion (ie: playroom)
- Small businesses and services (eg. woodworking, mechanical, small batch production)
- residential, office, workshop if not involving noisy machinery
- to grow veggies
- provision of extra affordable housing
- #1 Priority at the moment should be housing affordability and availability. Space to work from home etc can happen once we are out of this historic housing crisis.
- Strictly as longer term rentals - No airbnb's or any short term renting
- As a living and sleeping space as a home office or as a small studio (e.g., art). Not for any business or machinery purposes (e.g., autoshop))
- Office, art studio
- office, living quarters.
- Housing, home office, gym, childcare, assisted living for seniors
- Residential
- none
- office, studio
- The uses should only be residential in nature, not work spaces or recreational spaces.
- Garden suites should not be permitted.
- Artist studios. Residential. Office space makes some sense too.
- Work from home, art studio, no commercial purposes, workout gym or games room.
- Residential
- Residential only
- Residential living
- Residential, home office, storage
- Multigenerational living
- rental, working (with limitations), family, short term rental
- uses that do not generate clients at the site, the need for advertising or that generate noise, pollution or odours
- Work from home

- Not in favour of garden suites
- Work from home space, rental space, extension of house space for older children
- Housing, studio, office, maybe small business
- Not sure
- Opposed
- Home owner office. Not commercial
- Rental accommodation or intergenerational accommodation
- It should only be for housing. if homeowners want to use the space for a work shed or whatever, they can fit within the non-permitted space (10 m²)
- Home office, single person dwelling only, artist studio, non-mechanical work place
- Office space, home rental
- Living space, office, workout space,
- Home office, studio, family suite, other small business activities that don't have negative impacts on neighbours (e.g., noise, emissions, large equipment)
- I do not want to see Garden Suites being allowed anywhere. Seems to me this survey is being carried out AFTER you have already made up your mind to create them. Since that is the case, it is bad enough to have multiple households living on one property. That is the only purpose it should be allowed for.
- residential (say for elderly parents), rental (but not airbnb), home office (solo/remote work only), studio, workshop
- Office/Gym
- Work from home space
- Allowing kitchen & bathroom to be built in garden suites
- Living and working from home
- None. This is a terrible idea.
- Office, extra space, guest suite
- Rental suite and work from home space
- No garden suites
- I would love for it to be a granny flat , I don't want my mom living in a retirement home (especially now)
- Living, working spaces.
- What ever the home owner wants
- Work, recreation, living
- All
- Residential, granny suite, short term rental, student rental
- residential, home office (not for rent office space)
- Dwelling space/residential only.
- Housing, in-law suite, work from home space, studio space
- Rental, family live in, work from home. No commercial activity.
- Gym office
- living, single-owner business, small daycare
- Home office, affordable rental unit
- Work shop / office / gym / daycare
- Work, rental residential.
- Living space (long-term and short-term rental), work space, and/or recreational space.
- Little store, storage units, rental units.
- Not sure
- none
- Senior living (aging-in-place) virtual work from home craft/hobby/play indoor space
- My interest is in allowing older members of the family to have privacy and their own space while staying close to their family for assistance
- Offiice
- Art Studio Nanny Suite Home Office rental to no more than TWO renters.
- Separate work from home studio or perhaps a Granny Flat

- Primarily living for people of a different household than the land it sits on, not just another loophole for people to expand their existing living space
- work from home
- any type of uses as long as it's not heavy machinery or farming inside city limits or a business where noise would be an issue to surrounding residents.
- living only
- living/working
- Residential work from home childcare provision (eg home daycare)
- Office, studio, residence
- quiet uses that do not impact other neighbours
- Artist, writer, clerical office.
- Small shop, in-law apartment, temporary rental
- Residential or studio for art, photography etc
- Home office or storage space for small businesses
- MicroHome, Offices, kids hangout, entertainment, storage
- Art space, yoga exercise space, music rehearsal space
- grandparent accommodation
- For Living purposes only
- Rent, work, family etc
- Work from home office / hobby space
- housing and none industrial work space
- None.
- residential living that would allow more Torontonians to experience on the ground living.
- residential only limited number of inhabitants
- work and/or living
- I don't like them. So I think it's a bad idea
- Same as the main residence
- Well, if the idea is to increase affordable living spaces, then a garden suite should be used for living accommodation.
- home office, art studio, work out gym, tiki bar, recreational room
- All uses allowed everywhere. Abolish zoning.
- Home office, exercise space
- examples: Art Studio, WFH office, Gym, etc, and any non-commercial use desired by the homeowner,
- Whatever the homeowner desires. I think duplexes should be allowed too. T.O needs increased housing supply.
- Any residential, commercial or light industrial usage that has minimal health impacts.
- Studios (artists, musicians, etc)
- absolutely do not agree with garden suites
- any residential and work from home but no commercial activity
- Living spaces, office spaces - no industrial uses
- Not sure
- Residential only and not for the homeowners to have a bigger living space. E.g. office
- Office, guest room, parent's rooms when they do visit/if affordability is an issue for the older generation, play room for kids
- None
- Garden suites should NOT be allowed !!
- Rental, workshop but no retail or service bus
- Work from home
- full time rental space, short term rental, office space for small business owner.
- Work
- Additional space for homeowner
- Flexible spaces - for a work studio, guest quarters for family or visitors, elderly parents, or possibly rent out. It should allow for greater utilization of property
- Home office spaces

- affordable housing, home offices, retreat space
- Seniors down sizing, aging parents, college, university students, single mothers
- similar to house use.
- living
- Residential and Office.
- Living
- None - don't want them
- Accommodation, small business, art studio
- studios
- ones that don't increase traffic in the area. Home or home office is good. Customers visiting is not.
- Only living or living/work
- Artist / rehearsal / presentation studio
- Living, rental, multi-use
- Personal work space/office, studio
- None
- rental and to accommodate extended family (limited number, not multiple people living in a small space
- Single family dwelling
- single family residential, work from home (office type work) business space (design studio, architect drawing office etc....no manufacturing, outdoor storage, heavy industry uses)
- Working from home is becoming a norm for many professions/trades/service (proof of this is how the COVID19 pandeming is forcing us to do so) therefore, work from home space should be an option.
- residential
- Light manufacturing, cafe, daycare, pickup drop off for goods, small office, restaurant, residential
- All uses depending on families needs.
- Places for home owners to use offices, studios man cave etc
- work at home, family members
- Work from home for office work and artists, provided that the artist isn't using materials and processes that could be considered industrial (light or otherwise).
- If they are being proposed due to lack of accommodations then leave it at that. It might become small businesses over time which I don't support.
- housing, home office, exercise space but no air BnB (short term rental)
- Residence only
- Living rental, work from home for occupant of main house
- Supported independent living, aging in place, adult children, social need, etc. versus pure profit for the land owner
- I am opposed to garden suites. The surveys latter questions are assuming one wants garden suites which we don't
- Rec room, home office, entire dwelling unit (dining, sleeping, bathroom)
- Office or workshops
- Work studio or living rental property
- Potentially for work from home.
- Residential (rental/guest/owner/age in place), home office, home studio (music/art/fitness)
- housing.
- Residential and office space
- aside from dwelling units: work from home, live/work, small studio/showroom for small entrepreneurs
- I think the focus on residential would be extremely helpful, due to the lack of affordable, comfortable housing (esp single dwelling units) in the city
- Work from home offices or child care for local tenants
- Design studios, yoga studio, commercial kitchen.
- work from home , business

- rental housing, home office, intergenerational living, short term rental, small home business - let the market decide what it will support!
- office, fitness, bedroom, food prep
- anything that is not criminal
- Rental unit only.
- housing, home office
- Work from home, residential space
- NONE - NO GARDEN SUITES SHOULD BE ALLOWED!!!!
- None
- Home office or business use by on site residents: RMT, tutoring etc. NO SHORT TERM RENTALS OR AIRBNB!!!!
- The more flexibility the better.
- Art making, consulting, design, research, accommodation, digital communication, minor creative tasks
- None
- residential, office, retail, food services.
- living
- None. I am strongly opposed to Garden Suites. We already have enough issues with shoddy workmanship and illegal basement apartments and rooming houses
- Living by people who need affordable housing
- home office
- Bedroom, washroom and kitchen.
- Potential small work spaces, studios, small business. But most importantly to allow for the older generations to live comfortably yet independent.
- only rental
- studios, home office, home gym, daycare space for home daycare, creative space, yoga spot, extra activity space
- In law suites nanny or caregiving
- Home office, psychology etc, artists studios, 1 client at a time type of business.
- I really don't support them
- Hardship, taking care on family member
- small manufacturing household item area.....
- Living, office
- No garden spaces
- None
- Work from home. Two bedroom for a single person
- office, studio, etc
- Place to live, work or rent out.
- housing, but only with green roofs
- sleeping accommodation or garden shed
- residential only
- work from home artist studio
- Rental suites
- Only as a place of residence.
- Residential
- Do not allow Garden Suites
- I would prefer they are used for granny suites, or home offices. The rental issue causes concern for extra vehicles requiring parking
- work from home
- Live/work, rental, ownership, small-scale agriculture
- Housing and home offices
- No Garden Suites should be allowed to be built
- Office, gym
- Work spaces, hobby areas, local business location, rental unit daily
- Living space. Work from home which does not require client traffic.

- They should NOT be allowed
- Living accommodation for relatives. The number of occupants should be restricted.
- None
- living
- Various types of Work, parent/adult child accommodation
- residential, office, small business, recreational
- home office, spare bedroom, entertainment space. Anything that doesn't disturb the neighbours.
- Should not be allowed
- Housing
- work/living spaces
- None as I am opposed to Garden Suites in our neighbourhood
- sleeping space, recreational/entertainment space, home office space, crafts workshop
- I do not support garden suites.
- These need to be clearly determined. And clearly articulated as to need, uses
- Residential long term rentals only and a more expensive alternative to apartment rental
- Home Office, Long-term rentals, intergenerational living
- Only housing. Limits on size and number of occupants.
- Light office, fitness
- studio, office, home
- work space,
- Living, work from home.
- office
- Uses that would be compatible with residential noise, traffic, air emissions - e.g. office, artist workshop would likely be ok
- it is either residential or a workspace part of the primary residence
- Home office, guest room
- A Garden Suite should be very specific. There are better ways to provide rental accommodation. There are ways for seniors to live in place already available. Stop speculation through very high taxes on vacant properties. Develop better city planning .properite
- Living only
- Additional space for the existing property townner or separate housing
- Garden Suites are not a good idea
- work office very important right now.
- Residential or for work purposes by owner of main unit on property
- living, studio for self-employed
- Personal-use Fitness studio, work from home office, non-commercial art studio, small apartment
- Personal office
- Rental accommodations and/or use by extended family.
- Home owners can run their own food restaurants in garden suites.
- Long-term tenancies only.
- Single Occupant dwellings, Encourage solar panel usage, seperate hydro pannel from main home. Convert existing detached Garage to Nanny suite.
- Uses that do not impact neighbours (ie massage parlours, iron mongers, etc)
- This is just a small rooming house. I oppose
- Home gyms, home business
- Home office, grandparents, grown children, other extended family, care giver for family member, home daycare, rooming house, student exchange, care giver fo
- Air BnB
- Home office, workshop, studio
- Living. Professional office space.
- No commercial
- Housing
- Residential or work from home only.
- work/live

- Residential, office, studio
- None
- office or hobbies
- office
- None They should not be allowed
- None. Strongly opposed out of concern of overcrowding and urban density.
- Should be living quarters and / or office space, not a shed or workshop
- Home office, Rentals, Temporary Rentals (Air BNB)
- Gym, home office, guest house, mini kitchen with living and sleeping area with a washroom
- Home office
- residential only
- rental living, work from home, art studio, community greenhouse
- Living and office but NO party room or entertainment activities.
- work from home, short and long term rental
- Work from home space, supporting aging-in place for senior family members, providing affordable housing options
- Anything short of commercial uses.
- homes
- Residential uses only for either renters or owners of the property
- Living, renting, working
- Work from home, home studio
- Nothing but subsidized housing.
- everything that a home is also allowed to be. this would encourage an occupant to try such a space and will most likely to stay in the living space, as it would have the same rules as that of a regular house.
- Residential Dwelling, Office, Living Space
- Home day care
- Artist Studio or Work from home space
- Frankly, I think you should be able to do anything with a garden suite, including light retail.
- Work from home, artist studio, guest house
- strongly opposed to garden suites
- Home office/gym/guest suite/
- Anything that won't impact Neighbour's
- All types
- Anything but a slaughterhouse
- Office
- Office, extra room, extra living space
- Living / Home Office / Gym / Additional Living Space / Separate Confined Unit Is most crucial
- Office
- Residential
- Long term care
- Residential
- Work, intergenerational living
- Flexible and adaptable uses
- The last question was irrelevant. How and why would you prenent it. What's the garm done?
Permit all uses currently permitted in areas under consideration
- Residential, office
- None. Don't allow them
- Living. Home office
- Living accommodations
- AirBNB, it's great for tourism and it is an innovation that is inevitable
- ANY!!!!!!!!!!!! LET PEOPLE BUILD
- multi-generational living, seniors should take priority
- artist studio, at home classroom, office, gym

- office, studio, shop, small commercial uses
- Studio, Workspace, Rental, secondary bedrooms for guests, rooftop patio
- live, work, study, park, anything
- Residential, consulting,
- Principal residential only, no short-term rentals such as Airbnb.
- rental unit, home office, workshop
- Living, work
- Artists studios, small business offices (work from home), housing for students
- Child care space for at-home daycares. (I don't need that anymore, but people do!)
- residential, live-work, workshops, etc., anything to add life to Toronto's boring, lifeless 'neighbourhoods'.
- anything, let people do what they want. Maybe they will live in it for a few years, then maybe they will make it a workshop, who cares
- Gym and office
- Living space, office/workshop, den, toy rooms for kids, teenage getaway,
- Additional living space for the homeowner, e.g. art studio, work-from-home office, guest suites, or separate quarters for family members (NOT short-term rental income)
- Residential, work from home
- home office
- Office, residential, recreational, gym, short-term rental, purpose built rental
- Work Studio, Storage, Independent living
- Residential and Office
- An office or quite businesses(no loud manufacturing, servicing etc) . People will be working from home more often, a garden suite could also function really well for our adapting workforce. I would say control the outside shape similar to how the laneways are controlled for massing, but let the uses inside be more flexible, so long as they are uses that don't disturb the neighbors with unwanted noise and activity.
- Same work uses as are allowed in R zoned districts, plus professional offices,
- educational uses, small-scale medical uses, and professional uses and other home occupations
- Live, work, play
- Work, hotelling, studio
- live/work (no retail/storefront)
- basically any housing, recreation and employment zoning up to and including light industrial
- Office space, professional services, artist studios,
- Home office, small goods/retail or coffee store/cafe/bakery
- Short-term rentals, minimum of 1month lease.
- Studios, home office, games room
- Offices!
- residential only, no commercial or industrial activities should be permitted for Garden Suites
- Home office, home gym, airBNB/temporary rentals
- Residential
- Homeowner use only
- Office, rental, residential
- I don't believe that uses should be restricted - allowing variety here will contribute to the vibrancy of the city.
- residence
- For any purpose the owner desires, rental, secondary living space, work station, etc.
- For family members only
- Typical Office, psychologist low impact uses
- Residential or small scale retail/commercial
- a range of uses
- home office & rental units
- They should not exist.
- home office, artist studio
- Additional work space, living space. Separate accommodation for aging in place

- Where the resident of the house is using it as a studio or work space, or for an aging parent, but not as a rental property.
- commercial / studio residential not retail not manufacturing
- Work from home, kids/teen hang out space, additional family / Intergenerational -grandparent living space, living space for a university / college student
- Granny flat, rental accommodation
- Affordable Live/Work space, Affordable housing only - Affordable in the sense of Rent Geared to Income or no more than 30% of market rates
- Work from home or studio/maker spaces
- Affordable housing or space for aging family members. They should not be allowed as income properties if they are not rented at an affordable rate.
- Rental space, intergenerational housing, home office/work space (as long as this cannot be provided within the existing house)
- studio, small business
- Mainly residential, though I am not opposed to work-from-home spaces, artist studios, and the like.
- I don't think garden suites should be allowed at all
- Renting for people to live
- Housing, work spaces
- Housing rentals
- Living space and alternate business space
- I am opposed to allowing garden suites
- None. Prohibit garden suites completely
- Home office, home gym, guest rooms, extra living space,
- Workshop, office, living space
- Live/work, as long as work does not involve dangerous activities or flammable, chemical processes, loud noises or ground vibration
- Living, office, workshop, studio, rec room...
- Work from home
- Living space
- No Air BnB, exclusive for family members to downsize so parents can sell their house and live beside kids or vice versa
- Long-term rentals. That's it.
- Build a suite for an aging parent, build a wfh office or apartment for your purebred bulldog... But this is NOT a catch all solution to sustainable housing and continues to contribute to inequality. We need tax reform and more reasonable attitudes/thinking towards housing (enough BRRR, FOMO, HELOC investors, money laundering, house flippers, amateur/slum landlords and Airbnbs - it's gross)
- Apartment, studios, office spaces.
- residential only
- Studios (work from home) Senior Living (down-sizing) Student Rental Rental Unit
- any use that is allowed in the adjacent buildings
- Living, working, private space for hobbies
- Primarily affordable rental housing and for multi generational housing
- Work from home
- pretty much anything
- Long term rentals
- office space (work from home only, not conducting business/seeing customers), temporary accommodations for visitors, kids play area.
- Studio and small business
- Workspace, art space, music rehearsal
- Residential
- Housing only. Toronto needs more affordable housing options - especially for those who live alone.
- residential, self-employed home office

- Residential
- studio, offices
- Living, working, small craft/workshop facilities
- Housing not Air band bs
- Owner-occupied, Long-term rental, Short-term rental, Office, and potentially some Commercial uses
- Whatever the tenant of the suite wants
- Should not allow to build garden suites.
- Affordable housing
- rental living, live/work, office, studios, small scale making / repairs
- Office Work, small business
- Work from home space (offices, small workshops, studios, etc)
- studio, office,
- residential FT only. And not Airbnb.
- Livable, residential, storage space, work at home, play place, another garage
- Personal family use, extended family
- relative (family member), long term rental, work from home office (as long as not for regularly meeting clients unless not causing excessive parking problems), affordable rental. However, I would draw the line at short term rental (airbnb) - do not allow this on garden suite
- All
- anything that is not impact the enjoyment of the surrounding buildings. Nothing that requires lots of vehicle parking (several customers or visitors which would require parking).
- Office or home for relatives.
- Rental building, additional housing!
- rental use
- No garden suites at all
- hobby/work shops / studios
- Residential - provide affordable housing
- art studios, professional offices, work/live
- None
- run home based businesses, airbnb, renting
- None
- None
- Intergenerational housing, rental housing, air bnb
- Co-working space for businesses, artist studios
- Work from home
- Home, workshop, office, home above garage
- Rental unit, additional/aging family living space, work from home
- Perhaps study or home office use
- Artist studio, doctor's/architect's/accountant's/dentist's, etc., etc. office
- none
- No garden suites
- Inter generational living only
- A work from home location, or as housing
- I would approve of uses only for living and working. i can see a small business of 2-3 people using the building as an office for a home owner.
- residential only
- living accommodation
- Garden Suites should not be constructed ... we need to increase green spaces not cover them up.
- Living as a separate unit, or workspace for main house occupants. The latter comes to min given our year log COVID issues
- studio
- Rental Unit, Accessory space to the main unit for any purposes
- Apartment or work studio

- Airbnb, work from home, long term rental
- Residential. Any non-residential use will have to be reviewed as it may adversely affect the adjacent existing homes.
- Generally speaking, mixing of uses is not bad. Anything permitted in a Live/Work suite should also be permitted in a Garden suite. Add employment and economic activity as an option for homeowners and stable neighbourhoods!
- rental unit
- work, workshop
- Work from home space is fine if it's office work. Not keen on short-term rentals or anything generating additional noise, dust/garbage, significant visitor traffic.
- literally anything
- Work from home space, a play space for children, a guest house for the main house owner, a garden suite for couples (new or old) to live in for affordability
- Office gym studio
- workspaces and homes for family members
- Guest house, student housing, nanny suite, grandparents seasonal home, work from home
- Uses compatible with residential uses - home offices, residential amenities, storage.
- No Garden sweets be allowed
- In Thorncliffe Park, garden suites could be a great way of expanding small businesses (sustainably)
- office/studio
- studios, workspaces
- Live and work space
- Not short-term rentals. Long-term rentals or office space for main home that does not receive clients to the premises. I.e. no businesses permitted in the garden suite with attendance by the public.
- Living
- Residential or rental
- Working co-spaces, small businesses (fitness, RMTs, clinic, etc.)
- Residential, Rental, intergenerational housing, affordable housing, rent-geared-to-income housing, pop-up workspaces, tiny home space, small business use
- Office space, storage, guest room, workshop/art studio/small business
- residential , work/residential (depends on type of work space)
- only family members of larger house should be able to live there
- Housing, offices, small business
- Working space , aging in place
- Doesn't matter because the City will not enforce what isn't allowed
- employment opportunities, 1-2 people, startups, APPLE COMPUTERS started in a garage!
- I don't see why there should be any kind of limit. Any use imaginable short of industrial?
- Work from home space and adult children moving back home (due to financial reasons or divorce/separation)
- For living, working and hosting visitors
- Live or work
- Work, rental, vacation
- home office, makers space, small manufacturing
- I do not agree at all with the concept of garden suites
- we dont need them at all
- Studio space for artists, small office for working from home, workspace for artisan
- Residential rental, additional living space for homeowner, home office/studio for residents of main house on the property
- living, home office with minimal visitors and low noise
- Any uses that would not be a nuisance to neighbours (anything except for a nightclub :))
- Living, work/studio, micro business
- Live work spaces for artists and creators, small scale production and even some commercial such as restaurants and cafes

- Home office or art studio
- only residential and /or personal use
- Affordable housing options
- small business
- Child care space for families working from home while child is in virtual school
- Any, let them be a versatile space
- Primary housing only but im not liking the idea - Its a strategy which is inherently classist - does not improve the quality of life for all
- Work From Home space, studio space, fitness, recreation
- Work from home, music, art
- Housing. Work from home.
- Rentable accomodation, suitable to year-round living with minimum size, kitchen and full bath.
- Home office, workshop, living suite.
- Residential
- I don't agree with Garden Suites. Most Toronto properties are not big enough to accommodate them. We need to keep our green space.
- residential rental, student rentals, senior home rentals
- Any use in addition to residential but only by the res occupants
- separate apartments, ONLY a homeoffice for the HOMEOWNER NOT an outside business and anyother positive improvment to the neighbourhood or homeowners property, since they are paying the taxes!!
- There should be no Garden Suites NO underhanded municipal fast track to build. We are all taxpayers and no one should be more important.
- residential only
- live work units, small scale retail, small scale office use
- residential renter or as mentioned building ownership for garden. In no cases should any change be used to reduce potential housing. Allow the sale of the garden suite at mandated low rates. Maybe something like they can buy out the garden suite with fair market value if both parties agree. Always allowing full house to have the land but building on it regulated usage with tenant/potential building owner with rights.
- Recording studio, art studio, recreational
- not sure
- Childcare space for kids, play space for kids, studio/work space, place of home business.
- Living, workshop, office space, storage
- Any occupancy is good ... Residential and live work, professional offices
- Live/work
- Studio space
- Either home or workspace. Conversion to be a home should require a permit and inspection.
- Home office art studio
- Residential work from home spaces library and if the house faces an arterial road, retail and light commercial
- appropriate businesses, home offices, etc
- Light industrial, home office, dentist offices, law offices
- recreational uses, small business, storefronts/cafes in some areas
- work from home, rental, airbnb, age in place
- Home office, in-law suite, studio
- Studio, home office, she shed, guest suite
- Daycares
- Workshop/studio.
- Any use that would be permitted in a townhouse, semi-detached or fully detached house. That scope of use for all those house types should be broadened to allow people to have clients or customers visit them in a residentially-zoned property, without constraint.
- Personal Gyms Parlours Man Caves auto shop personal usage flop housea

- whatever uses ensure that no activity that is not suitable to a quiet backyard situation, takes place. so if someone is working out of such a space they are not creating continuous, excessive noise, smell, or other disturbances.
- Anything you can use the main house for, is what you should be allowed to use the Suite for. Living to Small Home Business. It should be allowed to host an all encompassing use set.
- Office workspace without customer access, extension of primary residents for in law law, granny art studio rental space
- Residential dwelling only
- My neighbour has built a studio last year and it is as big as a Garden Suite. It has taken light away from my backyard. You can see right into my house. It is huge and uncomfortable. She has built to the lot line of the fence and my backyard now seems so tight and small. I am so upset with the city to allow such a huge building on such a small portion of lawn. If people want to build these move to an area with a huge piece of property. This is so unfair to others that are living right beside those that build. This build has upset so many people.
- Space for a small business to conduct operation (kitchen to prepare items) or small scale manufacturing (fashion design of clothing)
- Home office, home gym
- Work from Home, Studio, Guest Suite for caregivers etc
- Live work rent
- Work from home spaces short term rental accommodation
- Office, quiet zone, in law suite
- Please no commercial / industrial / business use
- Office or studio space
- Living Accommodations, low impact, low traffic home businesses ie. Work from home Accountant, Artist Studio etc.
- Residential and non-industrial employment
- Rental housing, extra living space, work space
- Aging in space, new families, couples, singles, workspaces, long term rentals. No short term rentals!
- To live
- Work from home, rental unit
- Non commercial only - no rental arrangements i.. office or family member
- Only Residential Uses, Home Office ok.
- home office
- home office/ work shop and short term rental
- living and work spaces
- Rental, office ,
- home office
- Housing, home office
- Residential suites to increase housing supply. Affordable rates are great as long as actually provided to those that need it.
- Home studios, work from home spaces, rental housing, community shared tool sheds
- Work, light commercial/ Light Industrial (i.e., studios, small bakery, etc.)
- Nil
- Work
- studio, work spaces,
- Residential
- Garden suites are a regressive, antisocial return to the days of slum housing-- look at photos of the old Ward. They should not be allowed. Density belongs in areas zoned for it.
- residential housing
- artist studio
- Recreation spaces, art studios, home offices, etc
- office, studio, in-place ageing, live-in caregiver accommodations, (general) tenancy
- Studios, work at home but not inviting clients/customers, eg, no hair stylists, doctors
- office, workspace, living, rentals

- Work spaces
- Reside, studio, office, single
- Rental (Granny, student, downsizing, income property), personal (home owner office space), personal (home owner mini-gym).
- personal use for studio or office, in-law/teen suites and rental, no commercial or warehouse usage
- Work, play area, gym,
- rental unit, flexible work space
- Live, work, recreate,
- I DO NOT believe that garden suites should be allowed
- none
- Day use for work and study. Yoga/art studio. Quiet space.
- Work from home spaces, small businesses
- Home office space
- Work from home suites
- Any use
- storage
- Multi-generational living or rental accommodations
- Home office
- None. Not in favour of garden suites
- Any living or renting uses that the owner wishes
- I have no idea. This is the first time I have been aware of Garden Suites in our neighbourhood. I somehow don't think my opinion matters anyway. All a waste of time, you will do what you want to.
- Housing, workspace
- Work/live
- only residential
- Residential and work space
- Work from Home Office, Studio, Fitness, Remote Learning for Students,
- Residential, work from home, artist studio, piano/tutoring lessons
- Rental suite, accommodation for aging family members, student accommodation
- Offices, living
- Apartment for family members
- None
- Preferably none! But if approved, residential only!
- Studio space for rent (for artists), small business space for start-up small businesses, but I do think plain rentals for living is most important, esp if they can be big enough to house people with kids!
- Workshops, studios, office (for rent), meeting space
- Office work from home
- residential only
- Residential, office, commercial! Let's expand our narrow minded thinking create better mixed communities and spaces :)
- storage, music room, yoga work out retreat
- art studios, work from home. No large commercial
- office, retail, restaurant, cafe, industrial
- Live, work play. We need these types of suites in Toronto to reprogram space that can be used for new types of living
- Rental
- There should NOT be Garden Suites allowed. No one needs crowded living conditions i.e. don't know how many people will live there and a other building can be an other fire hazard.
- All
- Office
- Living and home office
- Child care

- Housing, second office spaces
- Studio, office, apartment
- In-law, studio, office. Not commercial (except art studio).
- Living and work space
- None
- none
- Office
- Storage, studio space, meeting space, rehearsal hall, streaming booths, kitchen prep space,
- Any that the property owner wishes.
- i don't think we should allow them in the suburbs. I've been in a neighbourhood that flooded and we don't need more strain on our sewers
- Housing
- Work from home
- Commercial, light industrial, etc
- made available to DSO for their 16 years and over wait listed individuals with developmental disabilities
- artist studios, theatre space, arts space, youth initiatives, artisan studios
- Living and working spaces, possibly combined or possibly separate (ie, office on main floor and living spaces above)
- Residential and work from home spaces NO short-term rentals (AirBnBs, etc.)
- Living, Working, Hobbies
- renters, family (parents, grandparents, children, inlaws, aunt/uncles/cousins, work from home, guest house, air bnb. I feel this is between a separate unit, and a room in a house so the owner should have more flexibility with tenants. However, an actual tenant cannot be evicted easily. Ex. and N12 would need to be issued and proper process.
- It should be an extension of work and living for the current home owner. Adding garden suites will create crowding and congestion in neighbourhoods.
- elderly parents, short term rentals, long term rentals, guest house, younger generation moving back in with parents. The end use should be flexible, as the financial costs to build a garden suite are significant and the City should do whatever they can to incentivize homeowners to build one. In addition, even if the garden suite is not first used for long term rentals, when the home is resold, there is the potential that the garden suite will be used to add additional rental stock.
- Whatever is currently allowed in residences.
- Home office or small business (NOT for the purposes of manufacturing or customer traffic dropping in the buy things)
- Workshops, craft areas, work at home set up
- Living unit and work from home (not commercial).
- Home, office, rental
- Work-from-home, living situation, workout studio, artist studio.
- multigenerational families
- Day care, home office, kitchen
- Rental, home office, short term accommodation
- Affordable, sustainable and accessible residential (potentially work space too) uses should be required to obtain a permit for Garden Suites.
- None
- none do not like this idea because enforcement will not be sufficient this will cause overcrowding in high needs area even more
- living, storage, working
- Anything and everything with no limitations
- Parking below
- Residential only and no business to be carried on e.g. office, shops, warehousing, repair depots etc.
- Home office, guest suite, place to sleep for recent university graduate children who want own place but can't afford rent or home purchase

- Residential living, home offices (to be used by homeowners and not any other employees. This would create a headache for the neighbors for parking space)
- Work from home, air bnb
- None
- Service based business
- Day care center work from home and private tutor's for music or educational studies
- parents or children of home owner...no renting to no relatives
- Accommodation only
- Multi-generational living, rental unit, home office or hobby space, storage, light commercial uses permitted in residential neighbourhoods
- Living, working, business
- Owner Residency or Long term tenant
- Home office
- Residential rental.
- living and working from home
- Resident work from home only. No other commercial uses
- artist workshop, gardening hut, work space, living space
- Residential living quarters only. Far too much illicit business activities in homes already. Just check their garbage cans at the curb.
- The best is not possible to build a Garden Suites in the lot unless the lot is really big.
- Housing, office space,
- Habitation only
- increasing the rental stock in the city, maximum occupancy of 2 people
- Home office
- anything indoors, no noise outside
- Live, work, studio. Should be restrictions on NOISE though because so close to another residence.
- Living space for extended family members of the on site owner or separate units for live in caregivers (nannies/elder care)
- Teenagers hang out rooms. Study rooms. Home office. Entertainment space. Home cinema. Home gyms. Play rooms for children. Seniors accommodation / holiday home
- Extra space for family to sleep in when they visit esp. in winter, or office to work from home people.
- living, work from home by main house owners worried that if it becomes a home office for a small business then lots of parking and car traffic
- Home business, rental suite, owner-occupied suite, office space
- Home office, studio, classes, etc.
- Long-term residential use (renters, family etc. short-term rentals not permitted)
- Noise and pollution free services
- office only.
- Residential and commercial
- artist studios, small meeting places, working places.
- I'm opposed to Garden Suites.
- Rental, office space, extra family dwelling, guest house,
- tool shed
- Garden suites should not be allowed on lots under half an acre, and they should be residential only.
- living
- Family use, rental to others,
- Granny flats, owner's office space
- None
- living, home office. NO running businesses out of suite
- question real value of having Garden suites at all.
- Living, working but not commercial/retail
- NO GARDEN SUITS ALLOWED!

- Housing
- at home gyms, work shop or office space
- art studios, co-working spaces for small organizations
- As long as there is sufficient living space for the possibility of a desk to work from home, that is reasonable.
- small single person homes with guest space, i don't know how work space fits in.
- The property owner should be allowed to decide.
- None
- Work or student
- small office, personal studio, workshop, rec room
- Any
- Home office, multigenerational families, student home
- housing
- accommodation, work, recreation
- Don't agree with the entire concept
- Work from home, hobbies, living space
- Same as allowed in principal house when garden suite is located.
- residential
- workshop, office, daycare
- Work from home or short term rentals if the owner lives in the main suite
- Indifferent
- Residence and office work space only. Nothing that would create noise or excess light
- Residential and small offices with a restriction they not be medical practices. No manufacturing where it is the main source of income, for the main house or others
- residential. renting, etc.
- Work from home as long as they don't get used for self employed running their own business from Garden Suite
- Work from home
- living space all ages
- All uses, except those that may be noxious to neighbours (ie. industrial)
- Non-public facing businesses. Kitchens would be fine, office, artist space, etc.
- I think it's reasonable to allow their use as work spaces and studios, but I think housing should absolutely be prioritized. I think the city should use whatever tools are available to it to ensure this is the case.
- all uses
- Work from home office, artist studio, children recreation area
- residential, occupational
- Living or working. Not sure what other options there are?
- residential, home occupation
- Tiny houses. Alternative office spaces.
- Home business, children's playhouse, parental separation/divorce so children remain in the house and parents swap out for custody visitation.
- Property owners should be able to allow the opportunity to lease the opportunity to tiny home owners, provided the built is built to CSA and OBC requirements
- Living
- They should exclusively be used for affordable housing—not to increase the wealth of already wealthy people.
- seniors accommodations
- Work space
- Home office
- Affordable housing only.
- leaving space as a family resident. ex: if my son or family leaving in the house and they can take care of me and keep eye on me so i know i am safe in my own environment.
- Rentals, office space, crafting space
- All

- housing, office suites, home gyms
- Flexible spaces. Rentable studio/office/meeting space. Leave it open and see what people want to do with it.
- Residence, home office
- Intergenerational housing ie Granny Suite, rentals,
- Office gym art studio cooking studio Multi-use space
- Art studio
- Extended family, aging in place, rental, office/studio space
- Ability to work from home is definitely in need, personal fitness space is also very much in need.
- WFH
- Any use the land lord sees fit
- Living quarters, with plumbing allowed and attached from the main house or city.
- Living for seniors.
- home office, or full living space
- work from home space for main house, rentable work studio for other and or a combo of both. a live/work rentable space
- Housing
- Work from home, computer labs, workshop/machine shops(limited by noise)... work at home businesses have a need for workshops.
- residential work space hobby space maybe even small retail space such as a seamstress or chef
- Home office
- Living. Non customer-facing professional. In law suite. Kids's wing. Retiree suite w kids building equity in the main house.
- Work from home
- Home business, work from home office space.
- Non commercial - work space
- Accommodation for older seniors, office spaces or just a quiet space in the back yard.
- Small businesses that won't disturb surrounding neighbours (e.g. via noise/air pollution) such as cafes, salons, offices
- Home office, studio, secondary lounge space, guest room
- residential, work from home, artist/craft studio
- Rental
- Office work, self employed, low noise work
- Residence and Offices
- Residential
- Multigenerational and Rental
- living use
- living quarters
- workshop studio office
- Work, personal fitness, greenhouse, workshop for hobbies.
- I don't think they should be separate rental spaces, this would create a very bizarre situation in neighborhoods.
- A primary rental or property owner residence, or a property owner home office.
- Personal space for residents
- Home office, living space for an older adult, housing for folks experiencing homelessness
- renting
- Granny suites/ relatives suites only
- Working, living, additional income
- Work space, amenity space
- Work, recreational, studio spaces
- Home office or renting
- All uses including work from home office space and small business uses
- As living space or working from home/office space only
- work

- Unrestricted...living, work office, design studio, relaxation
- Work, extra living space
- Low cost rental options, Downsizing, New immigration accommodations
- Residential living, work from home space, workout space, play space
- living, working, home gym
- Online business
- Office space, living and garage use
- Residential only, it goes back to increase housing and affordability.
- Residential work from home
- Work from home, art studio, doctors office,
- Resi only
- work from home space,
- Rental, WFH
- non commercial use, rental should not be allowed.
- Studio, office,
- Art space home gym home daycare
- Home office, work from home, home gym/sauna, affordable housing
- Workshop, apartment, work from home office, residence for grown children, nanny suite
- Office space/storage/bedroom/gym
- Work or business from home
- Elderly parents, work home office, young adult children, short term rentals, long term rentals, nanny accommodations, students-adult child with disability
- Residence!! We do not like to living in the sky on the 34th floor. Will be nice to have more units available close to the street levels
- Any use where there is only 1 employee, no clients. Any use that complies noise by laws. Any use that is odorless. No use of the exterior spaces permitted.
- All
- Anything
- Work from home, rental unit, recreational unit, small business space, for elders and young adults to live affordably
- Living or working
- residential, office space only - no manufacturing, no trade
- Affordable housing
- Home office
- Innocuous uses that would fit in a neighbourhood setting: home office, instruction where one pupil is taught at any time, artist studio, etc.
- Similar to laneway suites
- Living/ Working (Work from home would be ok as long as clients/customers and extra employees were not allowed)
- Anything that isn't dangerous to public health
- Quiet work or businesses (including daycare for few children) anything that does not generate a lot of noise or odours ().
- Art studio, office, home
- All tips the community is starving for affordable space to live and grow the economy.
- Living, working , eating
- None....you are just squeezing in more and more people and cars that are not wanted.
- Office, gathering, small retail
- Office, extended living area, intergenerational living
- nothing commercial
- Working (art, home office, etc.) so long as it is also paired with housing space
- Disallow Airbnb in Garden Suites Limited to multi-generational family members only
- Residential, or Live-Work uses
- There should be no garden suites allowed, dumb idea.
- Work from home or art studio

- No garden suites please! The city is crowded enough! More dense population is not possible! City infrastructure cannot handle the existing population!
- HOUSING only - otherwise it becomes a money making proposition only
- housing for relatives of the owner only
- Living, working.
- living accommodations.
- Office - Extra bedroom - kitchenette - 1 story low profile - small footprint.
- DON'T SUPPORT GARDEN SUITES
- I do not want to see Garden Suites----end of story
- Work, studio, increased living space
- Temporary accommodations, eg international students
- Limit commercial uses to exclude restaurants, cafés, microbreweries, shops etc. or businesses that generate a lot of traffic. Work from home offices should be allowed.
- home offices, therapies, exercise, meditation, studios
- Small business, agriculture, chicken raising
- one person only in a one storey structure only on a deep lot over 150 feet deep and under 400 square feet
- Living only
- Don't feel they should be allowed at all. The city is already densely populated. I believe the developers will be the big winners when it comes to Garden suites, as "building lots are becoming scarce and too expensive to derive big profits that they have become accustomed too.
- Rental housing, multi-generational housing, home office for those working from home or who have small businesses, a workshop,
- If secondary dwellings are being considered, I would presume use could be up to the property owner -- if they are using for their own purposes (residential or work from home), as long as it is not a public-facing purpose (active retail location medical office etc.) where large numbers of people might be attending at that location. And, I presume there must be some restrictions or guidelines to govern other uses -- and for any rental purposes. Through the life of a Garden Suite, I could see it fulfilling multiple needs for a household -- and might be needed at some times for an additional family member and others perhaps just a work from home space or studio -- and perhaps in future, it becomes a rental option, if no longer needed within the household. I think there should be flexibility re: use, but definitely guidelines in place as to size, height, density -- materials used, impacts on shade, mature trees and other environmental concerns. I also presume there has to be some guidelines with regards to general appearance (related to the main dwelling and others/neighbours) and placement to ensure we are not just filling every available inch on all properties and adding great density that the areas and city infrastructure cannot support.
- Housing for aging parents, housing for adult children with disabilities that cannot be fully independent but need privacy, work from home office, guest house for family
- Apartment, office,
- do not agree having them at all. Where will the gardens be
- Short term rental, home office, light industrial
- Live Work
- Residential, work from home, fitness studio for personal use, additional living space for homeowner
- Living, work/live
- I do not like the idea of Garden Suites.
- Residential only
- Residential only.
- Only allow single storey garden suites that will protect neighbours privacy.
- Affordable rental
- Office space, additional sleeping quarters/guest room, personal amenity space
- Home office, home gym

21. Do you have any other thoughts about Garden Suites you'd like to share?

- I would need more specific information before I can decide For example - what size and height will they be? What size lots will be required to ensure enough space from all adjacent neighbours. If my neighbour wants to build one will then need to get my permission or consult with me about how to build it? Will they be required to keep a distance from my house. How will fire access be handled so the property and neighbours are protected?
- Privacy/Proximity/Setbacks Lack of lane access means that additional consideration must be given to privacy concerns. Side/rear yard setbacks must be large enough that a garden suite is not too close to a neighbour's house or backyard. This includes pre-existing buildings (garages etc.) that are being converted into garden suites. I am concerned about this because Brad Bradford is supporting 'grandfathering' pre-existing buildings that may not technically comply with the new standards. This is unreasonable - the existing building should need to comply or not be granted permission. Not every property in Toronto is appropriate for a garden suite if the lot/current building does not provide adequate setbacks. Buildings that are right on the property line, have windows pointing into neighbours' yards, and are closer to their homes than the main house on the garden suite lot are not appropriate for garden suites. Garden suites need to have totally private access (i.e. not through a mutual drive). Fire safety is also a huge concern given the proximity to neighbours and the lack of laneway access. Rentals/AirBNB I am hugely concerned that garden suites will just be AirBNBs, especially as the City already does very little to police short term rentals now. This negatively affects the neighbors in a meaningful way that long term rentals don't. Garden suites should only be permitted where the main house is a single family home, or where the owner is occupying the house. A house that is a duplex/triplex should not be allowed to add a garden suite as this increases density in an unsustainable way and opens the door for the garden suite to be used as a short term rental. Requiring that the owner occupy at least one unit in the main house will reduce the likelihood that this happens. Parking Garden suites should be required to have parking. All new houses must have parking and bending the rules for garden suites makes no sense. There is limited street parking as is.
- Make the process easy. Provide a ton of financial incentives. Address shared driveway and services. Avoid committee of adjustments. Make sure there is a way to continue as best as possible where there is opposition.
- Please allow this in Toronto cities. Adding a Garden Suite to our lot would create a major, very positive financial impact on the wellbeing of my partner and I. If we can move forward with a Garden Suite it would make the world of a difference for our ability to afford our quaint little bungalow.
- No short-term rentals.
- I have concerns of fire safety, especially for existing building on lots being converted. Current fire restrictions need to remain for garden suites, so that they are accessible. Any home with 2 or more units should require parking on site. Maximum number of units on a property should be considered. Garden suites only allowed on an owner occupied property, not existing rental building, as this will have more of an impact on the neighbourhood. Fully water permeable driveway or access should be mandatory to help with rain water. Privacy needs to be considered for abutting neighbours Air bnb and short term rental needs to be addressed. The city has done a terrible job of enforcing this in condos and garden suites should not be used for this if the intention is to develop more affordable housing. Requiring the owner of the home to live there will help mitigate the noise from short term rentals.
- They are a good way to intensify the 'yellow belt' without building high rises or destroying mature neighbourhoods
- I think it's not a smart idea as it invade other neighbours backyards privacy and we all deserve to enjoy our backyards without neighbours looking into others.
- The solution to affordable housing is not garden suites. It is ensuring condo developers include affordable units in their plans. Stop ruining neighbourhoods with low rise buildings by increasing density on already small lots and taking away green space. This garden suite idea will further contribute to the deterioration of Toronto as a place to live. And you will have people living in sheds at exorbitant rates. This idea is not a good one for our city.
- Allow more flexibility in ground floor dimensions than Laneway suites which are capped at 8m wide. Many lots in the City without laneways are large lots, with trees. Allowing a large footprint allows the building to extend around things like trees. Size can be kept small by capping area,

FSI, and enforcing setbacks - but avoid restrictions on width/length. Lots will be larger than the lots laneway suites exist on.

- I think this is a fantastic initiative by the city and cannot be approved fast enough.
- No
- none
- I like this if it becomes suites for relatives or work from home. I like it a bit less if it is about rental suites. I am especially concerned however that it will become a way for people to build illegal Airbnb suites.
- This idea may work on large properties, but I have big concerns about the potential for noise, garbage, and general 'nuisance issues' with garden suites in a neighbourhood with smaller lot sizes.
- Don't allow airbnb in garden suites because this will cancel out the benefits to rental availability
- Would not like to see large family accommodation or commercial uses. Would like to see additional safety standards for accessing garden suites (lighting, grades, obstructions, etc.)
- Privacy for neighbours, lot coverage and lot density are key components for me.
- Parking should not be required. Suites should be allowed on properties backing onto parkland, ravines, cemetery, commercial and industrial properties not just other backyards. Relatively small properties like 'tiny homes' should be allowed for garden suites.
- As with laneway housing, the potential benefits of enabling more housing options in established neighbourhoods is very important. I anticipate Garden Suites will be one of those options but should also be accompanied by additional appropriate intensification and protections efforts.
- Lands purchased to construct rental unit should require a percentage of the units to be affordable with strict pricing control. Garden Suites could be an option of affordable units.
- Some concerns are the use of such buildings for short term rentals (airbnbs) - policy against this would be useful to ensure that they support housing and those looking to live semi-independently, and not another quick cash grab for property owners
- Long overdue
- Parking will become more problematic as density is increased. Many neighbourhoods are already at capacity re. street parking permits.
- To paraphrase the old saying: don't let perfection stand in the way of a good and timely idea.
- The size of the unit should be relative to the green space and lot size.
- Long overdue and excited this is being considered. It's a win / win / win. All key stakeholders win. The City, the home owner and potential tenants.
- I believe garden suites should be discouraged unless the application relates to a need to house family members or create additional work from home space. The city should continue to work to prevent the loss of permeable ground where possible. Building a garden suite will only be affordable to those who are high earners. These people do not need to pave over permeable ground to keep a roof over their heads and will likely create an expensive (probably beautiful) suite which will NOT be affordable. If a family wants to convert a detached garage into a suite to house elderly relatives this is understandable and a much better use of space. However, I don't think that these suites should be rented to people outside of the family who occupies the main house, if possible.
- It's a wonderful idea that could add tens or even hundreds of thousands of cheap, low cost units to the city. I am skeptical that the city will take advantage of this tool, and will instead put onerous requirements on these projects that will prevent most of them from moving forward. If that happens, then the beneficiaries will be older, wealthier, and whiter.
- Important that they be universally permitted Especially in suburban SFD n High end areas
- Legalize them across the City
- Good idea if implemented in a way that minimizes negative impacts for neighbours, trees and rain water absorption.
- My particular interest is to allow Garden Suites on reverse frontage lots throughout the suburbs. In these locations the Garden Suite should be allowed its own address on the street it fronts on, and there should be a requirement for an entrance from the main street.
- Anyone who fights for parking on someone else's property is anti-climate and anti-immigrant. Toronto pretends to care about climate change and to be open to immigrants, but it uses housing policy to enforce segregation and encourage car usage.

- I feel like if all homeowners took advantage of this opportunity, it would drastically decrease property value overtime.
- No Short term rentals at all such as Air BnB
- There are major social, economic and environmental advantages to sharing a property. I think this a great opportunity for Torontoians to come together through shared space.
- The privacy issue is the biggest problem for me. Our neighbourhood is so small and houses tightly packed as it is. I would not want my neighbours to have more concrete and people on their property. The noise, the lack of privacy and the lack of green space and sunlight are what concerns me. I bought a house the way it is for a reason and now to have my neighbours amend that? Dont like it.
- This is a bandage on a gaping wound, but still better than nothing.
- Unclear why garden suites cannot be severed from main house. The physical relationship remains the same but garden suites will be more affordable for those who want to own a house.
- I am concerned in neighborhoods with small properties garden suits will eat up backyards and increase density greatly. I have great concerns over privacy in backyard area especially with children. More cars coming in and out of my neighbour's backyards. Smaller units with lower rent also brings younger renters into backyard areas where hanging out, drinking and smoking weed occurs. I don't want this next door. Many of my neighbour's have already expressed frustration with this sort of behaviour in rental units in the houses. Allowing this in neighborhoods with small lots will create street parking issues and units with no backyard spaces, especailly if parking is required. Two story units will result in no privacy for neighbour's. If this were the case, we could potentially have 2 units on either side of us plus 2 backing on to our backyard. I chose to live in a neighborhood with small family homes and backyards to maintain some privacy and outdoor space. This idea could potentially strip us of this. I do not support this idea whatsoever.
- I have supported this infill concept for many years. Perhaps because I own a nonconforming lot, city planning refuses to consider an application without an extended waiting time period and significant additional expenses that would grant me a chance at a positive recommendation from the Committee of Adjustment. Why do planners refuse to treat all applicants fairly? Why does the city care about the shape of my lot and of the building I would like to renovate? I am trying to make more affordable housing for renters why are there continual roadblocks to make the best use of my property?
- Don't allow 'tiny homes' on wheels. The garden suites should have a foundation and be required to meet fire code. No short term rentals, should be longer term tenants.
- Legalize them! Single family zoning needs to be seriously overhauled and this minute step is a good step in the right direction, but more needs to be done to dramatically intensify our yellow belt
- I generally support this but do not support cutting down mature trees to build garden suites. Otherwise make them easy and cheap to get approved and build - develop pre-approved patterns or designs like other cities in the U.S. have done.
- Should not be permitted as rental properties
- Garden suites should follow strict rules and regulations to ban or de-incentivise use for short-term rentals (airbnb). I think Garden suites provide a great opportunity to enhance supply of housing in Toronto, which is desperately needed. City policy should focus on prioritizing rental uses for Garden Suites
- Consider allowing for flexibility in the provision of 3 units within the same lot to include 2 units within the garden suite ias an alternative to the Planning Act permissions.
- Price per bedroom for renters MUST come down in the city and property values for single family homes must come down to being affordable. Bicycle parking or electric vehicle only parking music be prioritized over gasoline vehicle parking.
- Fast track this idea.
- Fully support this - key is to balance adding more housing while protecting green space, trees and wildlife habitat, and not totally eroding sense of privacy and quiet for main residences (especially if many neighbours decide to build at same time). Would also like to see City consider enabling permission to build physical underground linkage between principal residence and garden suite (tunnel).
- We need to approve garden suites to provide more housing options for Torontonians.

- Ensure Garden suites are not used for Air Bnb, for neighbourhood safety and security, and to limit disruptive/destructive behaviour. Use by homeowner for extra family living space, or long term rental only.
- Allow for condominium sales. Not everyone should be forced to rent.
- if we can ensure they actually end up being rental properties and not just private house expansions I think it's a great idea.
- Fast track please.
- While they generally should not be visible from the street, this should not be a hard and fast 'rule'. Other considerations such as tree preservation should dictate this.
- End single family detached zoning. Allow full lot coverage if it means multiples of housing units and families. Start with the largest lots with the smallest numbers of people on them. Get rid of all the McMansions with one or two people living in them. Allow developers to make aggressive moves into the neighbourhoods like amalgamating two or four deep lots and building row houses or townhouses front to back. Better to put four full sized houses (or eight stacked towns) on two lots than two large homes with comparatively useless garden suites. Stop focusing on bandaids to try to keep holding up the NIMBY culture. Tear off the bandaid and let's fix the city.
- There really needs to be clear policies regarding the uses of the garden suite - this seems like an opportunity for people with money to take advantage of adding extra features and increasing their property value with studios or offices. I would be concerned about how this also impacts the total affordability for purchasing a home - what will the value of the property be with a garden suite?
- I think they are potentially a great way to add rental housing, provided we don't make it impossible for them to be built. I think they are an ok way of opening up the yellow belt to more density (although I feel that those areas should be freely opened to allow duplexes and triplexes, but that's another issue). I do worry that they will be slow and expensive to build and turn into luxury rental spaces only.
- As fast as possible, please! Toronto is in an affordability housing crisis. We need to use every option available.
- Yes. Green space in cities is at a premium. It offers crucial environmental returns, such as cooling, and oxygen, never mind human interaction with plants. Allowing Garden Suites means less garden space, which will negatively impact the city environment as a whole. We need more green space, not less.
- They should be exceptionally easy to build
- Considering having more than just one unit in garden suites and laneway suites.
- Answering a number of these propositional statements with sufficient accuracy of intent (especially from 61% of survey completed onwards) involves nuanced responses - for which space was not immediately provided - given certain historical practical realities (good & bad) that come with rental properties (e.g. if the homeowner's primary intention in constructing such dwellings is as a source of additional income, then concern about the 'calibre' of the potential 'tenant' and their potential impact on the immediate neighbourhood and the efficacy of the homeowner's vetting process). Garden suites - as envisioned and favourably described - can potentially be a force for good in increasing rental stock and access to affordable living they can also potentially prove to have an immediate, detrimental impact on existing neighbourhoods (e.g. loss of tree canopy, unsightly/disparate architectural design of garden suite, increased human density living in closer proximity with all of the potential problems associated with such (e.g. loud music, noisy party/social activities by 'tenant')). For the record, I am NOT - by default - a NIMBY or BANANA -minded individual, but as a resident of Toronto for the majority of my life, I am fully aware of the social problems that seem to attend City initiatives as they pertain to both 'affordable' housing (i.e. primarily rental units) and the citizens for whom such housing initiatives are undertaken. In my view, while Laneway or Garden suites can be a positive means of increasing housing stock, and by extension, provide opportunity for a better quality of life for both individuals and families (based on REAL affordability), such propositions cannot presume to address (i.e. 'mitigate') the equally pressing problematic social/lifestyle attitudes/'habits' that are associated with a certain % of the very people that the City is attempting to assist. It would have been helpful if the survey - had also defined 'affordable' at outset.
- I think that the rules around garden suites should be flexible so that they are not only able to be built on properties that have large swathes of land. there needs to be real optionality for most people in the city to be able to build a garden suite if they so choose.

- All the positive impacts of the allowing garden suites vastly outweigh any potential downside.
- The garden suite program should not be reserved for wealthy landowners that have the space available to satisfy bylaw requirements. Rather the bylaw should be defined to enable the most number of Toronto residents to access this development option - to support aging in place, work from home, and increase the rental stock of the city. Furthermore the city should be flexible in the application of the bylaw, in order to protect trees. Lawns and soft landscaping requirements should be eliminated, not because 'concrete and stone is good' but because lawns are one of the most ecologically damaging constructs. They consume too much water, and are hardly used by most members of society. The soft landscaping requirement that exists to 'ensure lawns are kept' work only to force development through Committee. Home owners will greenify their properties with potted plants, flower beds and trees, not because it is a bylaw requirement but because it is universally understood that plants and trees are desirable, and valuable.
- I think the more options for affordable housing the better.
- Please approve them as soon as possible with clear rules. They will help the character and housing affordability for the city.
- Excited to pilot certain projects in my neighbourhood's unusually sized lots backing onto the park.
- Low rise so does not wreck streetscape - still need to allow green space around it . Not for commercial purposes
- I think it's important for the City to create a framework that is easy to implement for property owners - that allows property owners to add coach houses as well as neighbours to contribute to the design process. The City's laneway housing regulations are almost impossible to meet on most lots in downtown Toronto. Additionally, NIMBYism is too strong around laneway houses. The issues associated with privacy are already an existing condition for most properties downtown where you can see into the backyards of most nearby houses. I think shadowing is more concerning in terms of blocking sun for the neighbours. Overall, I think legalizing coach houses can significantly benefit seniors, students, teenagers, millennials, property owners, etc. as they allow for much more flexibility in housing arrangements, and for sensitive densification.
- The pandemic has certainly furthered our desire for additional housing options in Toronto. However, it has also heightened our need to provide suitable options for multi-generational support in raising families. A household of two working parents (one pregnant & high risk), we did not have safe access to child care or family support. Having a garden suite would have safely allowed our elderly parents to move in and support our family.
- No
- This is very important, especially during covid, and we would like to see this come to life ASAP!
- Must have!
- I believe Garden Suites would fill a void that exists in Toronto. Affordable rent.
- Home owners ought to have greater flexibility to replace existing detached garages on their properties with garden suites having greater size/scale.
- No
- I've stated my opinion earlier - please pay attention. Sometimes I had to park around the block due to my house having no garage or parking space. How would I function if the laneway across the street had more units built.
- I think they are a key step in growth for older residential neighbourhoods to increase density as a more sustainable and palatable alternative to parachuting condo developments into the same areas. It also allows growth to follow a more sustainable timeline and pair with growth of infrastructure without putting undue burden on city services which are often seen when high density buildings are built.
- Rooftop green space
- Garden suites can help increase density in suburban areas, supporting local businesses and transit routes.
- Restricted to large backyard properties
- There needs to be clear regulations that need to be followed. A certification process with a published list would help renters to ensure they are renting a legal and safe garden suite.
- Should be one story ONLY. Two stories blocks light. Privacy issues.
- I'd be interested in connecting with some to discuss how we might partner to promote and educate homeowners and small landlords on Garden Suites.

- YIMBY
- I would want some thought put into requiring that lost area for water absorption be compensated. eg. if garden lot created, perhaps there would need to be some reduction of concrete patio or walkway or requirement of french sink drains(?), or certain plantings... I don't have the technical expertise to comment really, but we need to make sure we think of how the city can absorb water when we pave more of it.
- Please be clear about corner lots backing on to private laneways.
- I think there should be a minimum area allowed for green space - trees, lawn, earth, gardens - adjusted according to housing types and neighbourhoods of course. This may take the form of a minimum ratio of green space to built space. This should be maintained after garden suites are built. Neighbours whose privacy, shading, and gardens are affected must agree to the proposed build, although the default for most cases should be not to build if there is any doubt.
- I think there is a need for public education about Garden Suites because generally people will just say no because they know nothing about it. In my opinion, Garden Suites are more affordable, less disruptive to the home owner, more sustainable and have the potential to be less disruptive to the neighbourhood where they are being built.
- NA
- I'd like to see the City - for once - establish a firm set of planning rules then just stick to them. No appeals from NIMBY neighbours, or developers seeking exemptions, or basically unrepresentative RA's setting themselves as unelected arbiters. No endless to and fro with the City for owners attempting to construct garden suites on their property. No addition to the bureaucracy to police the minutiae of design.
- They should have to meet all space requirements on a property. You can only build so much before a property has too much. This should not be allowed. All outlying structures like a porch, deck, shed and garage have to be considered. Don't think there are too many properties in Toronto with enough room.
- Given the glut of rental condos coming on to the market post Covid, I believe the City should put a hold on permits for all laneway/garden suites. They will not be profitable enough to rent for low income so you are just adding to the 'high end' rental market. Furthermore, the quality of life for home owners is already substantially impacted with the crowding of postage stamp sized lots with huge additions and multiple suites in homes. The laneways are an obstacle course of parked vehicles and garage parties already. People are using their garages for party rooms, cottage industry businesses, etc. and kids are playing unmonitored in the laneways. There is absolutely no enforcement of parking, noise and safety bylaws.
- We need this ASAP!!!
- An important environmental consideration--in addition to trees and vegetation--is impact of percentage of lot that becomes impervious surface. This impacts matters such as storm-water runoff. Adding downspouts connected to the sewer system may affect the capacity of that system to deal with large events. Enhancing permeable surfaces with storm water going into groundwater may be an important consideration. With climate change upon us, designs need to include obvious measures to ensure resiliency in the future.
- Love the idea. Those who have the most space will probably be the most resistant, but here's hoping the idea gets some traction.
- It's childish and a sign of a backwards thinking city that this is even a debate. Allow this kind of thing if there is a demand for it. Fast track all missing middle housing initiatives ASAP.
- I love ideas like these that are giving more thought to additional arrangements to cut down on sprawl, increase density in single-family unit dwelling areas and provides more affordable housing in the city. These initiatives are going to be crucial to bringing greater density to areas to validate increase in community amenities and/or services. Keep it up! Ideally, faster permit processing on the whole for making changes like these on properties to inject stock quicker into market.
- The lots in most neighbourhoods are not big enough to build an extra structure on the property. There is limited access to a backyard. If built, such units should be limited to family members only - eg elderly parents or college students. Parking is already an issue since many families have more than the allotted vehicles per dwelling.
- No

- Any proliferation of Garden Suites should have a net positive impact on tree canopy, surface area of permeable soft-scaping, and net-zero energy consumption.
- They will be ghost hotel suites and not safe for seniors if laneway are not upgraded for safety, lighting, barrier free access, fire fighting, ambulance and police access.
- TORONTO IS ALREADY CRAMMED ENOUGH/WE NEED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND NOT HOUSING THAT IS HIDDEN AND TAKES AWAY FROM GREENERY ...
- The landscape minimums are hard to achieve in the laneway suit programs, a review of what is appropriate per site or site type should be considered. Higher sustainability performance or building practises should be rewarded in the form of reduced fees.
- Secondary units - laneway and garden suites - provide opportunities for intergenerational living and aging in place as well as keeping more people in the City. This presents a diverse mix of people and ages to support thriving neighbourhoods that are not ghettos for a particular demographic. Eliminating the parking requirement for these secondary units encourages public transit use and is better for the health of the environment and the population. Building above ground avoids the problems associated with subterranean units by giving access to light and air to the dwellings.
- We need more diverse housing stock in Toronto, this is a step in the correct direction
- This initiative will not solve the affordable housing crisis but every little bit helps. It will also give homeowners the flexibility to add additional, flexible multi-use space to their property.
- I think they are a great idea. I am sure that there are issues to consider, like with laneway suites, but they are a housing option that should be available in Toronto
- I fully support this idea, Laneway Homes are already very popular, and Garden Suites will allow more homes to be built in suburbs, where laneways are non-existent.
- Took everyone long enough to get around to this!! Glad you are working on it now. Great survey.
- Zoning standards should be similar to Lane Suites in terms of setbacks and height. Do not prejudice properties from building to same built form just because not on a laneway. Garden Suites permission will provide for a way larger range of GS configurations on different lots. Have pre-approved GS designs that can get quickly approved.
- Great idea. I hope to see many of them pop up soon!
- Noise limitations, worried about density
- Public incentives should not go to homeowners just to extract more rent from tenants. This could fuel speculation and reinforces inequalities. If incentives are offered it should be to encourage alternative tenure models that address barriers to housing access. Garden suites could be part of diffuse cooperatives, or community land trusts, or networked public housing (hold on to those TCHC 'scattered sites!'). Density is nice, decommodification is better!
- Just want to re-iterate that this seems like a great way to create more living spaces in a relatively sustainable way and would allow some owners to make additional income. Seems like a win-win.
- i think it's important to keep in mind storm water issues and they should be required to have green roof and be built with sustainability for the landscape and environment in mind
- They are a fantastic idea and should be adopted quickly.
- I am very concerned about the potential increase in vehicles and vehicular traffic as a result of Garden Suites. As it is, many houses that consist of two units already have excess numbers of cars (sometimes parked 'creatively' on front lawns and backyards. Increasing density in low-density neighbourhoods needs to incorporate incentives and bylaws to limit the number of cars per property.
- The laneway suite requirements are too strict I believe only 20% of applicants get permits this would be very frustrating and I have not even bothered trying
- It shouldn't just stop with Garden Suites. We should allow owners to develop their properties to allow for duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes general middle housing. We should also encourage more mixed use developments, and eliminate setback and parking requirements. These things should be entirely up to the property owner.
- Bicycle parking is good but is not a viable form of winter transport. It's important to improve public transit service areas where garden homes are being built. We need to prioritize people over cars.
- The policy must be as-of-right, and generously flexible so it will apply to almost every property universally without requiring minor variances. Fast, affordable, simple approvals.
- I hope garden suites do not have so many restrictions that it is impossible to do

- Realistically this will not address the housing affordability crisis in our city, so let's focus on where it can have an impact. Require these suites to meet progressive targets (ie passive house or net zero) to push the industry forward.
- An amazing idea.
- I strongly support allowing garden suites.
- The restrictions put forward on laneway suites is a fiasco and only allows very little suites to be built. I plead that restrictions on garden suites aren't expansive so that low density areas can increase their stagnant populations and bring vitality to the suburbs. Garden suites will cater to millennials and baby boomers who would get a space catered to them in the suburbs, while not being forced to live in shoebox sized condos.
- We need Garden Suites
- Regulations on garden suites' location, setback, etc should take into consideration for irregular pi shape lot. A pi shape lot can be ideal for garden suites because it has a large backyard that the main house can use one side of the yard, and the garden suite can use the other half separately. On a pi shape lot, garden suites can be located not totally behind the main house, but a little on the side of the main house, being accessible from the shared driveway (as opposed to shared walkway) and having better emergency access. In that case, garden suites should be allowed to be visible from the street.
- Desperately needed for seniors to provide safe living outside of seniors residences
- Highly in favour of
- Get on with it!
- Garden suites offer a fantastic opportunity to add small amounts of housing across the city, and it should have as minimal requirements and much flexibility to build these. Consider providing ready made options, like LA, to promote speed and good design
- I am very happy that the city is pursuing making Garden Suites legal.
- These suites should be incentivized in the last places intended for intensification, the farthest from avenues. We do not want to take places which would be great for intensification and instead create both the lowest increase and a likely more insistent objector to future appropriate intensification on key sites. Equity must be front and center, as we have already seen city restrictions empower and enrich the richest owners in the city. These suites, like laneway suites and in-unit suites, only further enrich the already richest part of society, while having impacts on the ability to move forward with bettering the situation and options for those who have the least.
- Get on with it, it is taking too long and time is being lost, let's get this going please
- They are long overdue. The 'concerns' you raise (e.g. character, privacy and parking) and the frame of "protecting neighbourhoods and residents" is anachronistic and tantamount to "fighting the last war". Garden suites, laneway suites and other forms of gentle density/missing middle infill development is a progressive form of intensification that indisputably strengthens the health and character of our neighbourhoods and city. They are also a critical strategy to improving housing affordability and sustainability. Let's get on with it!!!
- Please allow this process to be an easier, expedited process - less difficulty getting a permit to build, and make it affordable (ie/ below market rent, rent should be 30% of someone's income, provide subsidizes, provide incentive for homeowners to make this affordable and to build it - small break on taxes etc.
- City utilities like water, garbage and recycling should be billed separately for garden units
- My mother asked me to design one of these over her garage, 30 years ago, north of High Park. She could still own her house, take care of her garden, live near her friends, shop in her neighbourhood, rent her house to a young family, help them when their kids got home from school - ie: continue to contribute positively to her community. Of course it made so much sense, especially on the population density-declining Bloor /Danforth Corridor, that the City said no. They suggested that she could create a basement apartment. A woman who has reached a certain station in life does not want to live in a basement apartment. For another 20 years, my mother lived alone in her 4-bedroom house. What a waste that was. This idea made sense 30 years ago. It only makes that much more sense now. Just do it!
- Let's go! Fast as we can and make this a great city for affordable housing.
- there should be height limits in place so that the suites do not detract from the neighbours enjoyment of their yards or from their access to natural light in their homes.

- Great idea if you get subsidy on solar panels and other water conservation means
- Eliminating car spots for bicycles does not make sense it should not be allowed at all the issues of parking in neighbourhoods far out way other issues
- Make it easier to build single story.
- Regulations for both garden and laneway suites should be flexible enough to allow existing accessory buildings (like sheds or garages) to be adapted.
- 'Best' place I've lived... (detached back yard 'suite') ... having lived in dozens of homes over decades...
- Concerned that this approach will result in unmanageable and difficult to track, density levels in neighbourhoods. Also, concerned about difficulty with emergency personnel reaching the suites.
- Energy efficiency for reduced bills, natural/plant based materials where possible for sustainability and healthy environments, a bright space (i.e. not dark and cave-like). Keep professional young adults in mind as well as those with disabilities.
- I think the whole idea is ridiculous. People buy and own houses to enjoy the amenities of a home including gardens, privacy and space plus nature and beautiful mature trees which, very unfortunately for the planet and climate change, are in Toronto increasingly slaughtered in the mad pace to develop and line the pockets of the preferred developers by our current government. It is why people are fleeing the city of Toronto in droves to move to areas where nature, privacy and the beauty of surroundings are still available to them and are not constantly under threat. Whatever happened to the preservation of established neighbourhoods built and lived in for lifetimes by the people who built this city??
- I am totally against garden suites in my neighborhood perhaps there may be areas in the city but this Area is a single-family dwelling area and I would expect it to remain that way I did not live here in order to be inundated with more housing I also think it's ridiculous to think that this would provide affordable housing when we all know it's just another money grab or tax grab
- I support any measures that increase the density of our city's lowrise areas. This will help support local economies and make housing more affordable. I would also support getting rid of minimum parking requirements which should encourage more use of public transit and active transportation options.
- Fast tracking for 'affordable rental' is not a bad idea but could be abused. If done, it should include bringing seniors extended family which may or may not be considered under 'affordable rental'.
- The garden suite initiative together with laneway housing and laneway suites are misguided non solutions to housing supply that are being pursued due to mandated provisions in the provincial policy statement. They reflect industry lobbying (eg Lanescape) and are a flavour of the month idea that creates more harm than good.
- The quality of the build is important. Cheap construction can impact the neighbourhood.
- I would be more supportive if this was done in a way that would not increase parking congestion and reduce access to green space. The city's expansion of on street parking has made neighbourhoods less livable and more dangerous: if we put more people in these areas, that will make things worse. As well, we've seen during the pandemic how important access to green space is: fewer private backyards will make this worse.
- Toronto is in desperate need of affordable housing. We are also facing a crisis in Long-Term Care homes. Garden Suites offer a partial solution to both of these problems, allowing intergenerational living with greater privacy and independence than having everyone under the same roof, while also offering the possibility of rental income when not needed by senior relatives or young adults. We live in a city. If people do not want to be able to see or be seen by their neighbours, they should move to the countryside. I say, 'Yes In My Back Yard!'
- Extra priority should be given to building 'Barrier Free' suites and those suites that are designed to accommodate people with special requirements and those owners who want to 'age-in-place'.
- If laneway suites are permitted, garden suites should be as well, because they are a similar scale and use, while having similar impacts on the community. The energy efficiency targets of these suites should be high to ensure that builders and designers have the 2030 challenge in mind when implementing new builds on existing sites.
- Ideally, Garden Suites would provide more livable rental options in more neighbourhoods and help level out the housing/rental market. However, I have no faith in Toronto real estate and fear

that they'll just end up being smaller versions of Lamb condos (i.e. poorly built units that provide less than 455 sq ft of space that go for \$2000/month) rather than actual homes that people can live in, and do nothing to incentivize people to settle down in the city (or even make it affordable to the average citizen).

- We live in a large city that needs density and this makes sense as an alternative to living further from the city and commuting.
- Should have been allowed 50 years ago
- You make no mention of the Official Plan and the Plan's encouragement of green space. Why take the space away when there are thousands of available high rise condos?
- We need to gently increase density in Toronto in well-established and emerging neighbourhoods, and we need to create rental opportunities that are not high-rise, high-density, in areas that to date, have only been for owners, not renters.
- Most important issues are height and setback requirements to reduce impacts on adjacent properties.
- We are already dealing with out of control traffic issues, as well as increasing population density given all the condos and high rises that continue to be built. The expansion of the suburbs allows lower income brackets to take advantage of affordable housing possibilities without adding to congestion, deforestation, and radical loss of privacy that would occur with allowing garden suites. Further, the potential for abuse of these dwellings contrary to their 'granted' uses has not been addressed. Further, the infrastructure of Toronto is already under severe strain with outdated and crumbling water and gas mains, sewers, electrical grids. And when we are talking about buildings sharing laneways, we are talking about a radical increase of vehicle and foot traffic on lanes designed to allow access to parking on properties, not as thoroughfares. We must consider the population density that would exponentially increase if this is allowed. There is no more room for sidewalks or streets in the downtown core. One need only study the over-development that has happened in the Beaches, where lots have been subdivided and new construction has maximized the total lot space, eliminating privacy, trees, greenspace, light as well as maximizing traffic density and pedestrian traffic. This cannot be sanctioned without considering the long term effects, which would manifest in a handful of years, not decades. Strongly against this move.
- Government grants or incentives for home owners to build apartments and garden suites on their premises and in their homes. Renovation grants
- Very important no higher than 1 story. Reduce window size to reduce light pollution
- It is time Toronto caught up with reality. It is long overdue!
- I have some concern about scale, height and size. Are planners contemplating 2 story dwellings? This would concern me. I would have much concern about Airbnb rentals.
- if the City permits these, there need to be strict rules in place with no chances to fast track or cut corners and close scrutiny by CoA
- My neighbour has a secondary rental unit in his house currently and his tenants have caused us problems - primarily noise and parties. Jamming Garden Suites into the narrow lots in my neighbourhood will increase overall congestion, destroy backyard peace, privacy and atmosphere, as well as heightening risk of noise and other problems associated with rental units.
- I think it could increase the housing stock while also potentially providing rental income to some. For others it may allow extended family to live on the site. Toronto is a large dense city and I think more density is ok. I do support selective upzoning in some neighbourhoods as well as I have seen done in parts of Vancouver. I think it's important to think to a future where a city has more than 10 million people.
- Strongly opposed to the entire idea
- I think this is a terrible idea in a city without the infrastructure to support additional people. There are noise and privacy concerns.
- Please foresee it is time we need to think of the housing shortage.
- In my neighbourhood there are a myriad of high rises being approved. With the addition of Garden Suites I am very concerned about the environment and water drainage.
- For the last ten years we have built more condominiums than any city in North America. This not only increases congestion but a huge increase in tax revenue which should be applied to

affordable housing. Anthropologists have shown how space or lack thereof has impacted the outcome of societies.

- I think home owners should have the right to develop their property as they see fit, as long as this additional suite conforms to size and height requirements set by the City to limit overdevelopment of one site (ie, two equally sized homes on one property - the City should limit the footprint). As an architect, my clients want to convert their existing garage or coach house into a residential living space either for rental or for themselves. The current regulations limit this very understandable desire to maximize their property. Many properties already have an existing garage, or an existing garage has been torn down - many garden suites will not exceed this footprint. I think the regulations should allow flexibility in the design and solutions for maximizing space, whether it be excavating a 1/2 basement, adding a sleeping loft, etc. There are many ways to provide privacy with architectural tools like overhangs, privacy walls, angle of windows, etc. and I think the City should consider open policies that will allow for creative solutions to light, privacy, access, etc.
- My overriding concerns are: 1) privacy for neighbours and 2) loss of soft landscaping and impacts on flooding
- We should allow 2 car garages to be used as garden suites and instead take the building mass that would be for a garden suite to be used for storage. This way we take Jane Jacobs point about eyes on the street and turn these auto-focused homes into living spaces with windows on the street. The garage doors would be replaced by windows and you would also have less massing in the rear yard with a single story storage rather than a larger garden suite. Also, this would allow yards that are the minimum 25 ft deep to have a second housing unit. In addition streets that are just cars and garages would now have 'eyes on the street'. Require hedges plantings to soften the front of these snout houses.
- Do not allow short term rentals (Airbnb) in garden suites
- Garden suites are a total invasion on the residential community. There are numerous far less invasive ways of increasing housing, but the City can't even figure out how to get homeless encampments in city parks shut down so I doubt they will investigate these other options - such as residential over school and other publicly owned properties
- My parents live in a place where these are permitted. It has not added to the affordable housing stock, despite the best of intentions. It has driven up the prices as developers want these opportunities. It has led to short-term rentals, and the disruption that these often cause. It has affected the quality of life as the 'low rise' suites often overlook previously private garden space, and some are very ugly too. It has reduced green space. It has put a strain on local infrastructure which was not built with these extra households in mind...How about building up on the main streets - say 5 stories along Yonge, Bloor, Queen, etc. instead.
- **THEY SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED IN THE CITY AT ALL. WILL DECREASE PROPERTY VALUES AND TURN LANEWAYS INTO SLUMS**
- The wording of tree question was confusing. Trees should not take priority over a suite, but alternatives such as planting a new tree elsewhere makes sense.
- They should not be allowed. For all the reasons I have just stated. Although I feel I have just wasted all my time. City Hall only cares about what can generate money. And they have completely ignored the needs of the elderly, the sick and the disabled. This plan - as with most of your other plans for monetizing space - completely ignores them. Also it will reduce green space which is vanishing. Parks!! that eliminate grass, and trees and instead supply wood chips, stones and big rocks for people to sit on. Its a joke. Almost every new (hideous) tower has been monetized to the last square inch so we have streets with not a single tree. Guess its not required of new developments. Might mean they will lose a few square feet. Greed, and you have bought into it.
- My concern is with the property values of the homes around the garden suite (GS). There is no way to require builders of GS's to do so in good taste. In our neighborhood homes are 25 feet apart and we would be forced to live with a potential eyesore at or near our property line. Also, the number of people who live on a property could increase substantially which could interfere with my enjoyment of my property due to noise, parties, etc.
- We need them to provide affordable housing in Toronto but there's no way, I know of, to assure they will be affordable.
- I don't approve of them

- area character has to be maintained don't want streets to become parking lots, lot coverage addressed to ensure no flooding resulting from increase lot coverage, what is impact on infrastructure - water etc
- Should not be allowed in areas where there is street parking - would create additional streets on high demand parking. Should not be allowed in areas where lot size is narrow ... would increase noise levels and eliminate privacy in yards.
- LOVE this idea. Affordable housing is a huge issue in Toronto and looks to continue to be so for the foreseeable future. Allows us to create more housing options outside of hideous condo towers. Would also help owners pay down their mortgages that are now at ridiculously high levels. I am a first time homebuyer and while I feel very lucky to have a job that can afford to get me into the housing market at all, it's insane for a 30 year old to have to take on \$0.5M in mortgage debt when salaries have not increased to the same degree. Would also like there to be a requirement for long term (6 months+) leases only so that these do not become Airbnb rentals.
- I think its a great idea especially for families that would use the garden suites for their parents or another family member to live in.
- I support Garden Suites
- I am sending this in because hopefully it will offset a lot of nimby responses. We need this, desperately. Next!
- The idea of garden suites is interesting but needs a lot of thoughtful planning . The possibility raises a number of questions and some' of the answers depend on location, transportation, size of lots, orientation of the proposed building to the original building, questions about allowable size, height, school needs and effects, number of people to reside in the suites. etc., etc., etc.,
- Nope.
- Concerned about them becoming unsightly dumps. Also what about garbage collection and bins.
- I just did in the previous question
- allow these immediately
- Garden suites must have a 'rear yard' setback applicable on ALL sides. That is, for garden suite, side setback must be equal existing rear setback and existing rear setback must be preserved. The whole point of low-rise residential is the balance of green space, and privacy from adjacent properties. Plonking a garden suite close to the property line is negatively affecting privacy/noise of adjacent properties with no compensation. People bought houses with lots of certain size to provide distance from the neighbors. Allowing the garden suite to be built closer than rear yard setback ON ALL SIDES is tantamount to expropriation of the neighbor's amenities - expectations about privacy and noise.
- Flooding by paving over all of Toronto Reduction of green spaces making it a more concrete landscape Increased people in neighbourhoods where stability was presented when ppl purchased
- Yes, i think the City should allow more than one suite per lot if it is a bigger lot. This would unlock more land. This should be done if the buildings are respectful of heights and reasonable density limits are put in.
- Garden suite construction should minimize environmental impact: small footprint, lower impact materials, energy efficiency, minimal below-grade construction, etc.
- Appropriate design would be important to me. These suites should not devolve into shacks and size and scale should be closely regulated. They should fit in to the neighbourhood. Perhaps templates could be drawn up for people to choose from. There might also be limits placed on occupancy numbers to prevent exploitation. I do believe these suites, well planned and executed could help ease the housing situation for some seniors and students in this very expensive city. I also think they should be allowed under the same set of rules in all neighbourhoods to prevent the extreme NIMBY reaction which I am sure will happen in my hood.
- It is critical that seniors, new families, single people have affordable options as well as seniors who cannot keep affording or maintain their main home and need help, extra income that may come with a garden suite. Midtown especially was built too much as a suburb decades ago but today there is a need for more density and options for many not just the rich.
- Garden suites will negatively impact neighbourhoods. The City needs to find alternative means for affordable housing. This concept will change established neighbourhoods and force many to move from homes they have worked so hard to own.

- The survey didn't mention potential tax and utility bill implications. I am strongly against the development of Garden Suites for non personal use - (ie income generation). How is having a bunch of Garden Suites more sustainable and eco-friendly to having a gardens or lawns? Are our current sewers and electricity grid able to handle potential increased density that wasn't originally planned for? It seems to me that while well meaning this is a recipe for disaster and major conflict between neighbours.
- My neighbour has one already - not sure if it is permitted...
- get on with it!
- Noise and outdoor lighting is an issue. Removal of mature trees often at back of lots will be a tragedy. Registrar, Rent controls needed to ensure access. There are deep corner lots in my neighborhood that could facilitate this, but I would suggest windows be limited to owners side and street side as to keep privacy of other surrounding yards. Outdoor space the same, street side or owners yard. One story only, no roof top patios. All sides of building must be properly sided not cinder bricks. No dogs allowed No parking, bikes only. Good access to transit a must This could help younger families, lower incomes cover a mortgage. Rent controls , all must be registered, inspected carefully.
- No garden suites, please!!!
- Garden suites should only be accomodated through existing density zoning limits. you cannot max out the house and then add a garden suite
- If my neighbour put one in I would be pissed off. There are far too many negatives and unforeseen chaos will result due to: Overcrowding, Noise, parking issues, loss of permeable soil, no green space in your own backyard, no privacy in your own backyard. Reduction in neighbouring property values and enjoyment due to these issues.
- Should have happened decades ago! :)
- Eliminating green space for more impermeable surfaces, allowing more mature trees to be destroyed, providing more opportunities for land speculators to change established neighbourhoods and opening the door for airbandb rentals is a TERRIBLE idea. This city is losing its soul and is tone deaf to the needs of residents of established neighbourhoods.
- Good idea but seriously wouldn't want the five abutting properties at my rear yard to have one. A nimby I guess but I only see the personal issue and will derive no satisfaction. Basement apartments are a better approach.
- Quality and way of life of existing propery owners will be severely impacted. Garden Suites are not the answer.
- There should be strict building/zoning/size codes that do NOT allow for variances. What is the minimum and maximum size and occupant capacity allowable for a so-called 'suite'?
- Totally against - only if the existing dwelling + the garden suite total floor area is within the existing lot coverage
- There exist many backyard garages that aren't on a laneway toward the rear of the property. Building over these garages seems ideal as it 1. doesn't decrease parking, 2. will have a private lane plenty wide for access of people/firefighters/utility readers/postage-couriers and more. To do this, the garden suite would need to have the same side and rear yard setbacks as the existing garage, which in many cases is zero. This should be considered.
- This is a bad idea!!!! I do not want more suites built on city lots. City lots are not that big. Why is the city forcing more density in terms of individuals on a particular property? WE already have stacked townhouses. When is this going to stop? Let people go live somewhere where there is space. We should be trying to preserve our green space (as little as it is) - and that should include our backyards!!!! Bad idea!!!!
- flexibility of design
- I do not like them to be turned into airbnbs. The owner of the house next door does not live there and airbnbs. Guest leave feces all over and it smells badly. Parking is sometimes out of control. Strange people in and out on a regular basis does not make anyone feel safe.
- even though I agree with densification and affordability, downtown Toronto low-rise residential areas are maxed out and there are no by-laws or venues to help the current residents with issues i.e. not enough green space for residents during pandemic (working out on the sidewalks), noise issues where sound bounces off the bricks and disturbs sleep/work/recreational uses (late parties into the night), until these issues are addressed I don't see how Garden Suites would work

- As a newish resident of Toronto, I really want to stay and am very concerned about housing affordability. I would like to own property in the city and ideally move my parents here for childcare and ageing in place near to me. Initiatives that increase the number of residences on a lot make these goals more attainable. Also, my partner and I have an income above the median for renter or owner households and are still unsure if we can afford to buy. Housing affordability is urgently needed!!!
- Garden suites are one way to increase affordability of housing in the city.
- Don't let the NIMBYs stop this attempt to increase density!
- I think the only concern I have is around people using them as short term rentals.
- I cannot see how they can be permitted where they will impact on privacy and light of adjoining residential lots
- Hate idea
- The spirit is this is not financial benefit to the owner financial rather to allow seniors/ family members or children of owners to access affordable residential housing in Toronto that they otherwise would not. And help reduce the spread of subdivisions so fewer are forced to buy in the suburbs which are poorly planned and environmentally damaging
- My primary concern is about the garden suite's impact on direct neighbours, mostly in terms of shading and privacy. Increased density, in and of itself, is not one of my concerns.
- Flexibility: a Garden Suite in a residential area should be residential only but in a more mixed area with business maybe work from home or office space might be considered.
- no
- Protection of current zoning a must.
- Garden suites will make it even more difficult to enter the housing market. Investors will have a field day, putting up garden suites wherever they can and increasing the cost of housing overall. This city has already been spoiled. Garden suites will make Toronto less desirable. How will garden suites protect the city's tree canopy?
- Concerned that the parking needs will become increased and thats a major issue that would deteriorate the open and available roadway here in this neighborhood
- Love this idea. Great way for older family members to age in place and stay connected to community and family.
- They will lead to increased noise, strain on utilities, overcrowding , tree loss and decrease the property value of neighbours. Air B&B has not worked out well in condo buildings for other tenants and will be an added neighbourhood nuisance, parking on streets is already an issue, and how will a limit be enforced on the number of people occupying these units? its one thing to have a small granny flat but on a large scale these will be the slums of the future,
- Suites should be permanent, long term residential rental only. Short term rentals should never be allowed. Garden suites should be protected by the Landlord & Tenant act.
- height should be limited to single storey in residential location of 2 storey homes - e.g. not to intrusively block view or light
- Land is very scarce and valuable, if garden suites can be constructed to maintain privacy for neighbours and limit shadowing, it would be a sorely needed option for ageing family members or young adults. I am interested in this as a way to help my 84 year old father versus building a costly extension.
- It would be great to have more coach houses but also to have affordable housing that is accessible to transit and loved ones. Not everyone can afford to buy and if you are living like sharing accommodations so you can afford to live in the city it would be nice to live in a Garden suite separate from the house so you aren't disturbed or disturb others. Having access to gardens especially when you get older or less mobile is important to a person's mental health.
- Great consideration should be given to protecting privacy to neighbours impacted. Maybe less window density and more use of skylights. The height restrictions should note privacy into neighbours yards.
- they will make the city into a slum and will be very hard on the police and fire dept
- Need to have a policy on basements. Also need to discuss if there is to be a minimum size, and why. Finally - lot coverage?
- Do not support them

- Building a garden suite is currently more affordable than putting an addition on our home in east York. It would allow us to have a home office and guest space which in turn would keep us in the neighborhood
- It's not a good idea. There is already a range of living options with detailed zoning in place. This is changing the rules and I do not support it.
- don't allow them to be built. To hell with the province.
- do not increase taxes
- They would turn portions of this city into something resembling an above ground ant colony!
- We have an existing garage that we would like to convert into a garden suite but it would need to be raised up to prevent flooding. Suites should compliment the existing housing style of the community. Suites should be interpreted/approved on a site specific basis with respect to green space, mature trees, distances from property lines and accessibility to/from unit.
- Flexibility in locating garden suites to protect mature trees should NEVER be in question. A garden suite should NOT be permitted ANYWHERE on the property If there are potential impacts at the normal building site near the rear of the lot.
- Terrible idea
- Garden suites should only be allowed where the combined lot coverage does not exceed the average for the area and a specified percentage of the site is maintained as grass or planting. They should be restricted to 1- or 1-1/2 stories, with design features in keeping with the main building. There should be a limit on the number of square feet proportional to the lot size, perhaps as low as 200 or 250 sq ft. Their main purpose should be intergenerational living, or low cost where the main householder takes responsibility for care of the garden suite occupant. They should never be market rental units, or B and Bs. They should only be allowed where there is fire access as determined by the Fire Service. Maintenance of trees and greenspace is also crucial, as we are fast losing this in Toronto. Council should consider adopting the practice of other countries, when approving development, of ordering tree planting where mature trees are lost or tree coverage is minimal. Trees help absorb runoff and hide buildings.
- Not for short term rental
- Shantytown
- Great option that would allow residents the ability to maximize their property
- In place of garden suites, the city should consider taxing owners with more than 3 or 4 residential properties. That would dis-incentivize the real estate boom and lead to more affordable housing across all demographics.
- Garden suites will provide excellent options for those living in Toronto - multi generational homes, elder care, kids at university from home, etc
- Great idea
- Like laneway suites, policy should be simple and straightforward.
- This initiative is long overdue. Zoning should be specific and unappealable to avoid developers' ad-hoc resort to regulatory overturn of neighbourhood amenity and aesthetic assumptions.
- Due to COVID, nursing home is no longer an option for my parents. We thought about buying another house near where we live, but it's too pricey. A garden suite will be a life saver for my family. Just imagine the time and worries saved!! It will help the mental health of the seniors if they are close to the family. The city should at least fast track this regulation given the negligence the seniors had suffered during covid. I think there should also be special incentive for building a garden suite to take care family members. I'm not so sure about the garden suite as a rental, especially short term rental. There should be some crime rate study on that topic
- I hope they will be approved
- Th city has a desperate need for more affordable, low-rise and neighbourhood friendly housing options. There are simply too many condo buildings in the city. Covid has proven that green spaces and outdoor spaces are critical to citizens mental and physical health. Garden-Suites could easily provide some support in providing those needs to citizens.
- Let's do it already! Excellent idea.
- there needs to be consideration given to the lot size and built environment otherwise laneway houses will create overcrowding and lack of green space
- Many residents have old garages in their backyards that are no longer used for parking and the space could be put to better use. Some Toronto residents are already building additional office,

studio, etc spaces in their backyards. Garden Suites could enable intergenerational living or add to much needed, affordable housing in many of our residential areas. Income generated from Garden Suites would enable younger families to better afford homes within our city.

- Let's get with the times and make some progressive solutions to the housing crisis. Keep developers out of the equation.
- Stop trying to densify already dense neighbourhoods.
- See previous comments.
- On a lot by lot basis, permit approval should consider negative impact on immediate neighbours as a number one priority. eg. Wires, cables, power lines should not come over neighbouring lots. Proximity to neighbor's main house should not be less than proximity to owner's house.
- This is fantastic and should absolutely be allowed and encouraged! It has so many benefits with very few drawbacks.
- I think it would help to increase housing options in some residential areas. It can also help to protect the diversity and integrity of particular be subject to higher density development such as condominiums.
- How to ensure viability on very small lots? Allow roof decks to replace lost open space?
- Garden Suites are a vital way to improve density, reduce sprawl and help young adults afford living space.
- Thank you for allowing increases to Toronto's limited housing stock, particularly in the 'missing middle' between massive towers and (a few blocks away) single-family houses.
- Protecting green spaces is essential, using this as an opportunity to enhance biodiversity as part of their plan should be leveraged. Water management on site is a huge concern, will owners be required to plan hydrology elements? Less permeable space means water runoff of to sewers and neighbouring properties. How is the landscape being considered in this all? Someone with expertise planning these elements should be approving plans.
- I support lane way buildings but not garden suites.
- NIMBYism needs to be ignored. We need intensification in low density neighbourhoods to provide livable solutions to the housing crisis. It was time to act on this five years ago
- Not a great idea. As mentioned, it would certainly decrease the green space and will cause increase flooding which is higher now as larger houses are being built. **THEY SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED!**
- Garden Suite is a pretty word for Rental Box and will be treated as a Rental Box by owners and tenants. It's an awful idea for any community that prioritizes quality of life for its residents. The goal in planning should never be quantity (how many people we can fit into a limited space) but maximizing quality of life and providing the tools to residents to strengthen, take ownership and improve communities. The Rental Box idea is the wrong direction.
- I think that the suites should not exceed 2-stories.
- Need to increase neighbourhood amenities like parks, schools etc. If density is going to increase
- This is a great way to support inter generational living for both young and old. Also a great way for income for mortgage poor families. Need to consider the tree canopy please as we need to continue to think green space within the neighborhoods please!!
- I don't like parking requirements in general, but it looks like the 2 bike idea does not cost much and it helps offset some of the other big challenges that bike commuters have in Toronto. The bike parking requirement will be unnecessary when many people start bike commuting and this becomes a mainstream need. Also, the lack of car parking should not lead the city to allow more permit-only parking on streets. If residents need car parking space reserved for them, then they should be paying for that on private land.
- I strongly support allowing garden suites and think they would be a valuable addition to Toronto's housing stock.
- As soon as garden suits are allowed to be built without requiring them to be rental housing, we allow developers to build even more and cut down even more trees.
- Don't have them to big
- Privacy, transit, and parking availability (needs) for current residents needs to be recognized. Please plan wisely.
- Why am I filling this survey out in 2021. I should have been doing this in 2001. City is only 20 years late!

- not at this time- I need to do more research
- Some houses have a large/double garage that can be converted to Garden Suites. If the houses are close to public transit, or already have driveway parking, the garage should be allowed to be converted to a garden suite, provided it meets building and safety requirement. In addition, garage already have direct access to the driveway, so garage-converted garden suites would be easier for emergency access.
- They will ruin neighbourhoods. Block light from gardens and do little to alleviate the housing shortage in Toronto.
- Generally not in favour as it will be difficult to set appropriate standards that can be enforced.
- This plan will create financial incentives for developers making homes unaffordable for single families. Families will not be able to outbid a builder who will rent the suite out. Please please do not do this.
- not suitable for short term or holiday rentals given integrated into lower density neighborhoods with high visibility/low sound barrier.
- The lot size is a huge consideration & traffic/parking as well. It should not be a general rental issue, but a reasonable opportunity for families to stay connected. If rental housing is a City issue, then City can create that, but not by messing & cluttering established neighbourhood with what could be creations that resemble shacks. Considering individual tastes, this could create pretty tacky things that neighbours must look at over their fences.
- One of many examples of missing middle we have to embrace despite the change-management concerns.
- I unfortunately have zero confidence in the city's ability to properly implement Garden Suites in Toronto. There are a few locations in neighbourhoods where Garden Suites could be appropriate ie. where there is a detached garage on the property. But the city continues to allow oversized builds on properties and continues to allow the destruction of healthy mature trees. Favouring the desires of investors who have no commitment to the community over people who actually live in the community. The City has a growth plan for growth along the Avenues which they have not even begun to implement. Start there and prove that the City is able to grow in Neighbourhoods along the avenues. Prove they have the will to actually protect healthy mature trees. Once the city has proven the ability to implement some of the initiatives they already are to implement then we should consider appropriate neighbourhoods and locations for Garden Suites.
- Garden suites should respect the existing character of the neighborhood, trees and be permitted only to the extent that the surrounding infrastructure can support it.
- I am totally against increasing city density. Therefore I oppose Garden Suites.
- No
- We have 3 kids that are all out of our house currently and are away at university. This is a pretty common theme as many of our neighbourhoods get hollowed out. In order to support urban transit and the existing school infrastructure, there needs to be an opportunity to increase density in residential neighbourhoods. That might mean my independent 89 year old mother living in the Garden suite for some time, renting it for a few years, our children living in the Garden suite when they return from university, my partner and I moving into the Garden suite to age in place if stairs become an issue in the future or some components of all of the above.
- Please do anything to introduce more gentle density. My whole family lives in Toronto and I'm afraid of being priced out with this crazy real estate market. The less restrictions on these garden suites the better, and more possible they will be.
- Must be as of right. Toronto is becoming difficult for my kids to rent let own a home.
- The city needs to stop putting in luxury condos with studio and one bedroom units that do not provide the amenities for children nor do they provide for low income people. The developers are encouraged by the city planners/COA/TLAB to put in oversized, high end buildings that are not sensitive to our community standards and needs. The city has lost sight of their obligations to maintain quality environments for tax payers. The city needs to encourage low rise, affordable, with play areas, family oriented housing options.
- Great idea in theory, but I dread the poorly constructed, the improperly overly large or ugly, the improperly rented or occupied, an improper airbnb-type of use. Much residential building already is done on a 'do it and let them complain' basis rather than a 'get the proper approval first' basis,

and garden/laneway suites being somewhat more out of sight are even more ripe for abusive implementation.

- I found it difficult to answer some of your questions (it is hard to refer to specific questions as these are not numbered). Below are some examples: 1.How supportive are you of allowing new Garden Suites to be built in Toronto/ your neighbourhood? This is not a question to allow or oppose Garden Suites but rather to find out how many residents are interested in supporting/ not supporting/ indifferent to the development of this idea. In order to answer your question, one needs to be able to see policies and regulations. 2.Question about parking: This is strongly related to a location, access to public transport and amenities. 3.Should a Garden Suite be visible from the street? Why this should this criterion be considered in allowing a garden suite? I hope that policies and regulations developed would allow special treatment to variations based on specific local site conditions (slopes), existing trees, surrounding existing structures, others. Incentives: There should be incentives supporting this type of development which commits to affordable housing rate for a period of 10 years with a penalty of full repayment in case of a contract breach
- As the City is committed to achieving Net Zero buildings by 2040 for all existing houses, it would be absurd to allow new Garden Suites to be built that are not at least Net Zero Energy Ready [NZr] and Net Zero Carbon. Mandating that they not use fossil fuel for heat, and must achieve NZr (equivalent to TGS Tier 3) performance should be a requirement for approval.
- I'm surprised. I live in North York and share back yard fences with 4 properties, as it is. Zero privacy. Anyone of them putting in a garden suite means more noise, disruption, likely loss of trees and sunshine.
- This is a terrible idea. City infrastructure is already strained. Adding additional density will destroy the quality of life for everyone. In addition, allowing these will destroy the character of existing neighbourhoods. Please do not allow this. The last thing we need in this city is more poor quality rental accommodations and worse neighbourhoods.
- I am unsure of the concept.
- yes, they should be illegal.
- Good for affordability for family use. No rental
- Need greater flexibility to bylaws to reduce requirements of how close the garden suite is to the house, seize etc and special consideration for lots on a corner properties where access to the garden suite is from another street vs a lane of from the front of the house. It seems that despite laneway suites being allowed not enough are able to be built without going to committee of adjustment.
- There are many ways to increase density in residential neighbourhoods. The older plans of allowing diverse activities to take place in neighbourhoods (multi-unit, low-rise apartments, light industry, etc.) made areas very livable/workable.
- I am not in favour of this in my neighbourhood
- If permitted it will be critical that a strict size limit is adhered to and design must have some character so a garden suite doesn't just look like 2 cubes stuck on top of one another which is the style of many of the new houses in midtown. A process like the Committee of Adjustment cannot be allowed whereby people can continually request a permit for a larger size and it becomes a 'rubber stamp' whereby the Committee allows 'minor variances' regardless of the reasonable objection of owners of neighbouring properties.
- I'm concerned about privacy, short term rentals like air bnb, parking, tax impacts, impact on my light and sun in my yard, that they will be allowed to be built too high, that neighbours may not have a say in the building. Basically many concerns and I don't agree with this idea.
- Love the idea, I don't know if it was mentioned but also bring income diversity. Lower income people can share neighbourhoods with higher income people. This is better for society and infrastructure
- Make this a reality ASAP so that my husband (80) & I (750) can have one, thereby enabling us to remain in the community where we've lived since 1980 & our son to have our 2-storey home (which he can't afford to buy)
- I want to see so many more of them.
- Lot sizes have to be adequate to have room for the garden suite which is not available in my neighborhood. Will the garden suites actually be affordable? Builders will demolish older homes

and build a mansion and a smaller home as big as possible which will defeat the purpose of affordable housing. Lane houses are more appropriate.

- Toronto is too dense already without any infrastructure improvements to move these added people around. Street parking is insufficient for current needs and public transit is an embarrassment for a city of our size. Garden suites will only further reduce the amount of green space available to absorb rain water. Garden suites also severely reduce privacy within already densely populated neighbourhoods.
- In a city which has proved to be disinterested in or unable to enforce its current laws on renovations, basement apartments, multi rental single homes, illegal conversions, slum landlords, etc. this has to be the worst political decision I have ever seen by a Toronto council. The non-involvement of the residents until this late date smacks of catering to vested interests rather than the public good.
- Stringent approval process
- For the love of god please do this.
- The demand on city infrastructure will increase if they are permitted. Most city lots are just too small for such additional buildings!
- Urban planners need to visit the laneway sites during snow storms before approving their designs, as opposed as this seems to pressures for housing. There is no housing crisis in Toronto - there is a leadership crisis. Go through Etobicoke and Scarborough where there are thousands of bungalows, which could be converted to more housing. People are civilized about snow removal in Etobicoke and Scarborough, versus the treacherous conditions of Toronto laneways where people dump their snow on others' properties, and run away. Also, with the pandemic, the increased dog owners soil the existing properties intentionally, and this is a public health issue which isn't mentioned, and will increase with more density. Urban planners need to see this as well, since it affects the quality of the neighbourhood. We also can't put up personal cameras, in many cases, because of vandalism, and this will increase with density.
- Not keen on it at all. Too much building/ people density. Too much of a strain on water and sewage.
- Permitting garden suites are an easy way to address Toronto's housing crisis, and should be encouraged.
- They should not be permitted. They will junk up every neighborhood. There have to be better approaches to affordable housing other than garden suites. This is an ill-considered idea which will only add to density and ruin the value of most properties.
- It is a bad idea, that would lead to ugly, overbuilt, neighborhoods. The City has proven to be inept enough even with new construction - just look at the new 'cubed' 'family' monstrosities pooping up everywhere.
- Wonderful way to increase housing in existing neighbourhoods
- The permitting process should be super easy, and inexpensive. There must be an incentive to build these suites!
- Horrible idea that will instantly lead to abuse of regulations. People will ignore building restrictions (they already do when renovating/building and just pay whatever fines are levied as they aren't a deterrent). They will be used for short term rentals regardless of whether or not they are allowed to - people will ignore any & all regulations and the City doesn't have the ability to properly enforce.
- No garden suites!
- It should not impact immediate neighbours
- Great idea. Increases lower cost accommodation. Will definitely allow me to age in place.
- I don't like the idea of losing the green space.
- It is a new idea to handle carefully moving forward as the population of a community could easily be doubled without the resources to support it.
- Stop screwing around with land use issues. Let people accommodate this stuff within the existing parameters for their structures e.g. basement apts etc. Stop screwing around with peoples retirement nest eggs and destroying the fabric of our neighborhoods. Let Forest Hill, Rosedale and Bridle Path be the trial areas for this type of thinking.
- I'd like protection for it not to be used as a short term rental (e.g. airbnb) so it adds to rental market

- May have to consider restricting height (1 story) and size issues (less than 1000 sq ft)
- people may have cars and so take up parking spots on the street which adds to congestion. The big issue tho is one of privacy. I like my back yard being a private space and if there were a garden suite in my neighbour's yard I would lose that. I wouldn't want to live in a house that had garden suites in my next door neighbours yard.
- Short term rentals should not be allowed.
- I like the idea, but think it should be part of a slew of policies increasing density across the city. This isn't enough on its own.
- Elite's way to add more hard surfaces to their property. Will create more hard surfaces that accelerates already uncontrolled flooding. Even if the garden suite is for extended family members who may not mind people watching them through windows a few metres away, the neighbours will lose their privacy when garden suites look into their patio windows. Densification can happen quickly in Toronto with adding 3rd floor to zoning across the city. Look at the brownstone walkups in Montreal or NY City. Let basement and 3rd story additions for apartments happen. If the City wants more rental housing, the City should ask landowners why 66,000 homes are staying empty -- don't punish landowners with a tax if they have vacant homes (taxes just get passed on to tenants) but cooperate with them to understand what would create fear to forgo income generation -- there are 3 times more homes sitting vacant than rentals converted to sort term rentals (AirBnB) and why is that? A greenwashed storage shed in the backyard is not the solution, it actually shows clearly the problem
- Interesting idea, lots of research should be done. We need more green spaces in our city, not fewer.
- No Airbnb rentals. Possible long term lease. Our preference is to add space for a home office or space for visitors. We have room on our driveway for another car, if needed
- Will the fire department let people build them? Plenty of laneway suites can't get build because of firetruck access. Won't this be a problem for garden suites too? I am totally for more density and way more rental spaces, so I hope there are some solutions! If a 13 story high-rise can be build and firesafe, why not a garden or laneway suite?
- Garden suites are a great way to allow homeowners to make extra money through affordable rentals. Renters can enjoy living in a backyard instead of an apartment, encouraging community interaction. It also allows for the elderly to have their own space and live near their family. They are a great solution for students and grandparents hoping to live cheaply within a beautiful community
- The lot should be large enough to adequately house the two buildings.
- There is a lot to consider....there is no guarantee that they will be affordable...I am concerned about neighbour hood safety...
- Get on with it!
- Renters should not be allowed. To setup businesses in garden suites that would draw more traffic into neighbourhood. Should there be a limit on the number of renters or could 5-6 plus people rent a suite. It's very difficult to evict atena t who is not cooperating with bylaws, not paying rent or damaging property. The more density in a neighbourhood, the more pressure on services which are already stretched to the limit. Small cities like Orrilia, St Catharines, Collingwood have so many more amenities to offer on a per capita basis and so much more recreational space to enjoy. The city already is too crowded and it appears the closeness of neighbourhood is disappearing. Will pets be allowed in suites. As density is increased, will our health care system in Toronto be expanded as well. Having more people occupy the same space is never an ideal or progress. Romberg the city planners and sociologists' "density breeds morbidity " We already have enough examples in Toronto and for the past 40 years are finding it difficult to help our families who live in such conditions with enough support , educational opportunities, social services and preserving safe, drug and crime free neighbourhoods. Let's do a better job for the present population before embarking on other challenges in these times of limited resources
- Provide incentives for connections to the street to get heating (gas), water, sewer, hydro when it is complicated or too far to get it from the main house.
- I feel strongly that this should not happen. This survey assumes that those filling it agree that garden suites should be built and deals only with the how. I totally disagree with the concept and therefore did not answer some of the very leading questions. I object to the city treating us as if we are fools.

- What about safety concerns? How would fire trucks or emergency services reach a garden suite without having a laneway. Before even thinking or planning even starts about any garden suites an assessment must be done for safety. This may include specific lot or land size for said building. I rather think this survey is ridiculous...trying to ascertain private info from participants about their financial stability.... Many new mega homes are being built in old neighbourhoods that local sewers, water lines can't handle the new infrastructure before upgrades are done. I find this survey a JOKE, poorly thought out questionswhat is the goal or purpose for this?
- This opens the flood gates of people building garden suites without permits and becomes a long term problem of dealing with this through the city and neighbors. This could be a long drawn out ordeal. Also what's to say these don't block a view from Your back yards? And the amount of traffic will increase in areas that already has traffic logs and already growing housing developments. I am Opposed to this definitely.
- Garden suites are mainly a concern because, unlike laneway houses which are little bother and often located adjacent to garages, garden suites are likely to be adjacent to neighbouring backyards. There is a real possibility that they will negatively impact the neighbouring properties' for reasons of privacy, shade, noise, over-densification, etc. There must be strict and well-designed regulations for how large and tall the garden suites can be and how close to the property boundaries they may be placed, similar to how there are currently rules for backyard sheds, etc. An appropriate way to regulate garden suites would be to make use of current zoning rules which dictate what percentage of a property's area can be built on. This would allow garden suites to be built on properties on which the main house occupies only a relatively small portion of the property area in such cases, there would presumably be sufficient area in the yard to build a garden suite that is setback from neighbouring properties to an extent that it would not unfairly affect the neighbouring yards. However, houses covering a large portion of their property would not be allowed to build a garden suite as they would thus be deemed to have insufficient yard space to accommodate a garden suite without unfairly affecting the neighbouring yards.
- Garden suites will reduce the stability of our treasured neighbourhoods and erode the benefits of home ownership and they will drive up prices everywhere. Garden suites are a shortsighted response to the housing shortage. Since they have been imposed on us they should only be approved on properties where: 1) It has been verified that the owner of the property has actually lived in the home continuously for two years. 2) The owner has the full support of all residents, whether they own or not, and owners who's properties surround the subject property including those at the corners of the subject property and residents and owners of the homes directly across the street 3) The owner must also have majority support of the broader neighbourhood ('broader neighbourhood' as defined by 4.1.5 of the Official Plan). 4) The builder of the Garden Suite will be financially responsible for the removal of the building and restoration of the natural ground. 5) The builder will be registered with the Province or the City so that the financial responsibility for removal and restoration can be enforced and failing that the province or City shall be financially responsible for removal and restoration. 6) Within two months of taking ownership a subsequent owner of the property can demand the Garden Suite be removed by the builder or an owner subsequent to the builder. 7) Where the subsequent owner to the builder does not request the GS be removed, the subsequent owner takes financial responsibility for the removal and restoration
- Your survey is biased towards allowing Garden suites. Shame on you
- Lot coverage, an essential aspect of allowing ground water absorption to minimize flooding, must be maintained and not reduced. Impacts of noise and loss of privacy to neighbours must be considered. Over densification can be harmful to neighbourhoods as can loss of valuable green space. Short term rentals in garden suites could entirely ruin the fabric of a community.
- no one
- A beautifully designed and built architectural Garden Suite home can elevate and accelerate a home property value, add more living accommodation (which is much needed in the City of Toronto). The only aspect right now that is slowing the down the progress is all the bureaucratic red tapes (Zoning regulations) that not only prohibit such development but also creates a tremendous delays within the design, built and inspection process.
- We feel both garden suites and laneway housing rules need to be accessible, not overly restrictive. We need much, much more housing in this city. Any way we can accomplish this

without having towers everywhere will add to the style, character and atmosphere of our neighbourhoods. Thanks

- No rentals with terms under one year to be allowed. Parking should not be provided: understanding would be that the residents would have to use either public transportation or taxis etc. to get around ... or have parking on site. There is limited space, especially during festive seasons. I fear that some people in garden suites would want to have more than one space - absolutely not. Architectural and construction quality has to be equivalent to those for main houses. As part of the design, there must be requirements to minimize the visual impact on neighbours - to be incorporated as part of the planning process as an approval item.
- Water runoff from more housing and covering up land
- If this is allowed...homeowners who have made sacrifices to own a home with all of the responsibilities to maintain a property will now lose their privacy and rights...
- Most of the houses in my neighbourhood have already been rebuilt to maximize interior square footage thereby significantly reducing exterior, soft-scaping that would have helped reduce the negative environmental impact of these unnecessarily large single family homes. By allowing garden suites, green space will be further reduced causing even more environmental problems including the already outrageous amount of rain run-off from most properties which is overloading the sewer systems at present.
- This is a very bad idea. The issue in Toronto is affordable housing and that is a development issue. A garden suite in my neighbor's back yard would have many negative impacts on me personally and on the street. Most importantly it would do little to solve the lack of affordable housing for low income earners. This idea is a cop-out.
- The building of a garden suite should be subject to the lot size, the tree and lawn size of one property it is built on. Same building regulation should be imposed as the main house. Public infrastructure such as sewage, parking, school, public transportation should be also considered given the population density is going to increase in the city.
- I am very concerned about increasing density, noise and impact on infrastructure and environment. We extended ourselves to buy property where we have some green space. The traffic in our neighborhood is already dangerous.
- This will crowd and congest already dense neighbourhoods further contributing to existing problems.
- They should only be allowed to be 1 storey high otherwise neighbour privacy, light and views are seriously compromised.
- Let's get going!
- In our neighbourhood most lots are so tiny not sure how this could work
- For me the aesthetics plays a big part. There are beautiful ones in areas such as forest hill, rosdale. If they are built with aesthetics in mind, it can create charm in a neighbourhood. Otherwise people have this idea that garden suites will look junky and attract rift raft in their neighbourhood.
- When do rate payouts get a say? Or is this a "done deal" and you're just trying to smooth it over? I have 3 voters in my home who are adamantly opposed to garden suites - does that count?
- Put up small units in unusable spaces around the city...not in already crowded backyards
- Toronto needs to expand rental inventory anywhere possible and maximize space use for living and working. The ecological and financial losses from lack of housing are massive and garden suites help single-family-neighbourhoods ramp up density at an acceptable place. Allowing for small-businesses like coffee shops/bike repair/etc makes neighbourhoods more interesting and enjoyable and fosters community engagement. Garden suites make sense and it's imperative to build as much as possible.
- A truly deplorable idea fraught with potential abuse and chaos.
- Many areas of Toronto are experiencing flooding issues due to over building on residential property. Garden suites would further exasperate this issue. Toronto needs to prioritize natural green space in both public and private settings as part of the plan to reduce floods.
- Spacing of living accommodations should be made to limit the spreading of viruses.
- I think this is a horrible idea. You already every contractor building rebuilt houses well over allowable size limitations. Adjustments are always given. Same thing will happen with these buildings and a neighbourhood with 20 or 25 ft frontage will be jammed with nothing but buildings.

Contractors and builders will have a field day and mostly absentee owners will invest in these. I strongly oppose is proposal. I will move out of Toronto.

- We are totally against building Garden suites within our Community. Some unscrupulous landlords were cut in the past buying several large homes and packing up 25 renters in these homes without living there themselves. These are unhealthy and fire hazardous conditions that residents like us had to fight and report to have these closed. We do not want to provide further opportunities to pack a bunch of people in a garden suite and destroy the quality of life and the beauty of our Community.
- If a person is renting out a garden suite it should be inspected annually to ensure a safe living environment for tenants. The owner would be mandated to pay for this inspection with additional property taxes. A garden suite would require special classification if used for income / rental purposes.
- Setback from property lines is a key consideration. Mature trees must be protected and all tree removal considerations must remain in force. As stated earlier, I support garden suites for family use (e.g. guest suite, multi-generational living) and work from home purposes, but NOT as rental accommodation (including short-term rental, i.e. Air B&B)
- I'm mostly concerned about the height and any over reach.
- noise limits need to be strictly enforced (eg. someone who sets up a rehearsal studio) these Suites are closer to other peoples homes vs. the primary dwelling. I think the other issue is now that the property has move building and less green space - the heat signature for the city will go up - therefore a home owner that wants to build one should have to pay for trees planting in the city. All what about water run off? There will be less land to absorb water - perhaps this needs to be taken into consideration.
- Approve them as soon as possible. No pilots. No phased approaches. No evaluations. We are in a housing crisis. Respond to it.
- Impractical idea. It won't be cheap to rent. Potential tax free income will be difficult to monitor. Limited parking because renter will most probably have a car. Parking is an issue today already, not every renter will only own bicycles.
- I would like to see priority given to single women living alone. There are lots of resources for families and couples, but very little for single women who are middle-aged or older. Garden Suites would be so much nicer to live in than the places we're forced to live in now because we have no family/spouse.
- Distance from neighbours and sight lines are critically important. Also, a home should not have both a freestanding garage and a garden suite. They should convert the garage to a garden suite instead.
- Good idea, but enforceable protections very necessary. 'Maitre chez lui'/master of the home must remain protected.
- Most ridiculous idea I have ever heard to increase density where we need less.
- As long as it's done in a high quality way. It Must look Beautiful!!! No Slums!!!!
- I would love it because then I could utilize it for both my elderly father and autistic brother. This would offset any burden on the system at large. Caregiving could be done on my property! Amazing.
- Limitations on height and protection of mature trees are important to me. It's critical to keep in mind density and amenities to support the potential increase in local population.
- Laneway suites are more suitable and likely should have less restrictions, which Garden suites should be available with no laneway, but should impose more restrictions.
- Noise from occupants, air conditioning, is a large concern, shadows on adjacent property, light pollution
- Garden suites are especially useful in the inner suburbs where lots are large and population densities are dropping these can help maintain population densities, and allow for multi-generational living or ageing in place. Consider condo-like or co-op arrangements for garden suites, so the owners can have additional choice in housing tenure (not just renting).
- Min lot sizes and setbacks need to be considered. Impact to on street parking and access to transit.
- Garden Suites is a grave mistake that could destroy the aspect of our beautiful green city like it did in Europe

- Should only be a single level. should be comparable to a 1 bedroom apartment
- They don't need to be visible from the street as long as there is a clear indication that the suite is there visible from the street. And there should be safeguards for tenants, for example requirements that there is adequate lighting at night from the street to the front door, and more legal supports set up for all tenants in low-density neighbourhoods.
- Grass should be outlawed. Natural earth zones on property should be required for growing food.
- while the intent is to provide Affordable housing the negative impact on the community will be very significant.
- There's too much potential for abuse with Garden Suites. By that I mean short-term rentals.
- Garden Suites will cause a damage to quality of living in the city.
- I think a good idea!
- Do not want to see Airbnb, or rooming houses.
- Remain under 500 sq ft and up to 15% of total property area to be accessory buildings.
- this city is bad enough there is not enough room in the city for garden suites. I do not want a suite backing onto my yard with more people living there. Its bad enough with clogged streets and subways. Allow people to move to another city
- Totally unacceptable. Dont need the income and dont want the expense of building. I like my privacy.
- Glad the city is pushing for this initiative, we are in desperate need for housing alternatives and ways to smartly build density. Can't wait to see this get approved, the sooner the better!
- The lots in my neighbourhood are about 1/16th of an acre. To my mind, that is dense enough for ground-based housing. What would be the point of ground-based housing if you don't have any back yard left? So, if there is to be Garden Suite housing, restrict it to lots of bigger sizes, so that the 60-some percent coverage still applies.
- great idea to increase good housing stock when the cities have become so unaffordable
- Privacy will be highly impacted. Garden/ trees will be reduced which is not good for society. Instead of separate building, permission for multi storied building will be more effective for meeting housing demand without impacting backyard.
- Toronto neighborhood homes are already pretty much crammed together . This has got to be one of the worst ideas our government has come up with so far. The people proposing this should ask themselves would they like it in their own backyard. I wonder how many would vote "yes"
- I am already seeing inconsistencies. A neighbour build a similar structure that is at least 250 sq ft with a heat source, made of brick, etc. More like a small house where the rest of us are required to only build 100 sq ft sheds. He also raised his yard 6-12' and built a 6' high fence. I complained to the city and received no response. This is already changing the nature of our neighbourhoods and impacting drainage. For the first time in 20 years my yard flooded including my shed which is 6' above grade and had 4' of water in it. The city is becoming unlivable and too crowded.
- Adding garden suites to the backyards in many neighbourhoods will significantly change the character of those backyards. Garden suites shouldn't be allowed in a neighbourhood (or a group of adjacent backyards) unless the majority of property owners want them. In cases where only a minority want them, the character of those backyards should not be changed to satisfy the desires of the minority against the wishes of the majority.
- As well as causing an erosion of neighbourhood property values, Garden Suites present a Pandora's Box of regulatory problems if difficulties between neighbours are to be avoided and deteriorating street and traffic conditions are to be prevented. The proposal is neither imaginative or new, but simply the result of advocacy by social entrepreneurs. The issue has been raised on countless past occasions and properly always rejected.
- I would really like to not be priced out of renting in my neighbourhood or the whole city due to lack of options. Please make more opportunities to stay!
- Strongly disagree
- Opposed!
- I'm quite torn about this, as on the one hand I think this could be a wonderful new type of housing, but on the other hand I worry it will end up being at the cost of trees and green space, which help keep the temperature lower in Summer and with preventing flooding. I think strong preference should be given to applications where there is no net reduction in green space, i.e., where the space taken by the garden suite is replaced by green space elsewhere (e.g., in

removing driveways), or where it replaces a garage or so. Obviously, these worries are much less strong for laneway housing, since in those cases the house typically replaces a garage.

- We think this housing form provides the most cost effective way to add more housing in our neighbourhoods. Can garden suites include housing on private lanes and where lots have a side street - or a through street - location with the same exemptions on GFA and parking allowed in the lane suites by-law? These are unfortunately excluded from lane suites permissions and provide equally good opportunities for homeowners to participate.
- My main concern is around the density of structures on the property. The area that I live in is already crowded, new houses generally take up a much higher proportion of the property than older ones do so there is very little land to build anything else on. Even for the older smaller houses, the amount of surplus land to build something like a Garden Suite is very limited and would lead to overcrowding. Parking on the street will become a big issue in areas with Garden Suites, even if the residents don't own a car, visitor parking, delivery vehicles, etc. will be an issue.
- I don't like the idea. It changes the overall character of a dense neighbourhood. I could see this as being something to consider in an area where there is more land per lot but a very bad idea in my area.
- Concerns around privacy for the neighbours and the height. Perhaps limit it to studio unit that are intended for one inhabitant. Definitely no short term rental (ie Air BNB). Would this have property tax implications for the homeowner or neighbour? Lots of environmental impacts such as increased lot coverage, loss of trees, greenspace etc. Definitely should have a green roof system. Also would the garden suite have a basement therefore displacing even more groundwater and highly doubt this would greatly reduce the housing crisis. There should be a greater focus on midrise buildings along main roads.
- I can see this failing miserably if treated as income properties. If they are for rental income then the assessments and taxes on the property should be commercial not residential. They should have reasonable setbacks from adjacent properties and buildings, they should not over-ride tree protection by-laws. If a granny flat or garden suite used for an aging in place relative is truly used for that purpose there is a stronger argument in favour. I don't see how this can be enforced long term as aging relatives don't live forever. I think it is the thin edge of the wedge to turn stable, family focused residential neighbourhoods into uncontrolled, transitory rental zones - especially if short term rentals are allowed rather than family members only or leases of a year or more.
- They're great!
- We are interested in this housing option for our elderly parents who cannot afford to rent in Toronto. We would like them to live in our home but it is too small. Having a garden suite would allow us to be close to them to help them when needed, and would allow them to continue being independent.
- Garden Suites should not be permitted to be used as retail or commercial space.
- I think this is great and long overdue. I hope the city will decide quickly to allow garden suites and allow a variety of styles and be flexible. Allow zero lotline where it makes sense is a good use of space - ensure orphaned spaces are not created that collect needles and garbage.
- Needs to be some minimum lot size/frontage/etc. to permit them. We live on a 25 ft frontage street and I am unsure whether the lots are large enough for garden suites. Keep in mind that garden suites potentially have more impact on neighbours than laneway suites, the latter are always at the back of the lot (and not abutting the lot behind) and in many or most cases there is already a structure there. Max. lot coverage/min. open space should remain unchanged. Garden suites should be limited to 1 storey. Should have a max. gfa perhaps on a sliding scale relative to lot area. Should have appropriate setbacks from lot lines and main dwelling (at least 1 m). Otherwise should be flexible in location as long as to rear of main dwelling. No relaxation in tree bylaw requirements. Recognize the intent is to allow garden suites compliant with the rules to be build as-of-right. However, some form of consultation with at least the abutting neighbours should be required.
- The city's real estate market is broken. I would love for more affordable rental options to exist, and for more family-friendly rental options to exist. This is possibly one way for that to happen, though if it's like laneway suites, many will be too small in square footage to raise kids in, so just adding more 1-bedroom microunits that the city already has plenty of in the rental pool. Moreover, the physics of heating and insulating two smaller spaces with two furnaces, etc. vs. one larger

space means that this approach will lead to more greenhouse gas emissions. Indeed, are garden suites large enough for high-efficiency furnaces, or would they be heated with electric baseboard heaters? So while I want to see more rental units, and more family-friendly rental units, this is probably the least good way of doing that. I know you're not looking for blank-slate proposals, but I hate to put down an idea without alternatives. The first is to make more deals with developers that bring in larger rental units (even skip-stop tower designs) on 'the avenues'. Allow more height/shadow/etc. if they fill the building with 1000 sqft 3-bedroom rental units rather than 450 sqft studios, and build a playground on site. The second is to allow three-storey triplexes in all the suburban areas where the garden suites are being considered instead. Three units in one envelope will be more efficient, and save the backyard space for shared use/preserve trees/etc. while also potentially allowing for more liveable unit sizes and layouts (e.g. a basement and 3rd floor with single floor full footprints could be 2-bdrm, and a main+second story with 2x footprint could be 3-4 bdrms, vs 1-bdrm or studio garden suites).

- Garden suites should be built for young adults along the adjacent land where railway line is on Dundas Street West between Royal York and Runnymede. They could put tiny houses there. It would solve a lot of housing issues for young folk
- Majority of EXISTING Toronto property LOTS are ALREADY SMALL. Increasing density INCREASES STRAIN on existing OUTDATED infrastructure from ALL utilities to ALL services. Increased density shifts more financial increases to property owners - renters do not pay property taxes. Developers and Builders do not have to live in the aftermath of their 'industry', homeowners do. Quality of life for existing neighborhoods should be valued. Development of vacant commercial land for 'affordable' housing mandating increased fixed rental pricing introducing municipal revenues from other sources such as 'Tolls' on our Highways and increasing taxes to large companies/corporations would provide more for Toronto than 'Grandma' in the backyard Garage.
- Dangerous, far-reaching, desperate move which will only cause more crime, danger in every neighborhood they're in. Strongly opposed.
- This is not an appropriate solution to the housing problem. In some cases this will put extra strain on areas that are already high density, traffic will increase, loss of total privacy for neighbours, no guarantee that rents will be or remain affordable. Depending on the demographic I am sure there are other creative solutions to address our housing shortage.
- Not in my backyard!
- Garden suites will encourage cash-strapped homeowners to build just about any structure on their property without regard for adjacent properties. Rented out, they will create privacy issues, clog neighbourhood streets with cars (few ride bicycles) and will forever cause issues in established neighbourhoods. Developers are already capitalizing on laneway suites in the west end to overdevelop properties, and are affecting neighbouring properties' home values. People are having to move when these overdevelopments are approved. Laneway and non-laneway suites are a planning mistake all Torontonians will have to live with for years to come-and should not be allowed.
- The lot coverage should stay the same. Most city lots allow too much coverage and neighborhoods are ruined by the huge houses squeezed in. You should only be able to build to the extent the main structure does not use the allowable coverage.
- Some of your questions, e.g. financial incentives, are already farther ahead in a planning process which implies that this is a done deal and the city is just doing the survey to say you did it. Unless a property is at least 1/2 to 1 acre, a granny suite, rental unit or garden suite should not even be considered by the city. This is a tax grab with huge negative consequences on crowding, sewer and other services, traffic, parking, noise, loss of sun and garden space in yards, less green space with increased risk of flooding in neighbourhoods, etc. etc. Developers will also use this to argue there are more low rise units and therefore they can fight to build more super high rises. This is a very bad idea for Toronto.
- This will help out so many struggling Torontonians find affordable, close to home housing, built on existing properties without the need to tear down infrastructure.
- To be approved as soon as possible
- -our area does not have street parking so this would be a problem for extra vehicles -concerned that this would become solely a way to make extra money rather than help the housing situation -

monster homes have already affected the drainage in the area...wouldn't another building just add to this problem?

- This is a stupid, ill-conceived plan in a city which is already over-populated and is not dealing well with current health issues and issues borne by poverty. Are garden suites going to help tent city dwellers? Are garden suites going to help new immigrants? Most city properties are quite small. Many have already been significantly renovated with variances granted which are questionable. Adding yet another building to a lot which barely has a backyard or front yard for that matter does not make sense. People who want to maximize rental incomes from the property will flock to the areas where garden suites are allowed. Renting the main house and exterior buildings for rental income does not lend itself to building the types of strong neighborhoods and communities which we need in this City to counter the big city impacts we are already confronting. I vote "No" to this plan.
- I think the property should be large enough to accommodate a building and not feel like you are downtown with buildings all around. There should be enough room to have cars park on driveway or street. Right now the area I'm in has no driveways but they have a lane way which is not used. The owners all park on the street
- Will add to excessive density in the City
- I lived in Chicago back in the mid-2000s and coach houses were very common. I lived in one myself, and have been interested ever since. Ideally, I would like to build a coach house on my property for my Mother to live in, so that I can keep an eye on her, while also providing some space for all of us to live.
- Laneway suites to me are a no brainer. These are different. I worry about the overbuilds, access to emergency personnel and parking. We are highly congested as it is!
- Great idea to help create more rental inventory in the city and provide home owners with a new income stream
- This is a great option for families and for renters who prefer not to live in a high rise. Most objections apply to any current allowable housing options. Some neighbourhoods are already incredibly dense which doesn't seem to negatively impact approval for big development projects. The scale and number of garden suites that would be built are dwarfed by these large projects and would add much more character and welcome housing options.
- You need to make sure that there is serious oversight by the city and bylaw officers
- Lots in my neighbourhood are too small for garden suites. Basically a house close to me managed to build one and it looks awful. Not sure how they got it past COA
- They should be allowed in a range of sizes including small suites on small lots
- Resist the literal NIMBYism, which this beneficial policy will invoke.
- I believe that we need to increase density and provide more rental housing, especially in areas close to transit, where residents won't necessarily need a car. It's important to me that green space is not completely eliminated, and trees should be preserved whenever possible.
- what are minimum lot sizes to allow? not clear
- Think it is very unique and should be given lots of thought and protection be given to neighbours who are opposed to this.
- Prefer single storey
- The property should be large enough to allow for easy access from the street for emergency purposes. The Garden Suite should only be one story high. It should never be used as an AirBNB.
- Garden suites must be very strictly planned and regulated.
- Garden suites have a real potential to insidiously destroy a neighbourhoods character by creating dense infill housing to the point that peacefulness, privacy and lines of sight are disrupted, street parking is impossible and amenities are overburdened. Some owners will jump at the possibility make cash and depart for another neighbourhood - but neighbourhood policy should not be made for them, but the residents whom plan to live long term in the neighbourhood. Neighbours of residents whom construct 2nd dwellings (a 'Garden' suite) will pay the price but will have nothing to show for their pain. I strongly object to Garden Suites, despite being a home owner who could make a quick buck by selling out my neighbourhood..
- NO to AirBnB type short term rentals. Very problematic where mature trees might be lost impacting several properties' shade, beauty.

- I think the whole neighborhood should be considered
- It will give older homeowners an option to move into it when downsizing or have a family member move in or simply rent as a mean to be able to afford to stay in your own house.
- The can be used to help Aging parents to keep out of homes. Helping your children till they can get on their feet. The space is there so we need to utilize it and do it in a modern fashion.
- absolutely no air B&B or other short term rental
- I think the densification of low-rise residential areas will be negatively impacted, especially where parking is eliminated that green-space and ground drainage elimination is unacceptable especially where main property lots are already small with large homes (flooding is a huge and growing challenge and making all ground on smaller properties non-drainable is counter to logic and dangerous to all residents in an area where ground drainage disappears) that livable communities never include a preponderance of 'all concrete' property/lots with high densification, and negative impact on privacy on all neighbours with increased traffic in backyards.
- As I said earlier, we already have overbuilding permitted in our area. It is an area of feeder streams for the Don River, so the water table is very high so putting more concrete in the ground would cause more problems. Sewage and flooding are a problem. We already also have traffic issues as well. Schooling would also be a problem. Privacy is an issue as well.
- The earth's population is approaching 9 billion. The impact of humans is far too great for people to survive. We are in a declared state of climate emergency, when Man's occupancy of the earth is more than 60%, and Nature's is less than 40%. The Royal Geographic Society in the 1960s ruled that natural wilderness should occupy 60%, and humans should occupy 40% of the earth's surface. Pandemics are caused by this distribution being out of whack. The population is predicted to shrink once the 9 billion figure is reached. One mature tree supplies the oxygen requirements for a family of 4. I don't see this information acknowledged anywhere in this proposal. How can apartment buildings supply enough oxygen for their inhabitants? Many refugees would like to return to their homelands if their countries were stable and safe. How many of them have been making trips back to their homelands, adding to the climate crisis?
- Limit the height to 14 feet. No exceptions no opportunity for committee of adjustments. No exceptions. Proper drainage if necessary. Only use house utilities not separate and make sure there is enough green space around it.
- I don't like the idea at all. The city is already struggling to hold and be able to service current residents. Garden house will not be rented out at affordable rates as there is a high cost to build. Any person who purchases a property with a current garden house will have to pay an inflated price (as we see happening now with houses who have basement apartments) which in turn causes higher rents to sustain that inflated purchase price.
- not at the moment, aside from impact on property taxes
- I dont want this in my neighborhood. It has already turned into a ghetto with people buying the home and renting them out not maintaining them and living elsewhere. It's deplorable what's happened to our neighborhood
- Really terrible and destructive idea, goes against all neighbourhood planning and community relations, has multiple loopholes for landlords to exploit tenants, makes real estate planning a nightmare, lowers property values, destroys gardens and home environments, creates even more disastrous street parking problems, and will not alleviate housing shortages.
- Most lots in this neighbourhood are small (e.g. 25 feet wide). Putting a Garden Suite in most backyards is pretty impractical if you still want ANY open space. Privacy is already hard to come by and I think the addition of Garden Suites would certainly make a property less attractive to prospective owners in this area.
- No, you've covered it all
- The city should be using all levers to promote all forms of housing, including garden suites. Incentives should be used to create affordable garden suite housing, but the need for affordable housing should not be used to prevent the development of market-rate garden suite housing.
- Not turn them into another Airbnb fodder for the city
- please let them happen, sooner rather than later, we need more housing options in Toronto. all we build are super tall condos or single detached/semis. so many more different forms would be beneficial, don't let developers say it isn't economically viable. make it so that a 4 or 6 storey is just as attractive to build

- Please fast track a pilot project and create more permanent rules based on experience over 2 or 3 years.
- Doesn't seem like the sort of thing housing-affordability advocates should get behind. I think it's more important for neighbourhoods to include mid-sized apartments. This seems a distraction and probably has worse impact than apartments which will at least have their own lot, not cramming more people onto the same lot. I might be persuaded otherwise, however.
- Need to keep green space and trees. Not to overwhelm and overlook existing properties and change the character of the neighbourhood.
- Garden suites significantly alter the character of a neighbourhood. Rather than making sweeping decisions for all of Toronto, this should be addressed at the neighbourhood or Ward level and take into strong consideration the views of property owners/property tax payers and renters. If a majority favours garden suites, they should be allowed.
- I would imagine the people who have the most interest in a garden suite are likely people who do not have large lot sizes and would do this strictly to earn extra income and ignore what their property looks like and how their surrounding neighbours feel.
- **THEY SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO BE BUILT. THE PROPERTIES IN OUR AREA ARE NARROW, 30 - 40 FEET WIDE. ONE GARDEN SUITE BUILT IN A BACK YARD WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT 5 OR 6 NEIGHBOURING HOMES**
- Again, garden suites cannot solve the problem of housing affordability. This form of housing also heavily favours homeowners and gives increased incentive and power to homeowners, rather than directly assisting those facing housing affordability or security issues. Additionally, in comparison to slightly higher density housing types such as a four-plex or a low rise, garden suites are incredibly inefficient in terms of floor space and sustainability.
- This is the worst idea to come out of City Hall in a while. The building industry will obviously be happy.
- Yes. Garden Suites should not be allowed, not in urban Toronto. The lots are too small for additional dwellings. Toronto would look like a Rat City, cramped with too much structures and people squeezed into tight spaces. Also the infrastructure does not support Garden Suites in Toronto. It's more geared to rural areas or huge lots that have space. This is a poor excuse of a questionnaire obviously biased to support Garden Suites in the city.
- should not exceed height of main house, requires permission from 360 degree adjoining neighbours if they want to include a rooftop patio
- Having lived in many large cities around the world, Toronto's density is feeble. Also, adding accessibility features to older houses, is a difficult retrofit. Since many often have large yards, allowing fit-for-purpose new construction is great use of space. The existing housing market is causing massive imbalances that are dangerous for Canada. These planning changes are a small step in the right direction.
- We need these— only so many condos we can build. There are lots of deep backyards on my street and they could be housing
- Can a garden suite be built on top of an existing garage?
- These questions seem to indicate garden suites are a forgone conclusion. The answers may be yes in many cases but doesn't necessarily mean garden suites are the correct way to obtain these outcomes or even if they are necessary. If you answer yes to them it sounds like you agree with them because they are true. Really misleading.
- Really bad idea unless overwhelming majority in a residential block wants them.
- I would love to build a house for my adult son and his kids
- Toronto is LONG overdue for these! Please fast track. Ignore Nimbys!
- There should be no incentives for sustainable building, the code in Toronto needs to change so that ALL building is sustainable.
- I live in a forested area of the city with many mature trees. Over the years I have witnessed the loss of these trees due to development, renovation, pools and the addition of parking pads and hardscaping. As a result there has also been more flooding. I strongly believe that the addition of Garden Suites will do more harm to our natural environment and put greater pressure on the existing infrastructure.
- Concerned about the rules and regulations that will define built built, set-backs, etc. in order to protect the privacy and enjoyment of property of the adjacent neighbours, possibly on three sides.

- Would eliminate green space. Cause more flooding from sewer overflow
- 2 story max , make use of existing detached garages.
- Many European cities have wonderful models of infill housing that focuses on enhancing communities & serving families, professionals, seniors etc vs Toronto permitting developers to overwhelm neighbourhoods with high-rises while giving next to nothing back to the neighbourhood with no concern for schools, recreation facilities & infrastructure like water pressure-lots of talk yet minimal delivery to enhancing the neighbourhood. And surely you could find a software program that could spell neighbourhood the Canadian way!
- I am very concerned about the impact on adjacent properties, homes are already quite densely built in my area and I can't imagine having building in the back yards it will reduce neighbouring property light and views. If the city goes ahead with this plan it should only be on lots of larger sizes.
- I love to walk around interesting neighborhoods when I travel abroad. I think Laneway suites would be fascinating to incorporate into our Toronto neighborhoods. And help with housing affordability.
- No
- incredibly invasive issues with parking crowding. loss of privacy noise shadowing loss of neighborhood
- Will need to ensure sewage, water, drainage impacts of the suites is managed properly to avoid negative impacts.
- Do not bring this to Toronto. We do not have the infrastructure to support the potential exponential population growth from this notion. Save it for cottage country. Not acceptable in Toronto!
- Toronto is an ugly disparate city without obvious plan and services ,disjointed ! A few section have green spaces and beautiful houses but the core of the city is not attractive , plaza ,fountain ,mini park , centralized arts attraction like in other world capital .
- I think it's a great idea if thought through carefully but without too much bureaucracy
- It's a madman's idea and I am surprised that people are even talking about it.
- I believe this is a grand idea. It would create more rentals and opportunities for families to be looking after each other/closer to each other.
- My land is 25 x 106, like many in the area without driveway access. I can't image a 2 storey 'suite' in anyone's backyard. Privacy could not be provided. Maybe OK if family member. Must consider size of lot. Should always have space for greenery and trees. Definitely no ABNB's.
- Building a garden suite is unfair to neighboring houses that had not expected to live next to a multiple dwelling house. Please look at other cities such as parts of Los Angeles where Garden Suites are rented out for short term rentals (e.g. AirBnB). Owners go around rules and tell people to park in garages or on other streets to bypass AirBnB restrictions. Toronto is starved for green space, as can be seen by the crowds in ravines during this pandemic. Backyards and other greenspace is precious. Please do not allow further concentration within already dense areas.
- I think it's important to consider lot size to ensure the neighbourhood does not feel like a low rise multiplex area and neighbourhoods don't lose margaie certain charm.
- This is a great idea especially for residents in the core without laneway access
- I would not want to have any of my neighbours build a Garden Suite. Properties are way to small to wedge in more people and buildings.
- Less red tape in the process will make it easier for homeowners to build Laneway/garden suites. The city needs more housing and this is one important tool to do that. Reconsider zoning options to make more interesting and exciting neighbourhoods.
- Should be made financially excisable (example: banks offer extremely lower down payments and monthly payments) I think the government should help by maybe paying half of the initial down payment. Especially for people, families and seniors making under \$25,000/yr people OW and ODSP. Basically I believe Garden Suites should be built for Low Income people, families & seniors (esp ones on OW & ODSP, Because this would be the ONLY CHANCE they would EVER have a CHANCE to own their own place...EVER.
- Make existing severed laneway properties developable as well. Ban all future severances, but for those already severed, they should be developed.
- Great idea

- Alternatively this can be a creative way fixing the problem of affordable housing. Regions in the US have found great success where homeowners build and rent garden suites to tenants or rent the land to would be homeowners. This can be one of the only ways that urban residents can afford homeownership especially in the Toronto market. These builds will also create density in the city and build vibrant neighborhoods. I strongly support the addition of garden suites and tax incentives to those property owners who are renting the structure or land at affordable prices to tenants.
- Garden suites will cause overcrowding in neighborhoods 2. If you rent it out and find the renter does not follow the tenant agreement, it is IMPOSSIBLE to evict renters with the current landlord-tenant laws. 3. Reselling your house will reduce the value for the next owner. Not everyone wants a Suite their backyard.
- Roof lines should not shadow adjacent properties. Privacy to the property at the rear must be respected. All rainwater must be collected on site. No additional street parking permits should be issued to accommodate garden suites. Garden suites MUST be built with fire suppression systems (sprinklers)
- Should not be for short term rental, like B&B
- Absolutely NO to airbnb in Garden Suites
- Needs careful planning rules for lot coverage to ensure protection of trees, enough garden/natural space, light and privacy.
- The architectural design of the Garden Suites is a very important factor to guarantee their functionality. This way we avoid adding low-quality housing options to the city. Moreover, there has to be a strict measure for the affordability of the Garden suite if the main purpose is to provide more housing options for the renters.
- How to deal with emergency access condition where there is not enough setback on the site but requires neighbours setback space too - permission will limit neighbour's rights. Laneway houses have the lane as a safety measure. Spaces between houses in my neighbourhood are 3ft or less using both setbacks and are often used for storing garbage cans. Do not give incentives for garden suites used as extra space for the house. Height limits should relate to lot size and shape - small lots only one storey.
- density in neighborhoods is always a plus!
- Size of lot, remaining green space, distance from main house, distance from property lines , maximum number of tenants are all considerations. Major hurdles to have neighbourhoods change so dramatically.
- I would strongly consider building a garden suite to accommodate my aging parents. They would be able to have independent living while still being very close to me. I do not want my parents to live in a long-term care facility, especially after what we discovered during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- A very bad idea.
- They are a bad idea that will lower property values, build congestion, overcrowd schools and neighborhood amenities.
- Neighbourhoods aren't the result of bad planning- they're the reason Toronto's core wasn't hollowed out in the 1960s and '70s. While building garden suites, along with laneway suites and side by side lot splits, can be a tool to gently density Neighbourhoods, if done wrong it will be used by the development industry as a can opener to pry denser developments (multi unit dwellings) into Neighbourhoods by stealth. And sadly, the Provincial structure in relation to how planning decisions are made, basically ensures that if the City voluntarily accepts greater density in Neighbourhoods in sensible ways, greater density in forms which will negatively affect quality of life (i.e. garden suites of too large a scale, in the wrong places, and then multiunit dwellings on single family lots) will follow. This has been demonstrated in our neighbourhood, where the community supported rezoning to permit lot splits within a given distance of the major avenue- whereupon subsequent TLAB appeals allowed lot splits to expand to the entire rest of the neighbourhood. The existing built form, and the quality of life of existing residents, is held as unimportant in this process.
- For most neighbours not a good option
- This is another plan for increased building activity. The 'affordable housing' crisis is not a housing, but an affordability crisis. The solution should be reduced speculation by extending the primary residency capital gains period to 5 years from 2021 onwards in step 1 and 10 years in step 2.

Also the 'plus 1' rule for capital gains on residences should be eliminated. This will focus the building industry on required infrastructure projects, and will make existing housing more affordable by reducing speculation.

- Strongly opposed to garden suites. I haven't work hard, contributed to society in a positive way, saved my entire adult life and paid/pay tons of tax dollars to have my home and neighborhood become a rental community.
- I do not agree with this idea. We are on top of each other as it is and this will put more pressure on our infrastructure.
- This is a preposterous idea. Too many ideas are already destroying the fabric of downtown to satisfy the vocal liberal minority, ie too many bike lanes, taxes spent on affordable housing. Residents should live where they can afford it. The city needs decent circulation to keep up its economic viability. Commerce in the city is being choked by reducing circulation while bike lanes on most routes are hardly used, but councillors cater to the vocal cyclist lobby. They should be restricted to minor arteries that are easy for cyclists to use, not main arteries.
- This is an excellent initiative with the potential for many positive uses of these buildings. Please ignore all the NIMBYs who hate change.
- We live in a city with a housing crisis - garden suites will increase supply and contribute to more housing. We need garden suites / laneway housing.
- Garden suites would provide options for seniors to maintain independence and stay in their community. Too many 3-4 bedroom family homes in Toronto are being occupied by single seniors who feel there are no options for them. There needs to be an attractive alternative for these citizens that is not long-term care or apartment/condo buildings which will free up family homes for younger families with children.
- We need housing alternatives in our growing city
- Parking requirements are outdated and do not encourage the switch to an environmentally responsible city.
- There is an urgent need for it in Toronto, please cut the red tapes and proceed immediately.
- Stop using any excuse to increase population density with no regard for schools, parks, transit, community programming, traffic/roads, recreational facilities and general quality of life.
- This whole idea is stupid
- Homeowners should be incentivized to provide this additional from of housing on their properties, to enable more people to enjoy the benefits of living in Toronto's low rise neighbourhoods.
- What you are proposing is the overcrowding of existing neighbourhoods. We used to call such a situation a 'slum' and people fled them when they could. When you have developed all our major arteries to a height of 6 stories with underground parking and terraced green space, then other SENSIBLE proposals (additional high-rise) might be considered.
- Neighbours should have a veto over the construction of garden suites on adjacent properties. These suites will increase noise , reduce privacy and yard enjoyment, and will reduce property values, making it harder to sell one's property.
- Stop disrupting stable communities with your obvious preference to making Toronto ugly with "low cost housing" and disruptive to taxpayers who spent their lives developing our communities. Just stop!
- Poses too many problems in neighbourhoods
- I think they are a great idea and should be exempt from all vehicle requirements and "neighbourhood character" complaints
- Why is it taking so long to get this going?
- Not supportive as rules and regulations are difficult and timely to enforce. For example alot of illegal sheds on properties are already built. Many homeowners cannot even agree on property lines and fencing requirements.
- Please make it easy to build garden suites and do not impose requirements that are more onerous than building a semidetached home. We should also make it as of right to build these garden suites especially when the builder signs an agreement with the City to rent at 80% AMR. Write the new by-laws to encourage garden suites in neighbourhoods that are currently exclusive and expensive with large lots. Also remember in parallel to introduce zoning reforms that simplify the ability to sever large lots that are wider than 9m into narrower lots that are under 5m wide. Thank you for all your work and research.

- I hate the idea of people building glorified sheds and flooding my neighborhood with even more people it cannot already handle. Who's increasing sewer capacity, school capacity & all other social services needed? It's already maxed out. Everything!
- Allow conversion of Shipping Container into (modular) Garden Suites.
- a very important and long overdue initiative for the city
- I have seen figures for the cost of garden suites (given lack of access for machinery and delivery of materials, these are quite high) and also a report that indicates that these units are not generally affordable unless they are occupied by non-arms length persons (I.e., relatives of the owner of the house). There are a few examples of laneway suites in my neighbourhood. They are very large 2 storey structures that tower over the adjacent properties and exacerbate privacy and shadowing issues. When such structures are not on a laneway, there would be yet another property that is impacted. I understand that in some jurisdictions "as of right" garden suites are limited to one storey. This makes eminent sense, as it alleviates much of the shadow privacy issues, and larger buildings must be justified on a case by case basis so that these impacts can be evaluated. In the absence of a lane, what provision for emergency services will be made? Regarding affordability, I have heard from professionals in the field that the price of a property with laneway suite potential has already become higher than a property without such potential. In other words, up zoning of the property (to allow laneway suites) leads to increase in the cost of the property, which will drive up the cost of constructing a laneway suite. Do we really expect that these units will rent at "affordable" prices? The same trend in prices will surely happen with garden suites.
- They sound great! Let's do it.
- Garden suites are desperately needed to provide at least some relief to the housing affordability crisis in Toronto.
- Just make it easy to build them please
- Should be restrictions on use of garden suites for short term rentals (eg Airbnb).
- My neighbourhood already has some, what I think would be, "grandfathered" garden suites. They're great. No issues to report.
- I'd love for the city to look into/support some way for people to build and pay for a garden/laneway suite and take on a portion of the ownership of the land. Home ownership is out of reach for lots of people, but many more could potentially pay for a portion of the land from the existing owner (and have a shared interest of some sort) and pay to build the garden/laneway suite. This way more people can move towards ownership rather than have fewer people just continue to gain more and more land wealth while others have to rent from them. I think the city could support some sort of legal structure to make this feasible
- I think the city should be encouraging people to plant more trees in their gardens, not pave them over. The only exception may be if they replace an existing garage with one in which case it wouldn't be changing the character of the neighbourhood much or losing green space. Owners of investment properties in particular will generally not care about these things, they just want to maximize profits. It would be very detrimental to the city in the long run.
- Poorly thought out idea. Better to have more duplexes etc along the street scape. Only people who do not live near them support them. The suites will be used for air b and b. They are noisy as those who live in them have a different lifestyle. Not a bike in site. Only cars and trucks. I had a proposal next to my property that would have three separate units over garages each two stories high. The nearest house would have been 2 metres from the rear door on my main house. The windows in these units would have looked into my kitchen bay window and my upstairs bedroom bay _ The building would have been 6 metres high and run for 10 metres the length of my back yard from the back of my house to a point past my garage. There would have been a shadow on my yard a good part of the year. This will happen in many locations unless this initiative is planned very carefully.
- Affordable housing is a crisis in Ontario. I don't think Garden Suites will help as there seems to be a never ending demand for housing. We need regulation and real ideas that will work to allow families to live in affordable good homes. Also, the size of units has grown so small a normal human can't fit. I worry we are allowing smaller and smaller units that simply aren't ok. People deserve some space.
- I hope this is available to all parts of Toronto

- Sized for up to 5 people similar to a 3 bedroom apartment/condo (at least 2000 sq ft) if it is to be a true housing option for folks
- Planners have a holier than thou, paternalistic attitude towards existing residents, minimizing our resistance to their policies. This initiative is part of that longstanding pattern.
- I think it's necessary to consider affordability when pursuing these new policies. While I don't expect garden suites to be a panacea for Toronto's massive affordability crisis, it would be a hugely missed opportunity and misalignment of priorities to not utilize this opportunity to ensure/encourage affordable rental housing. I also think the language around the topic should be clarified somewhat — the survey doesn't mention the word garage, but that's clearly what we are often talking about with Garden Suites (Eg converting a non-laneway facing garage to become a livable space).
- A lived experience for the policy planners... I used to live in a coach house in the west end of Toronto for a year in 2019. As a young single woman, I was often afraid when I entered the backyard alone at night to get to my unit - safety is definitely a universal design concern for these types of units. The coach house itself had some deficiencies, which were a result of it being converted from a cement block structure to a residential unit (LOL), including shoddy plumbing and uneven heat. A novelty experience that soon wore off its allure. I liked the landlord and had a good relationship with them, but left because it was not affordable. I paid \$2150 a month in rent.
- This is a great idea that must to be implemented so that people who are like me that do not like the condo can live in rental that is not the basement and it is still in the city in area of houses not condo. It is a perfect idea for city that is Toronto without more houses that I can afford for.
- I would prefer Garden Suites to be occupied by immediate or extended family, although I can appreciate the need for more rental housing in low-density areas. However, is there a way to ensure that such rental housing is affordable?
- Garden suites are a very small part of the puzzle. I appreciate that the city is looking at them but let's not pretend it's a big step to housing affordability - it shouldn't be framed as helping affordability as there aren't going to be enough of these to make a dent in the current issues. This is just about housing choice
- I don't qualify for lane way housing to create multi-generational housing. I am hoping for the approval for garden housing to keep my family within distance
- They should not be allowed on a property with mature trees if those trees would need to be removed in order to build.
- I am quite concerned about garden suites being used not for family members (e.g. elderly parents, which seems to me an excellent use) but for pure commercial reasons (rental income), with owners renting both the house and garden suite, and negatively impacting privacy and quality of life in neighbouring properties. This has the potential to turn residential streets into lines of rental properties with no owner-residents, further eroding quality of life on streets. The idea of creating new, affordable housing through garden suites is worth considering but we do not want to turn our streets into rental blocks instead of neighbourhoods where people put down roots and enjoy community life together.
- There should be a limit on the number of Suites per neighbourhood, strict limits on size as it impacts on neighbours, strict limits on usage...ie numbers, strict limits on quality of construction.
- There needs to be heavily regulated. Garden suite should only be allowed for office space or for earning income purposes. I'm opposed to people using the suite as rental properties as it cannot be regulated. It's a risk to people and children in agent properties. I will not feel safe in my own home if there is a rental garden suite adjacent to our home. I hope you will reconsider allowing it as rental or affordable housing.
- I think it's a great idea and if the sizing is accurate to a person's backyard space and what the property borders on to like a park for example people should be allowed to build something like a garden sweet to help their own families in the community with extra rentals etc...
- The city has too much density as it is. Citizens struggle to get access to public amenities and city services struggle to provide sufficient support. Allowing this type of housing introduces more problems. Tax unoccupied condos and there will be more than enough space. If we keep building housing without city amenities Toronto will fall into disrepair and no one will want to live here.
- This initiative has the potential to kill neighbourhoods, disrupt heritage, and damage trees. The city needs coop housing not airbnb rentals, which is what these would become.

- As is Toronto isn't already a concrete wasteland: this initiative threatens to still further reduce habitat. Backyards provide valuable space for the city's wildlife, which aren't being considered at all in this initiative. STRONGLY OPPOSE.
- City should incent developers that are tearing down small older homes to build affordable multi-family residences on the site. Duplexes and triplexes should be encouraged to create more affordable family housing. Large premiums and high ongoing tax rates should apply when a developer proposes a huge, single-family home to replace a modest home.
- A terrible idea that will lead to/encourage the proliferation of shoddy and substandard "shacks" by greedy and unscrupulous landlords.
- I built a garden suite/coach house five years ago and was charged a huge development fee. Is the city going to waive development fees in future? No mention of this in this survey.
- Are there permitted options for plumbing like composting toilet etc that might not require sewer hookup - eco friendly and also less costly. Similarly, powered through solar power rather than connected to hydro. Rules regarding noise - air conditioner, sound insulation in walls etc. To buffer noise made by the garden suite that is now closer to the neighbour's houses. Rules re: windows and balconies looking over other's backyards.
- I think the main use should be for the elderly. Elder care is expensive and being able to have them close enough for the family to look after but still maintain their independence and privacy.
- Garden suites propose a an opportunity for families to grow and change in place. My brother has a developmental disorder and will never be able to live completely on his own. A garden suite would allow him to live with relative freedoms while providing more space to my mother to live out her golden years. I believe that garden suites can solve a range of issues as families grow and shift. Furthermore, if the unit goes unused by the family then it can easily add to much needed rental stock. In order to make garden suites a success, its important to make the permitting process as clear and easy as possible. Laneway suites have a complex building permit process that I think needs to be refined. As-of-right garden suites with clear criteria and design guidelines, as well as a specialized desk or contact at the city, would go a long way in supporting people in building garden suites. Beyond ease of use permitting, existing green energy grants that are provided by the city should somehow be rolled into the offering. I'm not suggesting you need to create a suite of green energy incentives from scratch, but use what you're already doing and ensure that every permit that comes into the city for a garden suite gets an offering or an option to apply for green energy grants.
- Toronto needs to expand housing options - it's a great idea.
- I think it's great but I really think affordable rent is critical. I would hate to see the garden suite modernized and then rented for \$2000+ Monthly. Rental costs are far too high in Toronto and I could see owners taking advantage of this to pull in as much income as possible.
- Suites should not be allowed to be built at rental properties that adjoin single family homes.
- I've been trying, unsuccessfully, to get a permit to build a 2 storey coach house for about 3 years. I have a huge lot which is perfect for one so it is about time that they are approved. The lot size and access to the yard should be a major determining factor in approvals. And incentives should be provided to making them barrier free for aging in place.
- Eco-friendly and good design that blends into neighbourhood.
- Garden suites allow seniors to live close to their children who can live in the main house. The senior can enjoy the neighborhood they used to enjoy allow them to travel and at the same time, not being forced to move to condo in order to support senior life style
- This is a great initiative in some ways, but smacks of too little too late. It advantages already wealthy homeowners who will be able to earn even more income off the backs of renters. While it's a step in the right direction, the real solutions are government built truly affordable housing (none of this below market BS) and using the city's influence to pressure Dog Fraud and the cons to pass rent control, mandate truly affordable units in new developments, defunding the police to fund rapid housing programs, and ending the entirely necessary poverty that is a feature not a bug of our current systems, including using the thug police and thug streets to homes workers to harass and displace the already marginalized sleeping rough or forced to endure the city's crumbling shelter system.
- I think it's a great idea and should definitely be allowed in a city this densely populated.
- Strict regulations for garden suites. No short term rental allowed. No airbnb. Only for long term rent or owner use. No commercial use with high traffic business.

- Unfortunately, with the increase in world population, all cities will become as crowded as Hong Kong or Mexico or any other presently large city with its attendant drawbacks, pollution, poverty and financial inequities. Yes, by intensifying the residential accommodations we can increase the number of people in Toronto. To what end? The world is a closed biosphere, from which we are currently depleting the resources and destroying the environment. We cannot keep on doing it without consequences. Sustainable growth is an oxymoron. Only when there is a balance between what is taken out and what is put back in will it be sustainable. Therefore, I am totally against garden suites in low rise residential neighbourhoods. Since the city is under pressure to increase the housing stock, new regulations will be passed to allow for all kinds of intensification. This may alleviate the problem for a few minutes, but the cost of housing will never go down. Just like the more highways you build, the more cars will use them, the more housing you build, the more people will come in and the cycle will continue.
- I believe Garden Suites are a great idea and would help the city deal with rental shortage. Please don't fall into the NIMBY trap here ensure that approval are quick and not onerously bureaucratic. Too often it takes months or years to get approvals for some very common sense projects. The city should be an enabler not a roadblock to creating density which is consistent with the overall intent.
- Yes, this should not be a pilot. Considering the lack of affordable living spaces in Toronto and the vacant homes (speculators) has not been culled as of yet. This project needs to move ahead in 2021 if not sooner. Due to a majority of workplaces now shifting to remote work, we need to focus on building out our homes to substantiate the increase to our living space. The average working space in an office environment was 500 sq. ft. per individual, if we add 500-1000 sq. ft. of new garden suites this will only necessitate current demand.
- No Airbnb
- I trust that Toronto will fully research experience in other jurisdictions. Australia has had rules for Granny Flats for many years, including rules and requirements to suit particular areas. I'm sure they also have background on what works and does not and why. One website that describes some of this is <https://www.diygrannyflat.com.au/granny-flat-zoning/> I'm sure there is a lot more available. It is also my opinion that the City needs to deal with the propensity to build bigger and bigger houses on existing lots (including pushing the so called minor variances way beyond reasonable limits), resulting in, ironically, less room for possible garden suites and houses with 5 or 6 bedrooms, 6 or more bathrooms - and two people living in them. It does nothing for densification unless these huge dwellings in fact become future 'rooming houses'. If the City wants space for garden suites, in the first instance stop allowing massive new houses.
- Look to simplify the approvals of this so as to get them out the door and under construction at 95% of sites if desired. Not everyone will do this, uptake will be minimal and slow...make it easy if you want uptake and actual impacts to housing stock/options. Keep up this great yellow belt breaking initiative!
- I want one.
- I think this is a wonderful idea that will allow aging grandparents to live independently (have their own space) while being able to benefit from being in close proximity to their support system. Housing prices in Toronto are so exorbitant that the cost for an elderly couple to downsize to a bungalow is just not possible.
- Just another example of the incredibly poor planning in Toronto and one that is sure to generate more overcrowding. Australia has a policy where new immigrants are required to live in a small town initially on entering the country. This could work here- instead of jamming new immigrants into the city
- They are one of the best options available to balance the need for densification with preserving neighbourhoods and increasing affordability for both renters and first time home buyers. Lack of parking will also further encourage use of transit which is a sustainability goal and will be needed to meet TTC funding requirements in coming years.
- I have added comments in the relevant sections. Some questions I said 'not sure' because the question was posed so broadly that i could not have a view or I didn't know what you were asking. I think this is more about small scale developers and property owners making \$\$\$ and less about good public housing policy. If really out for concern for housing and people, there should be a REQUIREMENT that ALL Garden Suites and Laneway Suites represent an opportunity for more affordable housing. This would work for Granny, inter-generational family

situations, people with disabilities, people who can only afford modest rents. They should also: respect adjacent neighbours, protect existing canopy tree or if none exists be required to plant a canopy tree, and make sure that a backyard has abundant soft landscaping (not decks or paving). Parking issue should recognize: even people who ride bikes in the local area still have cars for other travel needs, people who have bikes still drive traffic and parking needs in the neighbourhood (deliveries, visitors, etc.) Primary properties have a variety of situations (driveway, front parking pad, and street parking). Street parking is the best for trees/green space, but is limited and competitive.

- For us, this might allow us to continue to live in a supportive community that we love as we get older. Otherwise we will be forced to sell and leave the city as we have no pension. Thank you for considering this option. We really hope that you will find a way to make this work and approve it!!
- Any income would be taxable, and Garden Suites would affect property taxes and capital gains. There are also issues of sewage, parking, electricity, mail delivery, access, etc., etc. I fear that homeowners would build thinking only of the income they think they would gain, only to realize the drawbacks afterwards. Fine for relatives and/or caregivers, but not a good idea to turn average people into landlords.
- I am very concerned that this initiative is moving forward without seeing an evaluation of laneway suites (which is supposed to occur) to see if laneway suites are meeting the stated objectives, including affordable housing. I am also very concerned that there should not be 'one-size fits all' rules for garden suites where lot size and other circumstances in the city vary greatly. My concern extends to the size of garden suites- they should be limited to one-storey (and not a high one-storey) to protect privacy and avoid any opportunity for overlook and shade, and should have substantial set-backs from the backyards of adjacent lots.
- This is a great initiative that should be rolled out quickly and made easy to design and construct in order to provide affordable options that don't require living in a condo in Toronto. Especially with Covid-19 and physical distancing being the safest way to prevent infections.
- Do not support Garden suites,
- I think that special consideration should be given to corner lots where a detached garage can accommodate a garden suite above a garage similar to a laneway suite.
- Please don't make the rules so convoluted that no one can actually build a garden suite without going to heroic measures.
- I think it might be practical in some areas of the city but not all.
- Should not be allowed
- They have a purpose but our neighbourhood will not use them for all of the reasons described in this survey. It will be developers looking to increase profit when they tear down one of the existing old homes in the neighbourhood. We see it time and again. Cheap materials and monster size houses. They are not going to rent these suites as affordable housing or granny flats. It will be pure greed. And for that, I will lose my backyard privacy and sunshine because of some massive new construction overlooking my backyard. Quit trying to position this as altruistic and contributing to Toronto growth. It will not be the case here. There are already two garden suites in our row of houses and they are nothing but an eyesore and certainly not rented out.
- I think Garden Suites and Laneway Suites should have a fire inspection and a visible PASS by the inspectors if it is going to be used as a living space. Maybe extinguishers should be a requirement in the building, smoke detectors (heat sensors and carbon monoxide detectors) inside and outside too.
- There have to be strict permit and zoning requirements.
- Don't make too many regulations. We desperately need more housing in Toronto, so we should allow garden suites
- Have heard they are wonderful for elderly relatives - live nearby but have independence and privacy. A good idea about using it for home office or independent businesses.
- Given the size of properties in my neighborhood, I don't think this is an appropriate next step to develop housing. It would increase congestion for public amenities and have potential negative impacts on neighbors and impact their ability to enjoy their own properties.
- affordable housing energy saving on physical structure of the building - ie. geothermal heating, solar powered roofing

- I have a 51 foot wide property with ample space next to the house to build a 500sq foot gardensuite. I would like to use it for transitional housing e.g. woman fleeing violence or for other situations where it is beneficial to provide housing for individuals who would benefit from also being within a community. Concentrating affordable housing has other social challenges. If the city were to support the construction of the gardensuite I would be willing to set offer the site as a pilot. Otherwise, I would need to build to rent at a higher rate.
- We are opposed to the idea. It will double the population of our street, radically increase congestion, destroy our neighbourhood's character, we will not have places to park on the street, increase street traffic on a quiet street with kids, have a negative impact on trees and light in the backyards, and create noise pollution due to construction for many years to come.
- They sound great! Let's make them happen everywhere and make our neighbourhoods more lively and exciting!
- Make it easy with a clear path to approval. It should not take years and \$75,000 in fees, consultants and charges to build one affordable unit. City Planning should design a process that is solely administered by Toronto Building staff.
- We have 3 neighbours adjoining. One is already a rental because the elderly owner went into long term care. The property is getting messy. One has mature adult children who have moved back in with parents - there are now two barking dogs, and this family have pool parties and play music very loud very often, all summer long. One also next door is a lovely elderly couple. We believe there will be a teardown/rebuild of the two homes to either side of us at some point, and are already concerned that general contractors are not licensed, and that demolition contractors don't require special permits, and with the increasing number of bad builders and monster homes in the neighbourhood. That said, there is a triplex that enhances the availability of housing in the neighbourhood, and is in keeping with scale of the single family homes around it. That seems like a better way of adding density and incentives could be provided in those cases to make more affordable. Garden homes are on the surface a very good idea but we see so many problems with upkeep of properties that are rented out, it is very concerning. At least limits on size ought to be max. 450 sq. ft. single story, back yard only on a lot 50 x 285 in this neighbourhood, in our opinion.
- I think an incentive and/or requirement should be in place for planting a tree, permeable paving, SWM on lot, solar panels, rain water harvesting, green roof, etc. A green roof incentive would boost the industry in the residential sector and likely make it more affordable for other people to invest! I hear that's what happened for the commercial sector with Toronto's existing green roof policy.
- I think it's a great idea! It allows for creative and smart design to enable more people to enjoy a certain neighborhood without a very hefty price tag of a house. Living minimally and close to nature is good for mental health as well.
- I think they are long over due and should be permitted.
- It would be the perfect opportunity for my disabled and widowed father in law to maintain his own dwelling while we can still ensure he's taken care of. With the aging baby boomer population this is an amazing solution to help them keep their independence and not put them in LTC homes
- This should not be forced on homeowners. This should be a choice for homeowners.
- There should be no minimum or maximum size restriction. The size permitted for a garden suite should be determined by a percentage of the total empty part of lot size. Garden suits should not be allowed to be more than one and a half story high, but should be permitted to have a basement. No garden suit should be full two-story building in height.
- I would love to see more of these!
- Must be regulated to avoid Garden Suites interfering with neighbours regarding sight lines, noise, trespassing.
- Good opportunity to consider affordable housing, but also not the silver bullet solution. We need to talk more about diverse housing solutions across the city, especially mid-rise developments that can fit in with neighbourhoods, and we need to encourage more purpose built rentals
- Affordable housing is an URGENT issue in Toronto that isn't being fully addressed. I'd like to see the City of Toronto commit to providing more accessible housing, so that people aren't spending 40% or more of what money they make on rent. That means looking at lots of housing options such as co-ops, new developments with guaranteed % of affordable (truly affordable) units. Why is Toronto allowing so many 'luxury' accommodations?? People need affordable places to live.

- How will this be exploited by homeowners?
- Allow for locations next to public laneway but do not meet all laneway requirements. Or please amend laneway suites requirements to be less strict.
- They have to be architecturally designed to flow with the neighborhood. Must ensure the privacy of neighbours. The cost to ensure privacy (i.e. fences) should be borne by the owner of the garden suite.
- Short term rentals could cause problems
- It could be a decent idea but there are way too many problems. You're proposing to add more housing yet the public transportation in the city is inadequate. FIX THAT FIRST, also properly price rental units in the city and then you'll actually be dealing with the root issue. This does not do that and it encourages making the city denser, makes the sewage system worse and floods will be bad. Stop with bandage solutions that only benefit greedy developers. Can't wait to vote all of you out in 2022. P
- I think its a great idea and we should allow across all neighbourhoods in the city subject to some reasonable regulations that mitigate any negative impacts to neighbours.
- I am concerned about privacy, reducing green space and air Bnb rentals
- In our area lots are around 100' deep and 15-20' wide. I cannot see nor would I want to see a lane way house be built next to me. There should be minimum separation between the main house and the lane way house. Also a minimum lot width on which houses could be Vuitton. I see lots of problems with light and privacy. I think many of these types of houses will go to Air B&B's. The City does a poor job in enforcing current by-laws - insufficient resources are always cited. This will ever change.
- There is no
- no
- Actually allow them to be built easily with few headaches. I've looked into building laneway suites behind two of my properties only to realize the burden of red tape is too high and costly to make for an efficient investment.
- How do I stop this stupidity?
- They should not be allowed to be built at all. Too much congestion, noise, overcrowding,
- Toronto housing crisis will not be solved by allowing Garden Suites. They will create additional parking problems, result in the diminution/elimination of already limited green space/elimination of some mature trees/increase noise level, etc...
- I highly encourage this initiative to go forward!
- Garden suite is a great idea for sharing resources
- I'd love to live in one.
- Its a much better option for renters and neighborhoods than high rise condos I have been trying for 3 years to build a garden suite. I have won at TLAB my neighbors are in support. I have met only obstacles, road blocks and high expenses (park levy, development charges). What is designed as minimal impact low cost build, is becoming exorbitant and a road block to build. Not encouraging for building an affordable housing unit. Before even putting a shovel in the ground my project is \$100,000 I am proposing a 10' by 25' side addition to my existing garage. Unbelievably it is anticipated to cost over \$200,000 This is very very discouraging!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Limit to one storey, and no permission in areas prone to flood prior to storm sewer upgrade
- Definitely NO short-term rentals or Air BnB allowed! The owner of the main house should be living on the property if renting either the main house or the Garden Suite. This should not become an opportunity for landlord owners to rent out the main house and the Garden Suite to multiple tenants.
- Please implement them. We don't have time to wait in this city.
- zero tolerance for short term. party units.
- Toronto is a nice city, what you are proposing will develop into slum areas, it should never be allowed
- Please allow these!!!
- concerned with overcrowding, noise, potential conflict between occupants - want to maintain enough outdoor space for main house occupants. - gardening as recreation should be encouraged - would be limited with high lot coverage by buildings - too many pets might be a problem

- Please allow!
- Great idea especially in areas like mine where there is close subway access and a need for increased density, a wider range of types of housing a availability and more affordable housing in general
- Why not eliminate high rise condos in favour of better low rise suites. I'm opposed vehemently to such a proposal and would fight any permit for same effecting my property! These will lead to all forms of city deterioration, slums and an inability to manage - City can't manage existing City Housing adequately, what makes this any different??
- interesting question about affordability: if incentives offered, then must be a commitment to a modest initial rent and then include under rent review guidelines (not sure if city has this power though)
- Maintain by-laws that now pertain to main residence, high standards of architectural design both for the unit and surrounding landscape.
- There should be a set minimum amount of back yard space left over after the suite is built. Garden suites should be limited to one storey and a basement. No short-term rentals (AirBNB)
- Increases in density will improve provision of infrastructure, enrich neighbourhood life/diversity, local support businesses
- Very excited to see garden suites and laneway suites! Expansion of Toronto's affordable rental housing stock is extremely important.
- Full steam ahead.
- It's a positive initiative to help increase housing supply, and can use learnings from the laneway suite to enhance and expedite building of garden Suites.
- I think we need a lot more information and debate on the topic.
- I do think this is a chance to enforce or encourage environmental construction (geothermal, solar panel, ...). I also think that we should do what we can to maintain trees and greenspace.
- Should be subject to building standards, height and space limits, and leave room for gardens, etc.
- If they are not made affordable, primarily by reducing tax and fee burdens imposed by the city, they are just another alternative for rich folks and dont help with housing problem.
- They are very common in Vancouver and seem to work great! Even as air bnb or short term rentals, which offer homeowners another way to earn income or build wealth from their home, to help support the affordability issue in Toronto
- Great idea—glad the city is pursuing. Would love to see more grants/other incentives for home owners to invest in these.
- It has to be attractive for owners. Ltb rules do not support small landlords. Tenants who choose not to leave can severely financially impact small landlords.
- I fear they will spoil the character of my neighbourhood and reduce what small natural spaces are left. There are condos coming close by, so there is no need to increase rental space here.
- You are saying that these will be used for seniors who want to age in place, but that is unlikely. If you are referring to people who need care to live at home, they would need to live in the main house. It that's the goal, maybe we need incentives to add space to our current homes. I am in favour of increasing housing but this won't be used the way you are envisioning and will be tricky to regulate. What are the tax implications? Will the garden suite owners pay for the additional infrastructure?
- Garden Suites will negatively impact the quality of life, property values and characteristics of existing neighbourhoods.
- concerned about the adverse impact on adjacent homes if scale is too big
- Gardens should not be allowed to be built under any circumstances.
- We need to recognize the costs for many make them impossible to build. Allowing elderly homeowners to sever their lots and sell the land to someone who wants to develop a lane would make much more sense for both the home owner (who can downsize without moving) and the builder who can buy more land to make the project more economical. This also allows the end renter to benefit as the more economical project can support lower rents.
- I am someone whose neighbour across the lane built a laneway house. I imagine the owner followed the requirements of informing neighbours and seeking proof of support from neighbours. However those requirements apparently didn't include informing the neighbours on the opposite side of the laneway, so none of us knew this two story building was coming until it was being built.

We had no opportunity to input on this construction, while probably neighbours on the other side of an extremely busy street that were in effect not impacted at all did. This is ridiculous. When pursuing Garden Suites, The City needs to put in place a requirement that those neighbours most affected be informed at permit-seeking stage, and “most affected” needs to be about proximity to the proposed suite. Across the laneway is a lot closer than across the street in most cases. I would be reluctant to support this move if this weren’t part of regulations, even as someone who supports the idea.

- None
- Have always thought they had good features. Much better than giant multigenerational structures that impose themselves unfairly on smaller sustainable structures suitable for the long term age in place needs of our population.
- There would need to be some noise, neighbour impact constraints especially if the suites can be used for “work from home spaces”
- flexible location on the lot
- Garden suites can significantly increase the housing stock in the city without having to build “new” infrastructure.
- Speed up the permits at City Hall. This is a major disincentive for all alterations on a property. In fact, I think the city planning department, and permit granting department need to be completely streamlined, to serve the people of Toronto, as in having strict rules about how long applications can take without penalties being paid to the applicant.
- The lots on which they are built must be big enough to accommodate them without intruding on neighbours’ privacy while leaving enough space on lots for sift scaling enabling renters to have enjoyable outdoor spaces as well as occupants of main residence.
- Would be concerned with too much densification - and impact on parking, trees, vistas and availability of services. Also changing the character of the neighbourhood if they are too visible from the street and from within your home or yard. Height and size restrictions will be important as well as placement for minimal visibility while preserving trees and the amount of green space on a property
- I think they’re a fabulous way to allow more affordable housing in a city that’s way too expensive for most of us. We need to protect mature trees though as we don’t have enough of them
- Approval process should be quick and easy.
- We have to increase affordable housing. Home owners could be part of the solution. Don’t let the parking whiners ruin this. There will never be enough parking in the older parts of the city. Period.
- much of the city is far too crowded now.
- Permit them soon!
- There may be better solutions to the housing crisis, but owners should be free to build a garden suite if mature native trees will not be affected.
- Some consideration needs to be given to designing garden suites to mitigate the negative impact on existing neighbours. My neighbour is currently building an imposing two storey laneway building with enormous windows looking straight into the backs of the neighbours homes, no 2nd floor setbacks and no sloping roof. Perhaps some design guidelines are required to avoid this sort of negative impact - for both garden and laneway buildings.
- Multiple household cooperation builds communities!
- I think it’s a great idea and a move in the right direction. I am concerned with the loss of mature trees. We can’t afford to sacrifice them. There should be space left for gardens. Let’s create a metric to ensure we replace the greenspace we displace eg, vertical forests, green roofs, rooftop gardens etc.
- Long overdue - please implement ASAP. Other cities in the civilized world have allowed garden suites since forever so TO needs to catch up. In order to have an efficient city for infrastructure, density is required, and garden suites are part of this.
- This is yet another city attempt to help rich people while trying to make it look like you care about poor people. Garden suites will provide additional benefit to people who already own property. It will not create more affordable housing. It will not solve the problem of neighbourhoods in convenient locations having far too little housing density. It will not create more opportunities for affordable home ownership. It won’t move people currently living in encampments into long term housing solutions. This is a huge waste of time and resources, but I’m sure it will make a lot of

rich people happy and fill them with a false sense of having contributed positively to the well-being of the city while not doing anything of value.

- Noise is an issue. As it is no one presently adheres to supposed building standards in Toronto and they get away with it. Huge homes, no green spaces, front yard parking. This would be a nightmare because there would be no oversight.
- Please don't allow these to be short term Air Bn B's.
- I think garden suites are an interesting idea, but I think they will severely impact efforts to 're-wild' Toronto. I think if it were mandatory for these suites to have a living roof (and mandatory for them to be covered with 50% native plants, maybe?) then it would provide space for that, while also housing more people. There is so little green space already that it seems a crime to remove more space. I am also very concerned about the destruction of so many trees in the city, which this will most likely intensify (there will be more homes that could potentially get 'crushed', so the city and home-owners will be inclined to cut them down sooner in their lives, and more often). I wonder if there is a way to start thinking about living in an urban forest, and what those homes would look like? (maybe this is a discussion for a different survey).
- Need to be very careful to keep such an initiative under control in size, height and nature. Probably far more efficient to build LOW rise purpose rentals such as duplexes, fourplex, over existing retail, etc on many streets that already have such a mix.
- If the city encouraged the development of affordable apartments as opposed to expensive condos and elite massive homes built by the wealthy and developers who see immediate profit, there would be no need to consider this proposal Consider the Post War Victory/Veteran homes which the Canadian Government initiated until the 60's See the May 2021 article in Toronto Heritage.Toronto needs to consider its 2019 Resiliency Study and the negative impacts of Climate Change which will increase with this type of intensification.
- Long overdue! Wonderful opportunity. Make sure people can build on top of their garages and carports as well. Make sure that bars and restaurants/clubs that serve alcohol can't use one.
- Maybe I'm wrong about this, but I don't think the city allows for people to take advantage of incentives unless you use a contractor. I think it's unfair to handy people who might want to do work themselves - plenty of my neighbours are highly capable and they should be allowed to if they want to. Can they get incentives as long as there's an inspection? It should be OK for people to do their own work as long as there is a permit and an inspection -- stop punishing people who are skilled at home building for being able to do it themselves. I know a lot of people CANNOT but still try and I am sure that could require a lot of review type work on the city's part - I honestly don't care, that shouldn't mean that you punish those who can. You need to figure out a way to make it doable. If I'm mistaken here and it is, I apologize, but so far no one has ever told me that it's possible. Not that I can build anything! :)
- No.
- I wonder about fire safety. Would impaired access to the road make them less safe?
- Garden Suites have the potential to support inter generational living. We would rent to our young adult child, until they need more space for a family, and we would move into the Garden Suite. We would help with childcare, and he will eventually help us in our more senior years.
- No
- I believe housing affordability has a lot more to do with the capitalism (turning shelter into an investment) and less to do with supply. I think the city should be looking at the root cause. Garden Suites have the potential to degrade neighborhoods without the proper bi-laws and rules.
- GO FOR IT!
- If you're looking to add affordable housing I don't think the average homeowner is going to build and provide the utilities at an affordable rate. You need to use places like the property at Eastern Ave to build coops whereby the tenants help sustain the building and property.
- I hope they can provide affordable housing but fear they may be exclusive/expensive. They can be invisible or just visible from the street, like a coach house. Nimbyism. We are so far behind other cities on this, hope it happens and we don't just study/talk about it for 20 years. I hope parking will not be an issue. I rent, I've never driven. TTC, walk and taxis as needed. Water run off may be an issue, make sure still grass/permeable. Access and signage on street for deliveries, ambulance etc. I would like them to blend in to the style of the area architecture. Be a good neighbour.

- If allowed, should only be allowed only on lots above a certain size, such as at least 50 ft wide and 125 ft deep.
- To reduce the impact of garden suits on the property prices it might be good to have a similar provision like the one reg. laneway houses in the development charges bylaw. I would like to see something that the DC are not due unless the property is sold within e.g. 5 years after construction the garden suite. Already laneway houses or more laneway house potential are listed as feature to market properties and justify over the average sales prices.
- Great Idea, please allow.
- should not be allowed
- Worst idea ever. So easy to abuse and whatever law you put in, people smarter than you will figure a way around it.
- Access to garden suites should be through on-site pathways leading to public roads/laneways. A garden suite should not have access to the the shared right of ways of the primary unit (e.g. private shared laneways not maintained by the city).
- Need to ensure adequate lot size to accommodate the garden suite. Need to consider the impact of privacy, noise, and shadow on neighbouring properties. Need to consider means of access where not on a public laneway access should not impact neighbouring lots. Concerned about the impact on parking in areas where only on street parking is available. Tenants have cars too, often.
- Garden suites should have strict size limits that can not be overturned by Committees of Adjustment. All new commercial, industrial and residential construction in the city should be required to meet environmental building standards to reduce our impact on climate change. We can and need to do more.
- THIS IS A GREAT IDEA!! OFFER INCENTIVES AND ALLOW HOUSING SUPPLY TO INCREASE!!
- Preferably one story can reuse existing garage or structure already on property permit preferences given to properties that already have an existing structure that can be repurposed and will be occupied by intergenerational families especially to allow senior parents to live continue living independently with family together instead of being forced to move to seniors care facilities - this would also allow seniors to sell their homes which makes more housing available in the city for others preference given to homeowners that will not require street parking due to garden suite being added as there is already too many cars parked on our streets making it unsafe for children this is a great initiative that I hope will be fast tracked, and especially for my neighbourhood where we are looking for options to have our elderly parents live on the property with us.
- Should be designed and located smartly to keep green space and protect privacy of the neighbors
- I think this could be a good way to expand housing in Toronto. However, many landlords do the minimum amount possible when building and maintaining rental properties. The bylaws for this initiative must be detailed and well written to protect trees, outdoor living space, properly sized indoor space, maintenance, and so on. Extra by-law officers will be required!
- Make this far simpler than the laneway suites process. We need garden suites to be built quickly & all across Toronto. There should also be targeted education from the city to help homeowners understand how they can use the equity in their homes to construct garden suites. The process should be designed to minimize disruption from neighbours, unlike the current animosity of the committee of adjustment, where any change is made to be equivalent with siting a nuclear reactor at Casa Loma. Delays cost money and make projects unviable for even the most committed builders.
- Ensure Neighbourhood Official Plan policies are revised, and written to encourage the introduction of laneway and garden suites throughout Neighbourhoods, with particular emphasis on targeting sites in close proximity (500-800m) of existing or planned higher-order transit. Soften existing policies pertaining to prevailing physical character and geographic neighbourhoods, so as to remove potential roadblocks to the implementation of laneway and garden suites. Ensure zoning regulations accommodate for an appropriate degree of flexibility, in order to mitigate variance requirements. Waive development charges in exchange for affordable rental commitments. Where applicable, dedicate development charges to local community improvement projects which advance social equity, environmental sustainability and urban

resiliency objectives. Promote the creation of micro-level district energy systems, to optimize the efficiency of on-site mechanical and electrical equipment between units (e.g. multiple ductless heat pump air handlers sharing a single, appropriately sized, outdoor unit). Require that all additional stormwater be managed on-site, and promote the creation of stormwater management system which can be shared with the primary dwelling to reduce runoff. Accommodate for the possibility of stratified land ownership, fractional ownership and co-housing (e.g. in a co-housing scenario, a full kitchen, independent of the primary dwelling, may not be required). Permit garden suites at the rear of detached, semi detached and end rowhouse / townhouse units. Permit garden suites in all low-rise Residential Zones, City-wide. Permit the inclusion of garden suites as one of a maximum of three units per property.

- Taxed separately appropriate municipal by-law controls
- From my perspective if my neighbours build garden suites I will not allow any emergency access to the suites using my property for any reasons unless the City of Toronto has an agreement up front to indemnify me for all damages to my property. Case in point, if the garden suites are on fire that is not my concern. I will allow police access to stop parties only. These Garden Suites will be a nightmare for the City to enforce and will lead to neighbour conflicts.
- Policy on location and setback for a garden suite on a lot should be flexible, as long as it meets emergency access requirement. Consideration should be made for different lot irregularities for privacy and separation requirement. Example 1: A garden suite on a regular lot is located far back on the rear property line to provide separation/privacy from the main house: |-----| | |Garden| | | |Suite| | | | |-----| | | | Back | | | Yard | | | |-----| | | | | | | | |Drive| Main | | |way| House | | | | | |-----| Example 2: A garden suite on a pi-shape lot is located on one side of a large back yard. Even though it is not located far back on the rear property line, it provides better privacy and separation from the main house. It even has its own side of the backyard. \-----| \ Back Yard | \ |-----| | \ |Garden| Back | \ |Suite| Yard | \ |-----| | \ |-----| \ | | \ Drive | Main | \ way | House | \ | | \ | | \ |-----|
- Please expedite so we can start building!
- People purchase in my neighbourhood for the aspects that it offers and garden suites would greatly alter that it is NOT an appropriate option for more housing
- Is it okay to upgrade/renovate an existing garage to become a garden suite?
- Great initiative for gentle density! Please don't require additional parking as this will slow adoption.
- Should be permitted and incentivized
- Unbelievably bias survey only promotes the pros without discussion of the cons of Garden homes. No mention of the impact to neighbouring back yards and the impact to shared community space that existing back yard setback bylaws protect. Survey Designer were either incompetent or were asked to deliberately design a promo piece disguised as a survey. Garden suites generally benefit the wealthiest who can afford to build them. Garden suites can have a positive impact in some cases if: 1) regulations prohibit destruction of any existing tree (or anywhere a tree has existed in the past 5 years...because greedy developers will just cut down the trees before applying) 2) all existing setback bylaws remain intact ensuring only lots large enough can have garden suites 3) should require the approval of all adjacent neighbours (side, back and kittycorner) This city seems hellbent on densification construction to allow developers to get rich, while ignoring the destruction of trees and ecosystems. The city will burn with Climate Change while officials stick their head in the ground at the consequences because developer sponsored studies suggest growth projections that are actually unsustainable in a successful city.
- Great way to combat aging in place, and housing affordability
- I think it's a brilliant idea. It will help with inter-generational living. It will help with rental affordability, it will help homeowners with their costs. As long as there is enough green space on the property and it does not harm mature trees I believe it would be a positive impact on the city.
- Make developers build sustainable housing-affordable, rentable apartment buildings (not garden suites), every time they build condominiums that are expensive to own/rent. ie one affordable housing apartment building for every X number of condo buildings from each developer. That will solve the problem not garden suites.
- Our properties are already small and tree/green space and parking space are already limited. I don't want to see these taken up by more dwellings.

- There needs to be a minimum distance between main and Garden building. Developers will push for very reduced front yard setbacks, which will mean that monster homes will dominate streetscape and cause problems to infrastructure such as water run-off and potentially increased flooding. Increased density on the lot will also add to this problem.
- Not in favour of Garden Suites. Period.
- What about drainage of water when you are reducing the amount of soft landscaping which can absorb rain and snow? The city encouraged all homeowners to divert rain and snow melt from the sewers which results in more run-off and can impact basements. Most people in the city live on 30ft lots which makes this plan inconceivable. Possibly this is feasible in North York, Scarborough or Etobicoke where the lots are wider. No, no, no!
- My husband and I are divorcing. A garden suite would allow him to remain close to our children, help with child care and be a regular part of their lives while providing us with the space we need. My fingers and toes are crossed.
- Please consider older homes in Toronto that already have existing coach houses built long ago. These may not conform to the policies for new builds but there is some older lots, particularly in the city that have coach houses built a century ago. It makes no sense not to allow them to be used as-is for residential purposes if they already exist, or require them to be rebuilt to conform.
- Perhaps we need to be careful about the home office approach. One that potentially attracts a ton of clients to it maybe disruptive to a neighbourhood with children. So provisions should be made if it is to be used as a home office
- I think that if Toronto want to add affordable housing it should keep it out of back yards. Im OK with converting existing garages to housing. My problem is Committees of Adj. will allow Garden Suites very generous variances and in doing so will adversely distort neighbourhood character as they are doing throughout Toronto.
- Consideration to be given to allow green spaces over living space on lots.
- The garden suites i believe will provide an essential housing opportunity to affordably keep families together (give the elderly as well as university aged children a place to live, near supports) and also provide the chance for empty nesters to downsize within their own communities. Garden suites can create rental income to help offset the cost of a mortgages. Plus, the garden suites could make living in Toronto within greater reach for others e.g. Artists... who collectively play a very important role in our communities....
- There is a desperate need for housing in Toronto so this is a good idea. I also have concerns about the rights of landlords. Asking home owners to go through the expense of building rental housing must come with support so that landlord do not end up providing free housing for a tenant who does not pay their rent.
- Just generally, I think severability of lots should be examined - not every homeowner necessarily wants to become a landlord, but I'd suspect some of those residents would like to unlock some of the value of their land while creating more housing stock they don't necessarily have to oversee.
- Make sure that the Fire Department's restrictions are not too onerous, and that they commit to reasonable 21st century measures that show some forward thinking.
- Stop this stupidity.
- I think they'll add character to our wonderful city and to our neighbourhoods. I think they'll help create affordable housing allow for additional income streams for home owners as well as create opportunities for greater yet sustainable and aesthetically pleasing density in our city. I'm a strong believer in the missing middle and in creating more housing.
- If it is to be rented out, it should have all proper hook ups (water, power, etc.).
- Need them to be accessible for people with disabilities.
- Forget the idea. They will cause trouble and pit neighbour against neighbour. They will destroy property values and the very reason people buy in these historical neighbourhoods. I am violently opposed.
- I THINK THE WHOLE CONCEPT IS RIDICULOUS AND QUITE UNNECESSARY!!
- IT DEPENDS - will work in some areas but not in others. Not all neighbourhoods and access points are the same.
- The guidelines for Garden Suites must specifically detail limits on height, size, and the total footprint of both structures (main house plus garden suite) in order for reasonable development to

occur. The addition of a garden suite needs to be a benefit to neighbourhood, not just a new source of income for the landowner.

- This would destroy any concept of neighbourhood. Garden suites will serve only the selfish owners at the expense of caring neighbours who created/perpetuate the neighbourhood. This proposal is in conflict with many zoning bylaws regarding environmental issues (disconnecting drain pipes, greening projects). Use of one's property for relaxation will be diminished. The city will not increase the amount of green space in a neighbourhood, or do they plan to charge people for access to parks? Your questionnaire omitted the question "Have you stopped beating your wife?" It is very biased. If this passed, I would expect city council to rename Toronto as "The Ward". Another dumb idea
- I fully support this initiative and think it will help families support adult children who are priced out of the housing market, while growing the owners property values
- Garden suites will help provide more affordable housing in the ever growing city. It also gives homeowners the opportunity to explore sustainable and green building practices to further benefit our cities environment.
- bad idea
- I think I pretty much knocked it out of the ballpark on the last page. :-)
- I think neighbours should be consulted and should be able to oppose the building of garden suites. If my next door neighbours were permitted to build garden suites, my privacy in my backyard would be infringed upon.
- There are strict set back bylaws for building fences and decks and extending houses in order to protect the privacy of neighbours. Why on earth would it be a good idea to build a structure right up against the back fence of another property!?? Zero set back.
- Garden suites will be the best thing that will happen for the our City Taxes collection for the city will increase Every aspect of construction will increase. More income for each house hold More rental properties for tenements. The list goes on. The pros out way the cons... Please make this happen
- I think there a good idea
- Houses that already have an existing accessory structure (e.g. a double garage) built should be allowed to convert it to a garden suite without meeting new requirement for setbacks, as long as it meets safety and emergency access requirement. In fact, garage should already satisfy emergency access requirement, and it already conforms with existing neighborhood characteristics. By allowing garage to be converted to a garden suite without meeting new requirement for setbacks would help house owner to reduce demolition/construction costs and have more funds for building energy efficiency and environmentally sustainable suite.
- Long overdue. Hurry up the process and allow the city to thrive.
- They concern me greatly in a few ways: 1.Opportunistic Developers - we already have these people bulldozing through our neighbourhood egregiously abusing the 'minor variance' clause - they will surely take advantage of this proposal 2.Irresponsible Landlords - maybe not 'all' but 'some' garden suites would exacerbate these issues - we have irresponsible landlords on my street, 4 to be exact - a. neglected properties / b.inadequate parking leaving multiple tenant vehicles on streets (blocking plows from clearing street safely/leaving ice block walls on street blocking view & 1 lane street) / c.dozens of tenants in 1 home-noise/privacy issues/police visits, even raids 3.City Build Affordable Housing? - why can't the City build affordable townhomes/buildings or incentivize developers to do so - why is the affordable housing issue pushed on homeowners to rectify? Everybody deserves a respectable roof over their head-why must affordable mean 'ontario housing' stop allowing mega condos for foreign investment & build for our needy residents! 4.Lack of Inspector Oversight - we already have major issues with developer / city relationships & developers building WAY beyond zoning bylaws (why do we even have them?) I can't imagine how city inspectors could keep up with overseeing garden suites
- Garden suites may work well in areas where there are laneways, which are found in older neighbourhoods that are also walkable for the most part. How do you encourage owners in the middle suburbs, where properties are larger enough to accommodate a garden suite, but walkable amenities, shopping, public transit, parks, ecetera are lacking. Addressing the lack of walkable amenities in the suburbs would be a good first step in increasing density in the city.

- I have great concerns about the reduction of soft landscaping, an inability to accommodate trees and biodiversity in our urban environment and a decrease of those two in more suburban settings.
- The location of garden suites should be flexible to any area of the lot
- Try to have an open mind about uses as long as they do not compromise quality of life in the neighbourhood. Same with building typology and sizes. Maybe have baseline typology of structure that allows for some variances possibly incorporating a points system for taxation purposes. I am also suspicious of initiatives that are primarily driven by an affordability agenda. Nobody will want to build them for rental if they cannot make at least a bit more than what their development, building and taxation costs are. That they probably would be smaller and therefore at the lower end of the price spectrum is fine but unless taxation was reduced to a level to allow below market rates to be possible it would be a non starter.
- In areas with houses, we don't want any further density. Instead build affordable housing at the end of subway line/go train lines.
- I don't know enough about this issue yet, but my first thought is that it will not work in most neighbourhoods unless those who occupy a Garden Suite do not own a car.
- should consult with and partner with the residents associations before any decisions. neighbourhoods must have a voice.
- They should be allowed to be built as-of right! The City should develop standardized construction designs for several sizes/shapes of garden suites/laneway homes, make them available to property owners for free, and incentivize their construction through things like interest-free loans, tax credits, etc. There could be a whole development industry in Toronto around the construction of these homes en masse using the standardized designs. For a property owner, it should be as easy as having the available land, and paying 'Garden Suite Construction Company A' to go in and build. The city could even create a 'construction bank' that provides upfront loans for construction which are paid off by the tenant directly depositing their rent cheques to the city until the balance is paid off.
- Let's get these going!!
- I don't like the idea too much.
- Enjoy there adequate drainage on property. No Garden Suite if property has front yard parking pad. Or remove front yard parking pad to get Garden Suite approval.
- I strongly oppose allowing garden suites. Due to the relatively small size of a majority of properties in Toronto, garden suites would often reduce the amount of permeable ground, result on the reduction of trees, increase illegal street parking, affect neighbours privacy, sunlight and enjoyment of their existing properites. I also believe that there will be cases of existing residents using the legalization of garden suites in order to increase their own indoor living space, effectively, skirting the bylaws restricting the footprint of a house on the property in these cases, buildind a 'garden suite and using it for purposes other than renting to other tenants and increasing the affordable rental inventory in Toronto. Further, I think that permitting the erection of garden suites in existing neighbourhoods would be extremely unfair to existing residents who purchased their homes with an expectation that there would not be a home looming over their property, eliminating the sunlight that their garden needs and impacting their privacy in their own home and yard. Lastly, I oppose any construction in existing neighbourhoods that reduces or impacts mature trees and permeable ground.
- Privacy concerns, shadow concerns for neighbours. Density issues. Parking problems no green space or drainage Trees being removed to accommodate houses
- In my case, I want to build a garden suite to move my elderly parents in. We can't afford to buy a new place for the 6 of us and they currently live in Etobicoke and require assistance. It is very possible that my dad will need to go into a LTC which completely breaks our hearts. A garden suite would give them their independence and dignity to live a quality life with me as their adult daughter able to care for them. In later years, it could be used as an income property or for an adult child of mine (to rent).
- Seems like it would be too close to someone else's property.
- They should not be allowed. You are working to make this city even more of a garbage dump and less livable than it already is.
- Get on with it....the city is being damaged by the lack of affordable options. This is a great way to deliver supply.

- I think that the city is on the right track! create different options and have different demographics live together in the same neighborhood
- It would solve multi generations living together.
- As much as I think garden suites are an important tool in increasing housing stock, I firmly believe they are a band-aid solution on top of restrictive land use regulations (get rid of the yellow belt please) and until that is changed housing stock will forever be severely limited in the city
- They should be highly safe and secure and have health determined heating, cooling, ventilating, and exhaust facilities. They should only use green energy efficient systems.
- As mentioned, I think there are many opportunities for coach houses similar to what is allowed on laneways to be built on existing through and corner lots. But a garden suites where a home is surrounded by 5 adjacent lots, I think a lot of attention should be paid to allowable heights (shade), and where windows are placed (privacy). I don't think windows facing directly into multi adjacent lots will be appealing. Windows should be limited to facing into homeowners yard and sky lights should be encouraged. I could maybe support loft type spaces for beds, so no more than 14 ft building heights. Good luck with study! We are looking forward to building our garden suite ASAP! PS - I think development fees should be avoided like with laneway suites, that would be quite punitive. Also, there are currently benefits when someone provides an affordable unit, but many landlords are scared off by which type of tenants that may attract and will pass on those benefits. But if you provide benefits to owner to rent to anyone and provide benefits, many people will sign up for that which will not only increase the supply of units in the market, pushing down rents, but you will get a lot more legal/ tax paying units on the market which I'm sure the feds/ prov would appreciate.
- Dont make a half assed attempt like you did with Laneway Suites.
- Allow them to happen quickly and easily incentive rental and affordability where possible.
- I'm excited for this much needed phase of flexible housing option
- I fully support this initiative that increases density downtown so that the public transit system is put to good use.
- It is not enough to simply allow this sort of healthy infill. We should fast-track permits for rental units.
- I think it is a GREAT idea to provide housing for family members, especially older, and or disabled family members who need the support of loved ones close by.
- If it means it would increase my chances to rent or buy not in a large building (or with roommates), I'm all for them!
- I think it's important not to be highly restrictive when designing lot width minimums into the bylaw, so as to allow for as much uptake of garden suites as possible. Towns and semi-detached units should be allowed to host garden suites.
- When mature trees need to protected, any setback or height restrictions should be relaxed.
- This is a wonderful initiative that will go a long way to increasing density passively, providing more rental units in low-rise neighborhoods, and allowing owners more autonomy over their properties. Garden suites should be fast-tracked through this process as much as possible, and the end result should have very minimal regulation on the size, shape, location, and use of the units. Great cities are eclectic and built in layers, don't continue Toronto's history of regulating our way into mediocrity.
- Don't wNt then. Property size isn't mentioned.
- Housing affordability will only be improved if the suites can be severed and sold as a separate property, with shared easements for access and site servicing. Otherwise, they will have the inverse effect and make housing more unaffordable. Please figure this out.
- I strongly encourage this, especially as a single mother who cannot afford to live in Toronto anymore (priced-out), I am living with my parents who own property in Toronto. This allows children of parents who own property in Toronto to make better use of the lot/land.
- Not at this time.
- Would be a great addition to the City.
- Absolutely no air b and b.
- I believe the guidelines should be flexible enough to permit garden suites of a size large enough to accommodate a small family where appropriate. I believe very large/long residential lots

should permit more than one garden suite (or one garden suite plus a laneway suite) I want to ensure that garden suite tenants have the same rights as other tenants.

- My feeling is that anything that increases density, especially gently I'm in favour of. I would like to encourage the City to focus on enabling this type of development, and figuring out how to service (fire, etc.). So if we have to get smaller fire trucks with longer hoses....let's do this. Rather than not allowing this kind of development because our current fire services don't work.
- No
- I really hope the process of allowing garden suites is not a lengthy one as they city of Toronto is desperate need of providing more rental alternatives, live and work opportunities and is far behind other more progressive cities in this regard
- there are many empty front lawns that could be more purposefully integrated into the neighborhood's architecture and overall urban fabric while contributing to plant-biodiversity
- The city needs to build more housing options where people can raise kids. Less shoe box condos and more lane-way housing.
- It would be a great opportunity to increase housing supply in Toronto.
- Flexibility with clear dimension for access path by emergency services
- It is good for the family to be together in the same property
- There is an extremely strong moral and equitable case for implementing this as fast as possible. We urgently need more housing supply in the city core. Now is not the time to allow "shadow impacts" to win the debate.
- Additional rental properties in neighbour's backyards would have a negative impact on my use and enjoyment of my own back yard. There would be a great lack of privacy/ individual home ownership.
- Prefab designs to make them affordable to build. City fast tracks installation of water lines and services directly from the street.
- Seems like a great initiative! Curious about the configuration of lots that will allow for these suites (i.e. whether direct access from the street will be required, services, fire, etc.), and what neighbourhoods if not all yellow-belt will allow for such units.
- Urgently needed accommodation and use for high value land in a city where there is no land available
- Please allow them to be incorporated and permitted in Scarborough!
- I think Toronto could embrace these changes faster and better. It is already 2021, and giving limitless and scary permissions to the Developers to build higher and higher at Yonge St is not visionary nor human-centric. The City, a public agency, could do better to support people where developers are building smaller and smaller units or offering bedrooms with no real windows or developing giant towers shadowing school playgrounds or parks or the neighbourhood. City people could check other ancient cities grown under high immigration pressure in history and how they are converting it to better today. especially Scandanavian ones.
- Separation distances are important, there needs to be enough public transportation system in place. Especially large lot neighborhood, in proximity of stablished public transportation system to make the city more equitable.
- Toronto's yellow belt is becoming an exclusive place for millionaires and those lucky enough to have bought homes when prices were affordable. These communities have to be opened up for more density, affordability, and recreational use, or else our planning frameworks are only exacerbating exclusion and the (practical) concentration of wealth (financial and community assets).
- They're an excellent way to add some much-needed gentle density to Toronto
- height should be minimized to one/one and half storey to prevent overlook onto adjacent properties back yard
- Short term rentals should be discouraged or prohibited. Intent would be to add reasonably priced rental or accommodate family, ie inter generational accommodation.
- Judging from typical development in my area, a Garden suite will not be to benefit the community but only make money for the owner. Development is NOT a philanthropy and why would the Gov't. attribute such lofty ideals to a money making proposition. There are so many issues, from privacy and impact on neighbors which is ignored. The loss of what little green space there is, as front yards are becoming parking lots and the only green space is in the back. It would be very

different on a huge lot with an existing garage at the end. But in my neighbourhood, the laneways are already crowded and gardens small. Any increase with housing will have an adverse affect on the quality of life for others. I live in an 800 sq. ft. house, now, maybe people building McMansions should be encouraged to build smaller multi residential units on their property. Also, the cost of adding infrastructure and the cost in older neighborhoods with FIRE prevention need to be considered.

- As the City is considering re-zoning of private property every owner of an affected property should be notified and given an opportunity to express their opinion and be advised of their rights to appeal any decision affecting their property.
- I support the development of garden suites as new rental housing for the neighbourhoods.
- We are really interested in building a Garden Suite to keep my MIL at home but still have her own space. The only other option is to buy a bungalow in the neighbourhood, which are now out of our price range. If Garden Suites are approved, we would build one immediately. I would also love it if Garden suites could be two stories so that we could still maintain some storage in the back of our house. (We do not have parking or a garage currently)
- I really am opposed to garden suites. Not thrill about laneway suites either.
- The density of most of our neighbourhoods was decided many decades ago. We have more people now - we have to make space. Specifically, we have to make space for people who aren't rich. I would welcome this in my neighbourhood and I would consider building one in the future. I think garden suites would also be great for small businesses that could rely on social media and word-of-mouth recommendations. I'd be delighted if I could get a pedicure at my neighbour's backyard studio and a dozen eggs from another neighbour's chickens.
- Size should be gaged and proportional to the size of the garden- 1/3 structure 2/3 garden
- Make the permit process transparent and provide case studies and precedents of applications as soon as they are available to help with future applications
- Terrible idea. A garden suite will be another Airbnb unit that will not address any affordable housing problems. Affordable housing is not a home owner issue. This is small thinking for too big of a problem that needs a real solution that will not compromise the whole city.
- Incentives: Reduction of property taxes to zero for the entire property for 2 to 5 years if garden suite is built. The cost of the new garden suite might cost \$200,000. 5 year reduction in property taxes might be \$20,000. It's a fair contribution by the City to solve OUR GREATEST NEED - HOUSING. Garden Suites are especially suitable for some of the most neediest in the City - single-parent families and low income individuals. The income tax going forward might be \$1000 more per year due to a higher CVA value of the property so the City would receive payback on the \$20,000 through higher long-term property taxes. But most of all, it would help to solve the affordable housing crisis. CRISIS. Housing has become a financial investment where investors and the real estate industry are betting that the City doesn't have the ability to pass regulations to allow supply to meet demand. They are betting on the ineptitude of the City Planning Department and for NIMBYism to win over the public good. More housing = more property taxes = lower cost of living for everyone since City costs are spread out over a larger number of people. The way Toronto is going, our population will decrease becoming a Dubai or other rich city where middle class no longer have a place in the City, and will move to cities like Hamilton, Barrie, Orangeville, because Toronto is not affordable. This is not Toronto - Toronto is all about diversity. Diversity of race and income. Diversity of race and income means creativity and long-term sustainability. A city comprised of the wealthy and the service class (i.e. nanny's, cleaners, and Tim Horton staff, etc.) is not a vibrant diverse city. It is a form of monarchy. One more advice: Create a department specifically focused on permitting garden suites. Pay staff bonuses based on number of garden suites that get built. Knock on doors or make phone calls or send drawings to homes that are particularly suitable for garden suites. Be proactive!
- Do not like the idea of Garden Suites.
- My wife and I dream to be able to live close to our parents. However, living in the same house with your parents is difficult. Adults need their own space. A Garden Suite would allow us to build a home for one of our parents. It would make this dream financially more realistic than it is today. Garden Suites are a great idea to increase housing supply in Toronto. Housing supply would increase significantly. Income generation would increase significantly. In our opinion, and our vote, the benefits outweigh the potential costs. To note, laneway housing is uncommon, while

houses with backyards are common. This would really help fill the supply gap of housing in the city.

- Highly supportive and see them very similarly to a laneway suite.
- Establish standards for allowable square footage, height, etc. then get started
- This is the wrong way to increase density. Builders and land speculators will take any loophole you give them and negatively impact the quality of life of those of us who own and care for our properties and our neighborhoods.
- I think it's a great idea and long overdue!
- I don't want transient renters anywhere near my property.
- The city desperately needs housing options, far more than we need to worry about how "comfortable" neighbours are, or even worse, "neighbourhood character"
- Do not allow AirBnb / short term rentals in garden suits.
- Stop the consultations and just do it.
- no retail businesses allowed and green roofs encouraged
- I have a hard time believing this policy will have a big first-order effect on housing affordability -- there just aren't that many potential suites (if 100 are built a year that would be equivalent to one large tower). However, I do hope that this policy will be applied broadly enough that any residential property with the room to host a garden suite could put one in -- this will open up many neighborhoods that are currently restricted to single-family homes, and will provide a mechanism for slowly and gently increasing the density of these neighbourhoods to where they could have more infill development such as multi-family apartments.
- As space is taken up by garden suites perhaps some sort of requirement to provide ecosystem service compensation on site, or to use green infra. for storm water management would be wise.
- I'm so excited about this initiative! Let's open up multi-generational options in Toronto.
- I can imagine having something like this and passing the house over the kids so we can live in smaller place without selling
- Yes. PLEASE look into Tiny Homes! There are many situations where a tiny home is the most appropriate structure. Houses on wheels are good environmentally when trees are at heart, and for home owners not yet ready to commit to a full build or need temporary income.
- I think it's a great idea, I currently live with my in-laws and one great grandparent along with my wife and two kids and two dogs. A idea like this would give so much opportunity for our family, like. Having our kids grow up with constant family members around. Having individual space to feel independent, for all of us. It's like a little community on the one property. Child care when needed. Elderly assistance when needed. We actually applied to build a granny sweet on top of our existing garage when Laneway housing started becoming popular but we were rejected due to mainly not having a laneway but instead a private driveway which has access to the back no problem and is wider than most Toronto laneways. It was a great idea as the existing garage foundation and walls were up to code so all we had to do is go up. Unfortunately it was met with much confusion and push back by the city. Funny thing is our street has older homes with couch houses so precedent was already established.
- No
- Without stratification of land, laneway houses and garden suits serve to only provide premium rental housing to further enrich the existing landowners. Why will home owner go through the trouble of developing unless they can rent for a premium or they're looking to house their children? For true affordability to occur and rapid densification, the lot severing process MUST be implemented.
- It's a good idea to allow garden suites, the only thing is fire concerns I don't know if can be addressed by installing hydrants in yards, somehow connecting to street hydrant. I think it should be one storey to not block light, tiny home modular option
- More of a question, given that one of the use cases is to allow aging in place, will the policy address accessibility requirements in the code?
- My opinions draw from currently having too much asphalt parking space for our triplex and 3 car garage. We only have 1 vehicle. It just seems like such a waste of space. But I feel it'll be costly to extend sewer, water etc from the garage to the house. But will await news/info on this consultation process.

- If done properly, this could be great. I think that by not adding a parking space for the garden suite, people have to think about the fact that we need to go that much further with working on public transit and cycling infrastructure. Also, people need to feel safe riding bicycles and using public transit many do not.
- If the city is serious about bringing in more housing stock, bylaws need to be seriously amended to allow garden suites to be built more easily. The current lane way suite bylaws are still very restrictive for most lots on Toronto (i.e space required from main house to garden suite, height, angular plane etc). We need to encourage as many of these to build as possible. Focus should be on design and how it blends with the neighborhood vs. specific build requirements/stats.
- I can't wait for this to happen children and grandchildren are very excited
- I am strongly in favour of Garden Suites. They bring vitality and diversity to neighbourhoods, increase affordability and facilitate aging-in-place (an increasingly important consideration as our population ages), all without changing the architectural or aesthetic character of the properties in question.
- Part of the housing crisis we face fall at the feet of city leaders who have refused to raise taxes to even the average rates in the GTA. The garden suite idea might help a bit, but we need a public housing plan backed by a higher tax rate. The fantasy policy and have sold in the something-for-nothing principle. His initiative is too small on its own. To think that it will have any significant impact on the wider crisis is another fantasy—that of thinking you can let the market take care of it through minor adjustment. This will provide relief for those who today look to live in the same neighborhood via short term rentals (which should have been banned in owner occupied housing as well as in rental stock). Toronto should be raising billions of dollars through significant raises in rates through stepped increases and policies that allow owners with reduced income to pay arrears when they sell without additional penalty.
- I think it's a great idea seems long overdue to me a good friend with 3 kids had a space like this in Victoria (BC) years ago - it was great
- I'm concerned that it won't increase affordability or accessibility in the city. The height and scale of the garden suites concern me.
- Passive House standards should be met. Allow for separate water, sewage, gas (if not passive House standards), and electrical
- My feeling is that it is primarily going to be used for intergenerational living, which is great, but I am definitely concerned that the amount of softscape and number of trees on the lot would be reduced. Maybe green roofs should be incentivized? I feel like denser housing should be allowed in stable neighbourhood areas, and this will help, but other low and mid-rise housing types would do more.
- These are a great idea if the right intent and design is there.
- Don't forget about existing coach houses
- Don't be put off by nay-sayers. Just do this. For me, the bigger issue is how to make these homes affordable. The City can help by greatly streamlining the approvals process. The default response to an application should be 'Approved.'
- I strongly support Garden suites based on the following: - aging baby boomers: my parents and many other seniors will be retiring and there is not enough senior housing/government support to accommodate for rising housing costs. Garden suites allows multi generational families to live together and avoid additional burden on senior housing and care workers. - Improved livability: garden suites are above ground and are superior than basement secondary suites in terms of natural light. Generally higher quality living situation can be provided. - support new homebuyers: this will help support new homebuyers and those who do not significant equity in their homes, as the recent average purchase price of a home in Toronto has greatly outpaced the increase in wages. Currently the purchase of an average low density house is now costing the new home buyer ~\$3700/month in mortgage payments on an average starter home for \$1M. This is unsustainable for those with a household income of less than \$150k (arguably even those under \$200k household income) that are recently trying to purchase a home. -provide much needed lower density housing stock: renters (especially renters with children) are limited in the variety of housing available on a budget. Quality secondary suites should also continued to be promoted to improve housing supply in the suburbs, where renters can enjoy a yard and be in a desired school zone. More garden suites will provide coveted private, lower density, above ground

housing stock for renters. This may help lessen the number of young families forced to move out further away from the city because of affordability

- If implemented well, this will be great for the city and could help us use the 'yellowbelt's land better. It would be great if you could focus on impacts to transportation (while considering planning policies & complete streets), architecture & local character, interference with neighbouring properties (height, scale, colour, privacy, noise, natural), and livability. Good luck!
- I'd like to encourage more government incentives for home owners to build a garden suite. Much of rental housing supply in Toronto is from individual small homeowners/landlords. 1) With the current landlord tenancy laws in Ontario, many are afraid to become landlords, myself included. Landlords are the scapegoats responsible for bearing non paying tenants because the LTB does not hold prompt trial dates, some of who are disrespectful of the landlords home/property, and not permitted to charge the rent dictated by the supply and demand of the market. Affordable housing is not the responsibility of small landlords but the government. Therefore, if homeowners are providing housing supply to citizens who need it, the government should offer support and incentives and make it easy to get permits/provide resources to make the process as smooth as possible. Currently, the process to register a secondary suite is very difficult and so costly that many of those I know would not even try. The city should help and support homeowners in the process of creating additional above ground housing, whether that be during the permit process, inspections, providing financial incentives to help with affordability (i.e. loan qualifications, interest free loans, grants etc) 2) This is to say that a garden suite will cost \$300- \$400,000 to build and requires significant savings or home equity. The rent demanded from such a unit may be approximately \$2000-2500 depending on the location. This would barely cover the mortgaged amount of a \$300-400k HELOC loan amortized over 25 years. I would recommend the city to allow for grants and loan approvals if they would like to see garden suites being built by homeowners. This only happens if it's financially feasible for homeowners to build.
- This process needs to be tied to public realm enhancements including more bike parking in residential neighbourhoods (eg. Bike rings in sidewalks on residential streets).
- Nope. Great initiative
- The City should use every available tool to help increase housing options and affordability. I believe permitting Garden Suites is one such tool.
- Like the idea of permit fast-tracking in exchange for affordability.
- Make Garden Suites EASY & 'As of Right' with minimal restrictions. Don't let the process drag on for over a Decade like Laneway-Suites did. Don't allow Councillors and Community-Groups to exclude their areas from the City-Wide program.
- Garden suites are great. There should be a citywide approval. However, that is no solution to housing when we'll have over a million more people. Urgent need to do 5-12 stories along all arterials
- The infrastructure in our area is not designed for this. This would turn the neighbourhood into a multi unit rental area. This would change the neighbourhood that I saved hard to buy into.
- Toronto should look into publishing model plans / guidance for the process for homeowners and builders.
- Tree impacts are huge in back yards. Flexibility in design to accommodate trees will be paramount to success. Not confident in commitments to rent affordability as very hard to enforce. City has to take to the lead on affordable building, or with legally binding and enforceable agreements with private developers, not home owners.
- Increasing density in existing neighbourhoods allows for improved public transit, business services and walkable community. This is part of the solution for the 'missing middle'. Unrelated to garden suites, I'd like to see a planning change for 'as of right' triplex and quadplex in certain conditions.
- In the City where homes are on narrow lots and have shared or no driveway, garden suites would intrude into backyards on two streets. No privacy for those living in the garden suite. Emergency access would be almost impossible. Short-term rentals, where renters sometimes sometimes respect neither the property nor the neighbours, might be a bad use. A height limit would be important. Garden suites might be more appropriate on a property with a wide lot and driveway, and easy access from the street, such as coach houses in some parts of Toronto.
- Concern over safety and accessibility for fire and emergency. Height and massing should be relative to neighbouring properties, and always secondary in size.

- Concerned about impact on rainwater runoff
- Great initiative! It has the potential to help increase housing options in the city, which will help with affordability. But what you really need to do is allow increased density (triplexes, small apartment buildings, etc.) inside neighbourhoods of detached houses.
- Within the city, single-family home neighbourhoods are the only remaining urban spaces where green spaces, trees, light, healthy air and yards that provide natural flood protection are preserved. Like the monster homes the City has allowed to proliferate, garden suites would only diminish this rare and precious natural environment.
- If 'appropriate access' requires a dedicated path to the Garden Suite from the street (as images seem to suggest) there will be few opportunities in older parts of the city where lot widths are typically 35 ft or less and access to rear yards is shared between neighbouring houses.
- I am opposed to Garden Suites and I think that the ramifications for each neighborhood should be considered in more detail before implementation.
- In the absence of any significant shift in priorities, Garden Suites will suffer the same fate as laneway suites (very poor take-up rate) if fire access requirements are not eased and made completely transparent to applicants. The ongoing experience with lane suites has demonstrated that TFS requirements puts a brake on most projects, dramatically reducing the positive impacts we might expect if many more were built. The 'alternative solutions' city officials keep repeating endlessly are nothing more than lip service, as the lane house initiative has made obvious.
- Where to permit Garden Suites shall be permitted only in neighbourhoods in need of a large supply of rental units. The city bylaw should stipulate the designated setbacks and maximum lot coverage to determine whether there is sufficient room for Garden Suites. Garden Suites should be only used for long-term rental or self-use instead of short-term rental (i.e. Airbnb). Size and height of the Garden Suite Heights, number of stories and maximum square footage of Garden Suites should be strictly regulated. The minimum distance to the main residence should also be maintained to allow maximum green space. Garden Suits should ideally be no more than 1 story and lower than the main residence to ensure sufficient sunlight and privacy for the neighbours. Trees protected Every effort shall be made to preserve existing trees and roots. Relaxation of other design elements may be awarded in order to preserve a tree. Access Garden Suites should be accessible from the street, regulation should ensure minimum access way. Toronto Fire Services and Emergency Services will be consulted to ensure the safety of all residents. Conclusion: -A study should be commissioned by the City to understand whether permitting Garden Suites would actually address the housing supply and affordability issue. -Garden suites will have far more impact than Laneway Suites, residents city-wide should be highly engaged in the consultation process with respect to the various aspects of a permissible Garden Suite. -Not like laneway houses, Garden suites should not be permitted as-of-right. The permit shall be issued for sites that have been carefully studied and planned and neighbours have been consulted to provide input.
- There is already too much congestion in areas where lane ways exist. Many single dwelling homes are rented to multiple families and there is now little green space and parking. Laneways often provide SAFE places for children to play. Garden suites in lane way areas would negatively impact play areas for children and affect access to homeowners parking garages. Environmental problems would also increase with increased density. Politicians should ask, are we moving towards a greener environment or away from it? Garden suites are not the solution to affordable housing in Toronto as they are too expensive.
- I think this is a really great idea worth exploring.
- There needs to be balance between the neighbours and the owners in the restrictions. E.g., Neighbours should retain privacy and avoid shadow impact - which means the height and scale of the garden flats must be contained. The cost of additional sewer/water/electrical lines should be fully borne by the owner and the entrance area needs to be reasonable (ie not encouraging the tenant to go through a neighbour's property).
- No,
- We have been thinking about renovating so that parents could live with us. A garden suite would be a better solution.
- I think its a really good idea and is sorely needed to add to the housing stock in Toronto.
- While Garden Suites are a good initiative, I think there is much scope to increase the density within the existing structures. For example, I have a detached single-family home with a

basement suite. There is enough room to expand the current structure to include 2 more self-contained rental units and provide parking for a total of 4 vehicles on the property but the city won't allow such an upgrade/expansion. Such development will fall far cheaper and quicker for property owners to engage in rather than creating a separate garden suite with added complications for plumbing, heating, and electricity. However, if nothing else, I am strongly in favor of allowing Garden Suites but with sufficient parking. We need to strongly avoid increasing instances of parking on the road because that is what ends up visibly changing the character of a neighborhood.

- Allow flexibility with regard to set backs from property lines in dense neighbourhoods. Also consider allowing grandfathering existing accessory dwelling units and/or garage footprints to make way for garden suites.
- I have always been interested in garden suites, laneway homes and the tiny home movement - as a way to accommodate additional housing on a residential lot. Often it is for having elder family members be close to family and still live somewhat independently. I appreciate there are a lot of issues to be sorted out but we have to make a start. I see a lot of large - almost homelike - garden sheds on Toronto properties that could be turned into suites but am not sure how far from property lines they have to be. Perhaps there may have to be variances for these. All for now but will probably think of more.... thanks making this happen
- I cannot emphasize enough how dire the housing crisis is in Toronto and urge the City to expedite this initiative and others that would increase supply. Please do not over-engineer the program with prescriptive rules and requirements (setbacks, shadowing, design, etc) that could slow things down. Thank you!
- Nope
- I have a brother with many anxiety issues who likes to tell everyone how to live their lives. While I have a guest suite in my home, he is not someone I want living with me. (I have had to take care of him in the past and it was more than difficult.) I would be pleased to build a little suite for him so he can be independent. I am the only person who would do this for him.
- Bad idea
- i am already shocked at the type of infill homes that are allowed and worry about the integrity of neighbourhoods character being impacted.
- We have a lane way house on the property adjacent to ours. Half of our garden is in permanent shade. Lane way houses can have strong negative impact on neighbouring house values.
- Mechanical and electrical site services should be allowed to extend directly to main city service. This will ensure rental properties are properly sub metered without having the tenant over pay for utilities.
- No - but I have a comment about laneway suites. I have a possible laneway development but it fronts mainly on a private and partly on a public laneway. I will therefore have to go to committee for approval. But it would probably qualify as a garden suite. Suggest you think about changing the laneway requirement to front on a public or private laneway.
- This is a great way to increase density and rental stock without razing existing buildings.
- Style has to be suited to the neighbourhood
- I live in an area of 25' lots where development is out of control. Nobody is willing or able to build within the bylaws and go to the COA for big variances. I do not trust the current climate and regulatory environment to launch garden suites fairly for all. The laneway apts being added now are not being rented at affordable rates and overcrowd neighbourhoods. I can see Garden Suites would be the same overstep in being fair to all and not helping with any affordable housing.
- I oppose the idea particularly on typical Toronto lot sizes that are not big to begin with. This is a huge invasion of private outdoor space. It turns private outdoor space into more communal space by virtue of the increased number of people who are around. I can't afford a cottage. My yard is my oasis. I don't want to essentially double the potential density on the same land. I bought a detached home for a reason - no increased density! If I wanted to live among even more people than I would. Strongly strongly oppose this idea.
- Garden Suites is an historical and architectural art deco gem, that should be left alone. The number of additional residences will be insignificant and do little to increase affordable housing, but permanently ruin a rare historical vestige of original Leaside. For heaven's sakes, leave it be! There is so much massive change and increased density coming in every other pocket of the

neighborhood, all along Bayview, Laird, McRae, Millwood. Can't just one of few beautiful historical things that remain be left unspoiled?

- Hopefully the process can be executed soon.
- Our present regulations on housing are being changed every month as the Committees of Adjustments and the City Planners allow for more variances. We are building a very crowded city and are continually thinking of ways to make it more crowded and, as a result, to slow it down. Our present philosophy is to build higher and more often to increase the density of the population which is not the way to go unless you are politically thinking of housing the masses of population you are attracting to a main city. The thinking should be, in my humble opinion, to work on ways of populating smaller cities through encouragements of various forms of employment. At one time many smaller Ontario cities had large employers. We must start to think about energizing these once very employable cities.
- concern re: who will assure buildings are to code, not overcrowded, properly maintained, adequate green space on the property, limited number per neighbourhood--maintain neighbourhood characteristics, risk of noisy/problematic tenants so close to other residents. also increased risk of vermin/infestations with increased housing density.
- I am very concerned that many homeowners will flout the rules and build over size suites and rent out for short term to various renters
- I think they are a great idea. I think they will be popular in established neighborhoods with homes building pre 1950's, particularly in locations close to transit and serve to improve the sociability of our communities. I think the City should consider a Garden Suite/Laneway Program where residents in these types of housing are provided a sustainability package (eg perhaps a subprogram within GreenLiving that provides enhanced discount for access to BikeShare TO, etc... to encourage reduced vehicular dependency) I think sustainable building will be important to preserve storm water infiltration capacity and reduce strain on existing utility capacities. Consideration should be given to high energy efficiency, longevity of and low-carbon construction and materials. Many lots are narrow, and I would support greater lot coverage in exchange for substantial improvements in sustainability.
- With our children gone, we need less space and could use rental income from garden suite.
- We completely oppose them having seen how the committee of adjustment and the O.M.B. Basically rubber stamp developer's proposals. Leaside lots are small and completely unsuitable for them.
- In our neighbourhood, I would rather see a garden suite than massive homes built that are not sustainable in the long term. Based on property size, some can accommodate garden suites better than others. We have a particularly deep yard, as do many in our area.
- No running commercial business from the GS please.
- I will not support Garden Suites in my neighbourhood.
- It's an idea that is long overdue!
- Tight building codes and requirements must be enforced to accomodate these additional living spaces.
- On large properties, (ours is 50 x 220) it makes perfect sense, and even on smaller lots where there would be some distancing between the garden house and the main residence. The city needs to create more housing as so many struggle due to affordability now. So if garden houses present a simple, decent space with access to the outdoors, then this is a bonus for both the garden resident and the homeowner. It will also allow the homeowner to remain in their home if income from the rental is helping with retirement plans.
- These suites will severely impact wildlife habitat in the neighbourhood, by interfering with pollinators, bird and insect migration, and open green space. Tree roots and natural drainage systems will be impacted.
- The garden suite must not infringe on neighbouring properties with reference to privacy, shadows, noise, smells and light.
- No. Think that they are a great idea
- should have a maximum usable lot size in the back to accommodate the suite and not take over the whole yard.

- Size and height should be dependent on the size of the house lot. Privacy issues should be addressed with windows either facing onsite or skylights to the sky if the former is insufficient or not possible.
- Can't impact neighbours in any way.
- I would like to see the proposed rules/by-law requirements and plenty of time for neighbourhood/citizen review and opportunity for commentary before agreeing to 'as of right' Garden Suites. I find it hard to be in favour of or against Garden Suites as the details of what is or is not allowed would form the basis of my firm opinion.
- A garden suite is very common in the UK and I think would be great for Toronto. BUT I worry about real estate speculators - buy a house & tack on a garden suite and then flip the property. Also, if you are going to use it for rental income, it should be registered and an extra tax levied against it to offset the higher demand on the infrastructure in the neighbourhood. Parks will become more crowded, traffic more congested, schools more full. So if you are benefitting from the extra rental revenue, you should share in the additional costs associated with increasing the population density. I am fully supportive of Garden Suites and want to build one, but I have zero intention of renting it out. If they are to be built for rental purposes, it should be mandatory that it is registered with the city (failure to do so should result in permit to build being revoked and structure removed), there should be a cap on the number that can be rented out in a certain area, and an additional tax levied against Garden Rental suites to account for the increased stress on the local infrastructure. That tax levy should be returned to the ward to spend as they see fit.
- No Airbnb/temporary rentals. The hope is to provide more affordable housing to residents of Toronto who need places to live and can't afford current prices or do not aspire to live in current home sizes. For example I would love to live in a condo or small sizes home but would to be on ground level/green space.
- Street and Lane houses can be monitored for zoning issues, additions, assorted abuses, by the city but backyard garden suites would be private fenced-in buildings, open to abuse. I think many people are not building alley/lane houses due to current city development costs/height restrictions/setbacks. Small one-offs are expensive to build. Perhaps container/modular houses could be explored? Residents on an entire street with a lane could buy these from the city at a subsidized price to house low income renters? Perhaps attached with no side yards but front and back doors? I also like the city's recent idea of allowing higher, multi-family new-build units a block north and south of the Danforth where higher density would fit in. What happened to that idea?
- This is such a win-win opportunity for all concerned. It can quickly increase the stock of housing at minimal cost (if the City is not slow in giving approval). Perhaps some standard architectural plans would make this a cost effective way to build (like after the war in which there were simple plans for bungalows). Great idea if one can deal with NIMBY issues.
- I am overall in favour of measures to increase density and allow more people to live in our neighbourhoods affordably
- must be limited to single person, cannot attend local schools if they are at capacity
- The City Council has declared a climate emergency. We should be protecting the little greenspace we have left in this City. As it is, summers can be brutally hot. If we destroy gardens and trees to make way for more single family dwellings, we will all suffer the consequences. this is short term thinking. I am in favor of allowing homes to add another floor to accommodate guests or tenants but destroying green space is criminal.
- The density and population in the particular area would be unacceptable to me, and may present problems for neighbors.
- I do not think that Garden Suites are the answer. I think the city should build more affordable housing for people with developmental disabilities. The DSO waiting list have approx. 8000 people waiting for housing. Why are the disabled forgotten? More residences like the Reena residences should be built in Toronto. The city should partner with Reena Community Living Toronto, and the DSO. The housing should be purposeful, intentional communities. Look into vacant /abandoned lands like the property in North Etobicoke on Panorama Court, which used to house the disabled in group homes. (The group homes and buildings have been standing vacant for the last 8 years!!! What a waste, while we have a housing crisis emergency)!
- I think the design & shape & size & location on the property is very important . It can't be an eye soar to the neighbors on either side.

- Will create more pressure on infrastructure in regions that are already lacking capacity -schools, water, sewage
- No
- Seems the City has made up its mind Garden Suites would destroy the character of my neighbourhood It would reduce resale value of my property The City would owe me compensation for my loss
- no
- A new bylaw, if approved, should be designed to streamline the process and avoid the slow, bureaucratic process common to other municipal approval processes.
- No
- This will clearly require considerable re-zoning or new zoning adjustments. Here's hoping that room for some adaptation to individual circumstances will be considered. Assuming these Suites will be rentals to third parties, will the landlord and tenant provisions be observed and adjusted for these new conditions? Will there be implications for trespass rules and fire regulations? I think this is an excellent concept and hope to see it implemented as soon as possible even just in trial neighbourhoods at first.
- Single family dwellers pay high taxes. Cramming additional dwellings into already tight packed yards is dramatically changing how we will live and leads me to question why I will be paying higher taxes. What privacy will people have when they step outside and are faced with walls blocking all sides of their yards? How can children step outside to play? Once built on, a backyard will never be restored. What about the blocked sunlight? It's illegal to direct rainwater to the street because the storm sewers can't handle the load, so what will happen when much of the city is built over and there is no ground for water to percolate into? This is very greedy development that will substantially reduce the quality of life, not only for the neighbours of these properties, but for the people who opt to do this, who will have no yard, no trees, no sunlight. Do the single family dwellers of Toronto have any say in this, or is it already decided? This is a big reduction in quality of life.
- I would encourage this initiative as a way for families to provide affordable housing for their adult children with a disability.
- Bad idea, will create slum like neighbourhoods.
- Keep fees for permits, levies, development fees, etc., reasonable. Streamline the process to encourage the building of garden suites.
- I think this is an excellent solution to our affordable housing issue
- In a private lane, do I need "permission" from my neighbors to build a garden suite?
- While this seems like a good idea with respect to increasing rental units, I think it is unlikely to move the affordability needle at all, especially if these new units are not subject to rent control.
- BUILD BABY BUILD
- How do we keep the data open sources to help with more advances regulation and government facilitation to owners. How do we effectively discover the opportunities within City with the help of open data from by-laws, building codes or so.
- I find it disappointing that this survey did not flag for input several of the most serious concerns about Garden Suites---most crucially, that studies show---and in any case, it is just common sense---that increased permissions will drive up land values and hence property taxes even for those who can't or don't want to build Garden Suites, with the resultant increase in housing and rental prices. Only the wealthy will benefit from this initiative---everyone else will be further screwed, including seniors on fixed incomes who will have to sell their house due to increased property taxes proximal neighbours who will have no say when their neighbour builds a second house introducing shadow, massing, noise, and a lack of privacy into their backyard and everyone else when the sewers overflow into their basements.
- Plumbing and electricity required (minimum one sink and one toilet) to qualify as a Garden Suite.
- Limiting scale is important (height and GFA and overall lot coverage). No more than two storeys depending on size of lot and scale of neighbourhood, maybe even limit to one storey with a loft or mezzanine. Property line setbacks clearly defined.
- A lot of properties in the suburbs are quite large and could definitely accomodate these structures. They would be ideal for young adults who can't afford the housing market and also for aging parents who want to stay on their own property but need some privacy from the family. It

would also help people to be able to pay their mortgage with the rental income. I think it would also be an ideal solution for disabled family members to have a place of their own close to the family. The concerns I have are around the appearance. It needs to be maintained and kept tidy if it's seen from the road - otherwise you will get complaints from the neighbourhood.

- A bit concerned that Garden Suites could be as large or larger than the primary building on the property. Think of it more as a secondary suite unattached.
- I see no benefit whatsoever to these. This is simply splitting a lot into 2 for 2 dwellings. Knowing the City of Toronto, these will never be 'affordable' dwellings. This is just an increase of density, so the City can collect double taxes on the same lot. Our lots are small and narrow. We are already faced with oversized new builds on small lots. This will just increase lot coverage and infringe on neighbouring properties.
- Great idea
- The City should support Garden Suites and make it a possible opportunity for as many homeowners as it can (semidetached units and towns should be permitted to have garden suites), they should NOT only be an opportunity for those who own the biggest lots (ie. single detached dwellings). Flexibility should be written into the regulations to reduce barriers to entry and construction (do not require parking minimums, allow for flexibility in locations with mature trees, do not have strict separation distances between garden suites).
- PLEASE DO IT SOON!!!!!!!!!!
- I think the City is moving in the right direction by allowing innovative housing solutions like Garden Suites and Laneway Housing that are becoming common place in many other cities around the world.
- I'm concerned about short term rentals - I don't believe they should be allowed for that purpose. Other concerns: How will the construction of these new homes affect the tree cover, green space, and water drainage in your neighbourhood? Will emergency access to these new Garden Suites be adequate? Will Garden Suites trigger re-evaluations and property tax changes impacting affordability in the long term for property owners who are not interested in constructing a Garden Suite? How many additional units are possible across the City and what effects might these have on the City's infrastructure such as police and fire services, sewer, water, parks, schools, etc?
- I have lots! - Number of dwelling units permitted on a lot should be able to be allocated between main dwelling and ancillary building (ie main house 1, 2 in ancillary or vice versa) - Limits on size and height should vary by area and not be too restrictive. - People who move out to areas with large lots did so for the space and privacy it affords - Setbacks need to be carefully considered - small setbacks (.45m or .6m) lead to dead zones and spaces to gather leaves and junk - should be 0 or 1.2m or more? - Garden suites should be required to meet 2030 energy standards (ie Net Zero) not as an incentive but as a requirement - to push the industry. - I love the idea of a laneway house with an ice cream window or small retail shop on a lane - I think they are different than garden suites in that respect. I would love to have my architecture firm run out of garden suite on our property - I've got 5 staff... should be OK. However, I don't think a place of worship or daycare, any business requiring a lot of parking or disruptive to neighbours should be permitted. - Remove all parking requirements from the zoning by-laws. If people think they need parking they will keep the parking spot. If they plan to walk, use transit or ride their bike it's their choice to eliminate parking!
- While Garden Suites sound like a good idea, I'm concerned about crowding the housing area, loss of trees, and possible parking issues.
- I am concerned that garden suites would result in the creation of more inadequate housing that is impractically small for tenants, at a high price point, and will be used primarily as a revenue generator for landlords rather than to provide adequate, appropriate housing for families. The creation of small units (e.g. <600 sqft) does not address the needs of young working families.
- They are a disaster in Vancouver.
- Someone who has worked hard in order to purchase a detached home is not likely to be in favour of sharing the backyard space with another family. Additional noise and activity will eliminate privacy for the original homeowner. Bordering properties will likely not welcome an additional dwelling next door for the same reasons. Not to mention shadowing and poor visibility. Crowding a property is never a good idea and the stress on the infrastructure is a big concern. Property values will suffer. Most home owners don't want to be landlords. I see this as a negative proposal on many fronts. This is a can of worms in terms of zoning and owners who want to push the

boundaries in terms of proposing minor variants with the garden suites. Heights, widths, setbacks etc will always be challenged just as they are with single dwellings on a typical setting. I can't see this as a plus for any existing established neighbourhood.

- This is BS. The city can't even manage the illegal apartments that are everywhere in Scarborough as it is - there is no way in hell they can manage this and keep Toronto a city people want to live in! NO TO GARDEN SUITES!!!
- I would very much appreciate the opportunity to use my land to build either a retirement suite for me or a small home for my daughter, her partner and child as the only way they will be able to own a home is when they inherit on my death and I would like to help them now and stay in my home or at least in my neighborhood.
- No
- They should have separate utilities services from the main residence as they will put further excessive demands on existing services
- We need this in Toronto. Times are changing. This would make Toronto more desirable city to live in.
- Please allow to promote intergenerational living.
- The proposed changes are focussed on the TYPE of property to allow laneway and garden suites, rather than location of the property. What applies to downtown Toronto, may not apply to the suburbs. Vehicles are a higher priority in the suburbs, and parking is already an issue where there are freehold townhouses. Cars are parked in the laneway overnight all year regardless of the posted allowed times. The City already has experience on passing a policy based on type of dwelling without consideration of the location. There should be clear definition on the size of property on which these suites can be built. If the property has a detached garage for a single car, there are people that are going to want to convert to a garden suite. There are just so many issues with the way this questionnaire is proposing the change. There are no questions regarding the impact to neighbours who own properties purchased based on one understanding. Then the city allows these suites - what impact will it have on the value of the neighbour's property?
- Impact of extra plumbing on our already challenges sewer systems needs to be considered.
- I haven been living in bsmt.for the past 11 years just so that I can be close to them. They can't afford house or afford rent by themselves. Garden suite is something I have been dreaming of and wondering if legal in toronto. It is a blessing for Mr and for many people for many other good reasons I can guarantee.thank you for passing this law.
- They're a great idea and will have a smaller eco footprint than building new housing on separate lots
- Please allow for flexibility such that garden suites can be constructed on most if not all properties in the City. Certain folks will try to include regulations to stymie these efforts, but lack of housing affordability in the City is extremely critical, and, besides matters of fire and building safety, providing more housing should trump all other concerns, such as parking, set backs, shadow impacts, etc. The small group with vested interest in opposition to garden suites will the most vocal, but there are many, many times more people that will be positively impacted by allowing the practice. Expanding housing affordability is an anti-racist practice and any debate/process regarding the matter should be viewed through this lens.
- Garden suites are a fantastic opportunity for Toronto to be seen as a thought leader in affordable housing and building vibrant communities. The benefits dramatically outweigh the costs.
- Approve them ASAP!
- They are a progressive way of solving Toronto's housing problems.
- No
- In general I am pro. Not NIMBY at all. But the yards down here by us near Eglinton at Yonge are tiny, so any Garden Suite would crowd everybody around. And lot coverage would go so high as to affect run-off and the water table, starving trees of water. Design plans have to keep fire truck and ambulance access reasonable. In general, multigenerational living is a gift to all: seniors down to grandkids. And, as Covid shows, better spread out, for health.
- Under no circumstances should a garden suite be permitted unless the property is occupied by the owner and lives on site as a principal residence. Investor ownership will destroy all that is good about garden suites. Gardens suites are a fantastic alternative form of housing which provides an ability for the homeowner to age in place and generate the much needed added

income and/or care giver residency. Long term care facilities have proven to be disastrous and deadly during the Covid pandemic

- I found it difficult, in the absence of greater context, to answer general questions such as 'Do you favour Garden Suites?'. It would have been helpful if the questionnaire had answers that indicated conditional support for Garden Suites (i.e., only on the basis of certain criteria being adopted). (2) Equity considerations would seem to make it impossible to justify City subsidies to persons who are able to take advantage of the Garden Suite initiative. This is because it can reasonably be expected that only the most privileged residents of the City will be in a position to do so, as they: (a) must be home owners, and have properties of a sufficient size to accommodate a Garden Suite, and (b) have sufficient funds or access to credit to pay the \$100K++ cost of building a Garden Suite. Surely the City's funds can be directed at people who need it more. As well, it is not clear why any such subsidies should be directed only to persons who create an extra residential unit by means of a Garden Suite. Shouldn't persons creating an extra unit by way of, say, a basement apartment also be eligible? (3) It is difficult to conceive that Garden Suites will be rented at affordable prices to persons who are not relatives or friends of the owner of the Garden Suite property. This is because of high construction costs for a Garden Suite (particularly in cases where access to the Garden Suite does not permit machinery), and elevated land cost for properties that can accommodate Garden Suites after the City upzones such properties (to permit Garden Suites as of right). (4) There is a concern for access of emergency services to Garden Suites (unlike laneway housing, access via a lane is not possible). It is to be expected that emergency access to a Garden Suite will be equivalent to the access required for a laneway house for which access via the laneway is insufficient.
- Green design!!!
- I care for an aging parent and also have a sibling living separate from us in Toronto that has been trying to find affordable housing for a long time. I don't have a lane way for a laneway house nor can afford a large addition to my house but a garden suite could be the right fit and affordable opportunity to help a family member in need with a space that's not in a high rise and gives them access to a garden and a single family home community/neighborhood.
- No
- can a garden suite be build with a basement/second floor? could garden suites hold more than 1 unit (has separate entrances)?
- I think it is very exciting and I commend the city for moving to make this possible. A network of those actively interested in piloting this process and learning from each other and helping the city disseminate best practices would be very helpful.
- I am hoping that existing structures can be grandfathered into garden suites. I also feel that the garage requirement in the City is very antiquated where there is a requirement to house an automobile. These spaces should be freed to assist with additional housing supply to support affordable housing in the City and intergenerational living.
- I think we have to be careful about curbing speculative development use cases. Garden suites should help with supply and affordability — not for investors to increase their wealth. These should not be used for short-term rentals like Airbnb/VRBO/etc.
- let em build!
- Its a natural seamless transition from Public Laneway housing to Garden Suite housing all the work has been done basically.
- would love to see a program in place that provides for Garden Suites across the city of Toronto and not in specific pockets of the city many lots in the west and east end of the city are quite large but these properties are not able to have laneway homes would be nice to have an option to build a garden suite when the home is situated on a large lot
- Don't rush this. Priority for multi-generational housing is a great idea that supports positively for families and communities. Small granny or work-from-home suites should be explored. How do you limit the over-densification of functional neighbourhoods particularly when the alleyways and roadways in most neighbourhoods are already full of cars and lack green space as it is. We lack the necessary park, play and outdoor ravines and green space in general.
- To be implemented as soon as possible to help with the lack of housing supply within the city.
- I think there are immense opportunities to provide infill within the Yellow Belt. Corner lots and extremely deep lots represent opportunities where to accommodate this. Vehicle Parking should be completely eliminated from any policies for Garden Suites - bike parking is a must. Offer

opportunities for small-scale retail in select scenarios when a direct street frontage is available. Minimize up front costs to get these types of projects started e.g. minimize development charges for these types of units and fast track

- Need to think about access. The narrow laneway to the backyard of our property would certainly prohibit this on our lot unfortunately. Also need to consider how they be constructed without adverse impact onto other properties. It would be a temporary issue tho. I love the idea. We need more housing in this City.
- I work at an architecture firm in Toronto specializing in residential-only projects. We are currently working on a number of laneway houses. We have a steady stream of inquiries from people who want to build garden suites on their non-laneway properties. Many of these properties appear to be very well suited for this typology, in my opinion and based on the regulations for laneway houses at least. On a personal note as well, I fully support laneway houses and garden suites as part of our neighbour fabrics. I think it will create the kind of density that helps communities thrive.
- My main concern is the volume of these units and inability to control. HVAC on the roof can create noise, height and massing can be an issue for neighbours, suites may make the principal property less affordable, not requiring onsite parking will force residents onto the already crowded streets, how do we prevent these being use for other purposes than residential?
- For every one of these you allow there will be another illegal one put up. It is very easy to hide what you are doing until it is too late. This causes a safety concern when illegal houses are built. How are you going to enforce building code standards? You can barely do it now.
- Reasonable heigh restrictions should be enforced ie. angled roof to neighbour directly behind garden suite like laneway designs require
- Financial incentives for affordable units would have to be substantial as building garden suites is expensive. Shadow impact should not be a factor that is considered, as long as height is reasonably limited.
- I am not in agreement with garden suites. I have concerns with privacy, parking, congestion, aesthetics, green space and building's overshadowing the neighbours yard.
- I think garden suites can be a great opportunity. My biggest concerns are about increasing population density (and subsequent demand on local community services, ttc/parking/traffic, essential services like grocery stores etc). I also believe garden suites should be limited to one unit only, of 4 people max, and can have a basement area but not basement suites. I've lived in a few cities across Canada and Toronto has some of the most charming, unique rental units, as well as some of the most opportunistic ones that barely make the cut, if at all, and take advantage of a competitive market. I believe Toronto can, and should, address housing affordability AND housing quality at the same time.
- People will rent these shacks out to families of 4 living in squalor.
- I am very concerned that allowing Garden Suites would only serve to increase the square footage enjoyed by the main house, and not be rotated into rental or living space. There should be a minimum square footage required to ensure any new housing is suitable for habitation and not simply a converted shed/bunkie.
- Garden Suites will have a negative impact in residential neighbourhoods.
- Cannot be discussed in a regulatory vacuum. Financial incentive for affordable could be good idea but not if results in less ground cover and more 'pooling' on street. Should not be more than 1 storey high. Neighbours must agree as could impact their light. Nice idea if allowed grandparents to live near children but with own space but then once building is up, it is still up. So need to discuss all issues at once. Could we stop people using it for Airbnb?
- How will you avoid garden suites being rented out as airbnbs? What avenues do residents have to ensure noise can be managed? managing impact of increased population density with respect to utilities/amenties?
- I think this is a fantastic idea. I've got several family members that could end up being dependants in the near future. A garden suite/granny flat would make this much more affordable and pleasant for all involved. Up until it's required for that use it could provide additional space as a home office (sorely needed right now).
- F*** NIMBY's, build more housing, stop killing poor people.
- Great idea!

- Any and all options to adding housing to our established, single-family home neighbourhoods should be explored as quickly as possible. Our main streets were struggling before COVID and will adding density to these neighbourhoods will support the vibrant, independent, successful small businesses that make our main streets so valuable.
- No
- Na
- Great idea but needs careful implementation to preserve green space. The city might consider sharing sewer extension costs as having composting toilets across a neighborhood may become unpleasant en masse.
- I would want it to be clear that these units are NOT intended for AirBnB units or to limit these to short term rental blocks of 1 week and to a total of 6 weeks per year for any unit. A minimum rental period would be no shorter than six months otherwise. This would have strong oversight by neighbourhoods and heavy fines would be levied if this rule was not adhered to.
- I am in support of garden suites
- as a settler on this land, i believe the guiding factor needs to be the question, "are we living in harmony with the Indigenous Peoples of this land." answer that first.
- This is an amazing idea to help with rent and living spaces in Toronto. Also, (personally speaking) it would allow for elderly family members to live on their own but close to family and as I said existing structures should be grandfathered.
- Hurry up and make the process simple and easy to do. Models of small footprint/creative use of space would be great. Toronto is way behind other Canadian municipalities. Stop studying it to death and just get on with it! A list of green design and build companies with turnkey reasonably priced options would also be very helpful.
- I think that Garden Suites should be permitted in those cases where the Owner lives on the property (i.e., in the main dwelling or the Garden Suite). If the Owner is not located on site, the name and phone number of the owner should be affixed to a metal tag on the side of the Garden Suite. The city's noise bylaw should be updated to provide an effective control on these units (e.g., no loud music in backyard after 11pm, etc.)
- We are a builder focusing on the missing middle. In order to make the MM financially viable, due to the parkland levy and development charges, being able to sell the laneway or garden suite is critical in order to hit a minimum yield ie. 10%, to justify the risk. Also, as a home owner, shading, material usage on the side lot line and massing are critical to win over residents.
- More affluent areas will not develop Garden Suites. There is already overcrowding and small lots in Toronto that will be turned into slums. Mexico, Mumbai, Calcutta, and most other 3rd world countries have this type of living space and it will create a drain on our infrastructure, fire hazards, potential for conflict, overcrowding, and more. Do not agree with this as an alternative to proper 'affordable housing' and should it proceed taxes must be applied at a premium (ie. more that a garage or toolshed)
- Snow removal has been a chronic problem, since absent landlords rent to sneaky renters who 'dump and run' snow on their neighbours. Urban planners need to figure this into the plans, and actually 'plan', not just rubber stamp without consequences.
- Suitable for fairly deep lots so that enough green space remains
- I am a property owner in Toronto with a large lot that borders but is not technically on a laneway. Our property value was based on being able to build on the large lot, but currently it's not allowed. I think it important that if house prices are reflecting lot size and garden suite capability, that this actually happens! I also feel that this is the ultimate aging in place solution, particularly for family members who may not live in a city, but who could provide caregiving or may require caregiving. I would much prefer to see more garden suites that build upon existing communities than another massive building go up and replace all of the beautiful old historic buildings in Toronto. Save our city! Make it denser not taller! Actually support aging in place! Thank you!
- In most neighbourhoods, parking is already a problem. Garden suites will make this worse as they will add more cars. I would also not support any additional uses for garden suites than what is permitted for the existing residence - which would lead the neighbourhood to evolve into a mixed residential /commercial zone with clients and customers coming and going from the Garden Suites. I think the personal enjoyment of one's own property could be compromised by a Garden suite on a neighbouring property with its additional activity, noise etc.

- let's do it
- We need the natural ground cover, shrubs, gardens, grass and trees to give space for wild life, birds and insects. If we cover every inch of the land there will be worse drainage and water run off issues, no parking for the cars and reduced mental health. People need green space!!!! Garden suites are a very bad, short term fix.
- Would be concerned about short term rentals, would need to have some high standards in place. Mainly concerned with size restrictions in my neighbourhood. If lot is 125 wide, would have to get neighbours agreement or it will become out of control. Many times any issues with exceptions to variances are overruled by province and am not seeing any positive changes from the regional committees.
- ADUs have been very successful elsewhere, for example, in Portland.
- Please allow them for affordable housing, NOT short-term rentals like AirBNB!
- Please make it accessible for as many owners as possible. We have to make the most of the limited land we have. It makes for more interesting neighborhoods too.
- Laneway and Garden Suites are cause for trouble to neighbours who want to live in a quiet detached home and enjoy their property. Such neighbourhoods will go down in value. I definitely would not want to live near such property due to all the additional noise and trouble tenants would bring to the neighbourhood.
- Garden Suites are a nice idea in theory, but in practice it would be a terrible mess. Housing is designed with certain safety specifications in mind, and all of that would be in jeopardy if Garden Suites are permitted. In addition, Garden Suites would negatively impact the quiet enjoyment and privacy of neighbours.
- There may be the odd property (large enough) to accommodate a garden suite however most properties do not. Our neighbourhoods are overcrowded with cars, garbage bins, people.
- PLEASE let them suit the neighbourhood in architectural style
- exploitation of renters by owners who can afford to build a garden suite who won't need the income from the property. priorities should lie elsewhere for building affordable housing
- It would be infinitely better to allow small multiplex buildings on streets now zoned for single-family houses only. Garden suites will primarily benefit those already living in large houses on large lots. Their use to provide intergenerational housing on one lot is a positive.
- These have the potential to contribute to solving the rental and affordability issues in Toronto however, also have the potential to create a whole slew of new issues and problems. I would caution the city to think carefully and not rush into allowing garden suites without examining pitfalls as well as benefits. But overall, I'm in favour of them
- They need to be small, there needs to be a lot area minimum. Can't take mature trees. Research data on no parking. Must be a primary resident for the owner.
- cramming more people into smaller spaces is not acceptable. The city does not keep up with amenities for denser populations.
- I would have concerns if a garden suite was built right beside a lot line as next door neighbours might be subject to noise, light, etc.
- Concern that tenants may bother neighbours (noise privacy etc.) too difficult for landlords to deal with difficult tenants (I would NEVER want to be a landlord in Toronto after the horror stories I've read about bad tenants that cannot be dealt with effectively - even those who commit fraud can stay in homes for lengthy periods of time and I do not have deep enough pockets to handle such a possibility).
- I Love the idea, it's a win win win for affordable housing, healthy living city and quality of life.
- This is a great thing.
- IF these are approved - and I hope they are not - even ONE objection by neighbours within the immediate block/blocks would deny the application. Further to this, 5 years must pass before applications can be submitted BY ANYONE WITHIN THAT BLOCK (regardless if they are current or future owners).
- I lived in a coach house as a recent graduate in 1989 and it was lovely. the main house on the property was three apartments. It totally fit into the neighbourhood and was in the same place as many of the adjacent garages. No laneway but a driveway did come back to the coach house. We had bikes but no car.
- Concerns of privacy, noise impacting neighbours.

- Please, don't squander this opportunity! This should be a by right process with permits issued in 30 days. Don't kill projects with shadow studies, tree protection, and other nonsense. We are in a housing crisis and more of the same mistakes will not help.
- They are an excellent idea for affordable living and investment in growing cities.
- How about suites above the existing garage? So the green space remains as if is presently used for vegetable garden.
- I think garden suite sizes should also depend on transit accessibility of the lot.
- the definition of garden suite indicates there is no lane, however you cannot build a laneway suite on a lane if you are further than a certain distance from a side lane or have a wide access from the street. This leaves a whole bunch of properties not able to have either. The definition of the garden suite should be altered to include properties on lanes where the fire fighting access is not adequate to qualify as a laneway house.
- No
- There are many factors that should be considered with respect to garden suites such as whether the neighbourhood infrastructure supports intensification. Access to transit should also be considered if parking spaces will not be required. If more lawns will be taken up with garden suites, it will put even more pressure on public green spaces. With more and more research showing the positive impacts of time outside in nature on mental health, the city will need to continue to expand available public green spaces.
- Enforcement of whatever is decided is a major issue. People become very 'creative' in discovering ways to get around the rules. It becomes a nightmare for neighbours. Everyone applies for easements which means local residents time and other resources are spent trying to protect the property rather than simply enjoy it. If this comes into affect in my neighbourhood, I expect that my property taxes will be reduced. Multi generational living is not as appealing as the city thinks increasing density like this is a very risky endeavour.
- Great idea - we need to increase density in residential neighborhoods, especially older areas with large lots
- This is a very sound idea given our accommodation crunch, but aesthetics must always be respected in the construction of garden suites. It would be particularly useful to those with semi-dependent elderly relatives.
- Were heading for a disaster if Garden Suites are accepted.
- Perfect answer for inter generational residence
- It's a great idea and I fully support it!
- They should well constructed and have a nice appearance.
- Fast track this concept
- NOT to be allowed for vacation or short term rentals, or for business ventures requiring the use of loud machinery and equipment
- I think they are a great idea to solve many issues in Toronto. I'm all for them!
- Yes, I don't think it needs to have any real requirements in terms of how far it has to be from the main unit. I think there should be enough flexibility since it can't be severed off and sold in terms of the lot. It wouldn't make sense to have a requirement which needs it to be far from the primary house.
- Really like the guidelines for laneway housing apply similar principles to garden suites. Limit heights, setbacks etc.. Connect services back to main house. Firefighter access thru side yard setback on main house
- Remove impediments and bureaucracy from the process. Apply design requirements to ensure compatibility with neighbourhood character in terms of scale.
- Net zero should be mandatory or at least incentivized. Owner must be obligated to maintain in excellent condition. Privacy should be integral to design.
- making sure fire access rule don't severely restrict eligibility
- You're on the right track
- Noise levels should not disturb neighbours, and no harsh chemicals.
- Privacy is a huge concern. If my neighbour has a garden suite. The use of my yard is more restrictive.
- I think garden suites are a great idea. My biggest concern would be residential neighbourhood becoming a place for short-term / AirBnB rentals which sometimes result in noise complaints and

other issues. I support garden suites primarily for inter-generational living, downsizing (age on property) living and additional living space in general - it necessarily for more space to rent.

- Brilliant idea!
- I don't think Garden Suites are a good idea. They have the potential to over populate a quiet neighbourhood and the could also attract an undesirable element.
- We bought a single family dwelling in a neighbourhood (either learn how to spell using Canadian English or turn off your American English spell checker) comprised of such dwellings and have no interest in the City of Toronto turning it into the same sort of crowded ghetto that is downtown Toronto.
- I'm concerned it's going to further increase the prices of homes (especially if they have *potential* for a garden suite). Housing prices are unattainable and not everyone wants to have to rent out a portion of their home to make the mortgage affordable.
- There should be clear regulations so permits can be fast tracked
- More people likely being unrelated being congested into smaller spaces on property. Most likely will be short term renters. Strong concerns on shadow affect, privacy and potential noise impact. With spread of diseases such as Covid, could lead to increase in communicable diseases within the community. As an alternative, should consider making more available accommodation outside of the GTA
- I am sure that neighbours will be against garden suites, but it is important to factor in the voices of those that may potentially move into the neighbourhood. NIMBY impacts affordable housing and Toronto is a world class city. The affordability crisis needs to be addressed using many different tools and I think laneway and garden suites will help provide one avenue to diversify the housing stock and bring more units to the rental market.
- Given difficult access for repairs, thoughtful rules around longevity of materials (40 yr roofs). Impact of shade, setbacks, loss of soft landscaping to absorb runoff. Make goal a cottage concept not watchtowers nor warrens. Ensure specific side of house access rules to respect neighbours' property. Include sound study for new noise reflected on new hard surfaces. Strict water runoff / rain barrel rules for new roofs. Tighter building permit regs for renos since compliance from street view is hard.
- this does not solve the housing issues in Toronto. It is a short-sighted and patch work solution
- The lots in my neighborhood would not be big enough for garden suites without impacting the neighborhood
- Protection for landlords who create such spaces, since seniors may be the ones creating them.
- A really really bad idea.
- I want all new housing to be affordable and not an opportunity for landowners or landlords to grab cash through ABnB etc. We all benefit when people have affordable and decent housing in our city.
- This strategy seems to favour providing low income housing among neighbours which is already extremely high density and there is already a great deal of crime due to these low income housing options. By allowing even more population in a neighborhood such as Weston Village, we introduce even higher density, lack of resources (I.e schooling, infrastructure, medical care) for those of us who are property owners and paying taxes to barely maintain our community resources as they exist today. This project. Having a garden suite in one of my neighboring yards will reduce my right to enjoyment on my own property in creating lack of privacy. Overall, this proposal is absolutely not appealing to a young property owner like myself that is trying to create rejuvenation in a community that is riddled with issues caused by low income housing.
- I don't want them in our neighbour hood. We have enough issues with privacy in our backyard and lack of trees
- We need to allow Garden Suites. We also need to allow houses on the streets to be one floor taller - to get to 3 or 4 story buildings. We could house so many more people in low density neighbourhoods if we added another floor to our streets.
- If they impact on the privacy, noise level and parking congestion for the neighbours, this should not be an option in that neighbourhood. If they allow too many people to live on one small property, who are not of the same family in a residential single home area, this impacts on the surrounding neighbours.
- I think it is a wonderful idea

- I think they're neat, I think it would be good to have in low density areas like my own where a lot of the plots have space for one
- Like the idea, in general. Concerns about potential abuses in type of use, noise, size, proximity to neighbouring property lines, cutting trees and bushes, not enough green space for amenities and water absorption
- Garden suites would be valuable for homeowners, real estate property value and the social and economic dynamic in the city for access to different typologies of housing. There should be incentives to build laneway and garden suites (similar to City of Vancouver) where you can get additional GFA in the main home or no permit fees, to help make it more palatable for homeowners to build them!
- Make them accessible as-of-right with fast-track permit and minimal paperwork and 0 development charges. The biggest hurdle to affordability in Toronto is how complex and costly it is to build anything. You have an opportunity to change that dramatically.
- We need green space
- Great option for homeowners & tenants. Adds opportunity.
- I love the idea of building a tiny home with the backyard space available. This thought crossed my mind 3 years ago when I saw the beautiful tiny homes being built. Though I love greenery and a beautiful lawn, I find maintenance can be expensive. Why not extend the home and live close to family as we grow older?
- More gentle density! Get rid of development fees for all lowrise missing-middle solutions. I live across from an old factory converted to condos and there are a few multi-unit residential residential buildings side by side with other houses in my street and they add to the neighbourhood. Eliminate the yellow belt and screw the NIMBYs because the greater-good is what's important for this city.
- Height and GFA are key components and whether a home owner elects to have parking for cars should be up to the owner. Bike parking is good to mandate. Energy efficiently as well.
- I am a young person greatly affected by the housing crisis. My father in law has a sizeable property with more than enough space to build a secondary garden suite and had invited me to do so. Currently, zoning restrictions limit my ability to do so. Being able to build a garden suite enables us to have a home, along with having my children grow close with their relatives, and gives homeowners greater flexibility with their property.
- This is beating around the bush at the margins to fix affordability. We need walkup apartments at the edges of neighbourhoods to make a real impact. Shame on the City on focusing on ways to allow privileged home owners to profit off a housing crisis. Fix zoning in yellow belt first! Disgusting
- Why not allow tiny homes?
- Properties should have a minimum square footage in order to have Garden Suites in order to prevent possible neighbor conflicts.
- How do you keep house with laneway or garden suite from becoming investment property? That makes the market move competitive for single family.
- The definition of garden suites should include building them on properties with laneway access that do not currently comply with parts of the laneway housing by-law (e.g. too far from end of block).
- Should allow all properties to have up to 3 units without parking requirements. Or 1 unit per floor if they meet fire and building codes.
- Typically a tiny house is ideal in the backyard space. With older parents and adult children with families wanting to live together this would be one of the best solutions without having to relocate when housing prices in Toronto is hitting the roof. This also provides older parents their independence and downsizing requirements. I considered this idea 3 years ago when garden maintenance was getting expensive. Will the government provide any subsidy to encourage this incentive or perhaps a tax break?
- Serious consideration needs to be given on the height that it does not negatively impact neighbours. No one purchases a home with space between their neighbours and suddenly there is a two storey Garden Suite overshadowing your small backyard. I have seen this in the Beach area. This happens often when a townhouse complex is built first and a few years later up goes a condominium towering over the townhomes. This should never happen.

- Pls minimize red tape and traditional barriers. Incentivize innovative and high quality construction of suites. Consider property tax holidays for the additional suite. This will help to mitigate our housing issues
- I think is an important step that city of Toronto is taking to allow owners to build more liveable space, as we all know with demographic changing, where families with bigger family members require more space, is a win win situation for the city and the house owners
- Any Garden Suites would be terrible to the community and neighborhood.
- Can they be built underground?
- Garden suits should be allowed. Creates extra livening space and more affordable housing options. Approve soon please!
- Not at this time
- No
- I have a laneway with garage and want to either customize my existing garage or add a garden office shed for work not a live work just a work with plumbing. I think this should be fast tracked given the covid crisis and the adoption of Work from home becomes more popular.
- Fully supportive
- Very important strategy to increase diversity, create more affordable housing, intensify use of city infrastructure
- 1. Access to local public schools need to be considered as many neighbourhoods in the core of Toronto are over-capacity and are not accepting new enrollments...don't want to see more traffic by having to bus students 2. I have big concerns about building Garden Suites as it would mean reducing green space, this producing more risks for flooding and run-off water. 3. Concerned about current sewers and other infrastructure handle the extra loads of additional dwellings. 4. Many neighbourhoods are already struggling with not having enough green space/parkland for existing residents. 5. Very concerned about privacy and over crowding.
- I think they are preferable option to high rises. This alternative way of identification will preserve the character and charm of neighborhoods, instead of surrounding them, walling off the neighbourhoods and destroying the charm and reason people were attracted to it. Easier on city infrastructure as well.
- If the motivation for building a garden suite is for rental income, then these are likely to be built as cheaply as possible and without a focus on either architectural details/visual appeal or impact on surrounding neighbours. Particularly given the concern of many landlords regarding destruction of property by tenants. The situation would be different for a senior aging in place, or a multigenerational household. If neighbourhoods become filled with cheaply/poorly constructed units then these will not only impact privacy of neighbours, but potentially become fire hazards or other potential sources of building non-compliance.
- Don't over think it, just do it.
- Im opposed to garden suites. Build more high rises in affluent neighborhoods first, like forest hill. Negatively impact those neighborhoods first and add to intensification there.
- I think the city should reduce restrictions on Garden Suites/laneway suites. Owners should have more flexibility to build spaces to accommodate their needs.
- The building design is covered as much as possible with planting. There is an exchange of green space. For every metre of coverage the building lot must provide additional green space ie. green roofs, vertical green walls. The buildings must be as visually low impactful as possible so we keep our sense of seeing gardens. This can be done with trellised walls, green roofs, dark building colours, rooflights instead of lots of windows. The buildings have a maximum height yet are allowed to have deep lower levels which could extend out into the main garden with garden skylights for natural light and a terrace at the garden level. So the suite has below grade area which is invisible above. In order for these buildings to be small some OBC can be relaxed for stair widths etc. Limitations on night light are important to keep light levels low in gardens. Perhaps all units must have black out blinds and only low level exterior lighting. I do not think they should be used for STR short term rentals, Airbnb. These should be for Toronto residents who will know and care about their neighbourhood and neighbours. Bylaws might be put in place so that neighbours are able to request that night time light levels are reduced and daily noise kept to a reasonable level. This kind of density happens all over Europe, people simply need to be respectful of neighbours. I am very happy to have further conversations about this exciting

development. I am a British reg. architect and Canadian designer. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the dialogue.

- As a homeowner age 60, I have opted for a reverse mortgage 2 years ago (best decision for me at the time). Now that I am earning more money, the opportunity to live on the property while one or both of adult children remaining here means I could 'buy back' my home. I have had tenants in the past, but because of COVID adult children now reside with me.
- I think the fact that 93% of aging people who want to live in their home and community should have a chance to live where they want to be. The prices of homes will continue to increase over time and homeowners should have an opportunity to help with their overall expenses by a: create a rental property on their property and b: have an opportunity to create a separate dwelling for their child(ren) as they enter post-secondary education or, the workforce at large.
- I don't agree with having them
- They would make a positive impact on available accommodations and rates in Toronto... and enable previously unused and 'dead' zones in large lots to be put to use
- Garden suites are a no brainer in a City like Toronto greatly in need of more housing options, and specifically more rental units. Its time to densify our yellow belt!
- My parents are getting older. Would love to give them an opportunity to live with us in the future. Pandemic illustrated the need for a separate space for multi generational households.
- Non
- great idea, would add extra units to the housing stock while also freeing up larger units with seniors or others living alone
- I think it is an insane project. This is offloading public sector responsibility to ensure adequate housing. It supports individual GREED . Development in Toronto is already a mess. Ontario is a paradise for developers and speculators. The environmental quality of life in this city is getting worse every year.
- This has been an informative and thorough survey. Thank you so much for asking. Please allow for much building of more affordable and environmentally sustainable housing in low-rise residential neighbourhoods in Toronto. Be a leader, so other cities and towns in Canada can also follow. Housing is a crisis we CAN manage. Thank you for your work in this area and industry.
- I live on a corner lot, so would be curious how rules might apply differently in that case (i.e. if you used main dwelling front or even side setback requirements, then it would squeeze a garden suite to be of no value. There would need to be allowances to permit a corner lot garden suite to be closer to the road, or in my case, sidewalk.
- Build them asap!
- Great initiative - let's keep this rolling expeditiously instead of having it delayed with further studies. There's always going to be those opposed to change and we need more housing and affordable housing in the City.
- I love the idea of garden suites as I do with laneway suites. I want affordable housing options to continue to expand in Toronto.
- Not sure how to accomplish this, but try to keep speculators and professional developers out of this market!
- This should have been allowed a very long time ago. Reduce the limitations on what property owners are able to do with their property!
- I love the idea but I worry about disturbing neighbors and especially about the rise in price for current houses with a lot that allow it. It will be great for families with adult children, or to get an extra income, more rental offer of course but it won't drive down rental costs and most likely will rise buying costs
- it's a good idea. I look forward to seeing where it goes from here.
- Fantastic idea to bring more rental units into the market for those in need.
- They're a great idea and we should approve them.
- Garden suites may result in the following: population overcrowding, parking problems, increasing number of tenants in owner/occupied neighbourhoods, light/shadow/noise issues, construction issues (laying of new sewer lines, etc.).
- Do it.
- Existing homes should have an easier process to becoming a legal duplex or triplex, in neighbourhoods where it is appropriate.

- Firstly, they're long overdue. It's about time the city acted on missing middle housing. Secondly, there need to be reasonable 'as of right' parameters so that every proposal doesn't end up at COA and TLAB. Big waste of time if we use the current approvals process.
- I love the concept. Let's make sure it doesn't get slowed down by lengthy permitting times and bureaucratic nightmare that would defeat the purpose. The city needs more housing supply fast as we can attest from the current housing market and condos are not necessary the answer for the low rise residential neighbourhoods in our city. So let's make sure density gets maximized horizontally in neighbourhoods where vertical density is not welcome at this time.
- I am a pro believer in dense city/dense neighbourhood - it helps local businesses and encourage mixity. Garden suites will definitely help it!
- I feel this will provide solutions to many issues Individuals and Families need throughout life. It maximizes the unused space on many properties. Access and Safety needs to be accounted for.
- Specifics around access, parking, sewer hookups, and other utilities as well as property taxes will need to be clear. Does rent need to be charged if a family member resides there?
- Stop this crazy Idea.
- Windows should not directly overlook the adjacent backyards. Privacy concerns. For example, windows should only be able to be installed on the front (facing the main house) and not the three other walls.
- I think they are a great concept and have worked elsewhere in Ontario and Canada
- They should follow the same rules except for the fire department rules where a sprinkler system is installed and the the requirements can change
- The architecture of the suite should be critical. We cannot build boxes
- I believe that Garden Suites should be able to run on its own, as it will affect certain things coming from the main house. Eg. water having low pressure when both Garden and House run it.
- I know someone with a garden suite (in California) and have stayed with them as a visitor - I'd never seen anything like it! The homeowner used it as a work-from-home space on days when they didn't need to be in the office. But when I visited it also made a great place to stay as a guest. Wish we had that kind of thing here as well
- No
- How would development of garden suites impact green space in the city?
- No
- I think this is a good idea for people who lives alone, small business or for artist. It is another option besides condo and house (which are very expensive)
- This NOT the solution for affordable housing. Fire issues, Airbnb issues, privacy issues, noise and light issues, parking issues, too much density issues, I DON'T agree with this solution at all.
- They are great and work perfectly fine in other cities around the world
- As long as they enhance the architectural look and feel of the neighbourhood and are built in a sustainable and eco-friendly way, I don't see why they can't be developed.
- I have so many question- how will this affect property taxes, privacy, green space (lawns, trees), noise between properties. Are these one story or two?
- No
- Firmly opposed. City density should be reduced, not increased.
- The most ridiculous idea I have heard of and would definitely devalue the property, overburden infrastructures and create traffic chaos. Are we heading in a third world direction? Most homes can urgently accommodate basement or in-law or grandparent suites. Parking would be a nightmare and infrastructure could not accommodate additional traffic, etc.why not infill Lake Ontario to accommodate additional housing as they have done both here and in other countries
- Great idea.
- Terrible idea
- Many areas would end up with different sized units with little privacy for anyone. Facilities in many areas of Toronto are scarce or simply not provided the further the area is from downtown. For example few restaurants or recreational areas, swimming pools ice rinks etc. Also grocery stores and hospitals. Public transport for many people living away from subways is grossly overcrowded and takes hours to get anywhere.

- I don't think I've seen anything regarding the size of garden suites in this survey. Presumably the size would be in relation to the size of the property and ensure there would adequate soft-scaping after completion.
- Don't do it
- I am against building Garden Suites for many reasons, but the main one is the impact this will have on the city's biodiversity and environment. Allowing Garden Suites to be built in backyards means that the city's backyard greenspaces will be drastically reduced. These backyard greenspaces contain lawns, gardens and trees, which clean our air and water, and provide habitats for birds, butterflies and pollinators, which are already in serious decline all over North America. What politicians and planners don't realize is that green spaces are also essential for our mental health. Much of our green space is already being lost every year, and it is a shame that the little that remains in our backyards, is now also at risk of being lost. I will also point out that since Toronto is located along a migratory bird flyway, millions of migratory birds pass through the city during the spring and fall migrations, every year. Allowing Garden Suites to be built in backyards will reduce the green spaces that the birds rely on during their annual migrations, and may even violate the Migratory Birds Act.
- No one wants to live next to a house with a second house filling the backyard. We already have sewage problems requiring eave troughs be disconnected from sewers because of inadequate design. Power, water supply and sewage systems will be gradually overloaded as garden suites are built, with no way to fix this afterward. Landscaping design for rainwater runoff will be ruined, flooding neighbouring basements. Too many cars will be parked on the street, illegally. Very few grandmothers will live in these. They will become disgraceful low rent eye sores. From every aspect, this is a really bad idea.
- I said no about 'affordable rents' and benefits for sustainable building - I like to support these but I think tracking them is impractical.
- I'm confused about the question on flexibility to protect trees - I think this may refer to relaxing setback rules to site a garden suite to protect a tree. However, the ability to remove a tree without penalty should also be given to enable a they increased utilization of garden suite that would not have been comprehended when the tree was planted. Potentially a new tree can be planted in a nearby location to off set the removal. As to parking, I think lane way houses basically meant that a garage had to be converted to living accommodations (or a new structure on the garage footprint) meaning the parking was lost. How ever if a garden suite can be located on the property while preserving the garage, then that should be allowed (I.e. removing the limitation of only 1 accessory building on the property).
- I think this is an interesting and powerful idea to provide more affordable housing and make our city increasingly livable.
- This policy will completely alter the quality, look and feel of suburban neighbourhoods over time without appreciably increasing the stock of affordable housing because people are greedy and they're not going to be sacrificing their personal profit for the city's stated social cause. I worry that a plan like this creates unwanted disruption such as garbage bins, brick walls, obstructed views, open fires, noise, idling cars and potentially inconsiderate, non-vested neighbours placed right next to my private and enjoyable back yard. Unless there is a dedicated garden suites Bylaw Division to police this stuff, a policy like this could make a lot of people miserable for the sake of benefiting the few.
- Great idea. Long overdue. Try to be flexible in guidelines rather than overly prescriptive.
- I strongly support the initiative to explore and hopefully allow garden suites. I believe it aligns the interests of the city and its residents, both renters and homeowners. It adds to the density of a city on under utilized lots and increases the vibrancy of a neighbourhood.
- Multiple garden suites in close proximity may not have a desirable affect overall (planning/built form/ adjacencies/ lack of setbacks/ shadows, soft landscaping and trees. They should be the exception - not the rule, conflicts with life safety and emergency access notwithstanding. I don't think this applies as readily to laneway suites and fully support those.
- Yes yes yes.
- I think they are a great idea.
- Please do not be too stringent with zoning regulations on where/how garden suites can be built. Lot sizes are so variable around Toronto that it will make it difficult to build a garden suite if the setbacks etc are too restrictive.

- There should be a size requirement re lot size
- This is not appropriate use of single family homes and will only destroy the fabric of neighbourhoods. Eliminating green space thus creating drainage issues. Cutting mature trees. Sitting in the back of your home looking directly in the front window of an abutting garden suite located mere feet from your back wall. The density issues this will create will already put neighbours on edge subsequently more calls to the police and 311. The noise and privacy issues of people living cheek to jowl in Toronto will be exacerbated by this ridiculous proposal. Developers will purposely tear down houses and additionally construct garden suites to maximize their profit. What do you get? The flight that is now taking place where residents are fleeing Toronto because of the lack of support for neighbourhoods, residents and communities.
- What agreements need to be reached with neighbouring properties?
- Please do not allow them!! Thanks for listening
- They will create problems with water, sewage and hydro drains on the community, more congestion, more cars, invasion of neighbours privacy in the back yards, tenant issues and noise for neighbours etc. I am strongly against.
- It's likely that these suites will be expensive. I'd like to see some sort of incentives to build balanced by reductions in rent. Most of all, we need a mixture of incomes in all neighbourhoods and many moderate and low income people are absent from neighbourhoods dominated by single family homes.
- This is very much needed, and as few regulations as possible should be included. Must consider that Toronto is lagging other major cities in permitting these, as well as in eliminating parking requirements. This will only contribute a small amount to housing stock and affordability, but is much needed to mitigate discriminatory zoning practices.
- I do not want them in this neighborhood
- In the Victorian downtown there really isn't the space for a garage and a garden suite. Even without a garage the population density is too great. I live next to a house with four apartments, and I back on an alley with an alley house and houses with up to six units, so I know quite a lot about the general disruption of high population density. It's noisy... can be fun....but in the summer the continual deck and lane and back yard parties are very tedious indeed. Consequently I am hesitant about the prospect of one more layer of population. There is also the high turnover of tenants: one never knows just who lives anywhere which is not conducive to security in one's own 'hood.
- Don't let the fire department make up a bunch of rules for Garden Suites like they did for laneway suites.
- There should be financial rebates to incentivize off-grid building of garden suites to lessen burden on city systems, such as solar panels for energy, rain capture for water, and compost toilets that do not need to be linked to city sewage.
- I'm really concerned about density in the neighborhood. I'm also concerned about the loss of greenery and privacy
- Allow at least one unit per lot even if there's only one house on a multi-lot property. That is, there are houses that were built on multiple adjoining lots of land the suggestion is to allow one garden unit *per lot* not per house.
- Key thing is that city should be encouraging this type of development and not make it only accessible to people with deep pockets.
- This will make the neighbourhood more crowded and noisy. But if it is for ageing parents, then that would be useful as elderly people are less noisy and being part of the family will respect the life style of the subdivision.
- Please make this city more affordable by providing the opportunity to build garden suites so that more people can live in the yellow belt. Please.
- I fear that these will become air B and B hotels. I would never want to live next to one of these. With Strangers traveling within feet of my house in the lane between them to get to the back yard. If short term rentals would be banned and ENFORCED then I would be less opposed. But they would need to have serious privacy issues with in regards to height and visibility into backyards. As backyards are designed to not be seen from the house next door but not necessarily from the back yard as well. Owners with pools like myself would be very irritated with a stranger staring at my daughter as she swims because his windows are feet away from the pool..the police would be

called a lot. All in all this idea of a separate dwelling is a very bad idea for keeping good neighbours just to make a granny flat. If you want more income turn your basement into a rental property and share the space you already have.

- I don't like it because it does not have proper entrance and proper private space either. Who likes other people walk in the middle of their backyard? I don't like to see my neighbors have these units because it affects my privacy as well. I think the city needs a different type of building all together in the urban planning.
- N/A
- Don't listen to the NIMBYs. Their kids are under 16 so they have no clue what it's like for young people to start out after Uni or upon marriage. G suites can allow the younger gen to help out their parents while their parents help them. Win win.
- As a tenant in an apartment building in a neighborhood I love (but can't afford to buy in) garden suites give me the possibility to rent something at an affordable price in my neighborhood
- Strongly against this proposal. A high end neighborhood should have its privacy and garden space. We pay enough taxes to be able to enjoy our space alone.
- Affordability for renters and not just built for family members.
- none other that already hi-lighted
- I would request that there is no set-back requirements placed around the garden house building. In my case I am located directly beside a low rise residential building and the developer was allowed to basically butt up next to me however I would be required to step back (3 ft?) away from that same building because I'm not a developer. This bylaw would limit my already narrow build area if garden housing were to be permitted. I think the city should be even more flexible with regular house owners since they are allowing such a high number of buildings to go up in our residential neighbourhoods without much consideration to the effect on surrounding home owners. The ability to build a garden house on my lot would greatly assist me in being able to keep my parent out of senior living accommodations which is my biggest fear given all that has happened in many of those facilities. You have my full support for this type of housing to happen as soon as possible. Thank you for allowing for this survey.
- Roof top terrace to allow for more green / garden space, and for private outdoor space for garden suite users
- Make green roofs mandatory on the garden suite structures in order to increase biodiversity
- It is imperative that neighbours are not impacted. Tax payers have a right to the property they purchased as is without having a neighbouring unit take away from their privacy or green Space or increase noise level, garbage and unsightly structures which reduce their property value or quality of life
- I am not able to build a laneway suite because the right of way is 30 inches and not 36. although the laneway itself is 12 feet wide. Now the city is allowing garden suites it a[ff]ears. Isn't this ridiculous?
- What are you people smoking down there ? You my must have COVID brain to think people would want to put a mini shed, call it what you want ,,it's a mini shed that will turn into a squatters dump, in their yard . Really ?????? Are you kidding ?
- I wouldn't like them in my neighborhood!
- Do it!
- Great idea and definitely interested to see more density in low-rise neighborhoods. It's still pretty empty and have room for more people for sure.
- Very interested to have one set up at our own backyard. We are great potential for our own garden suite
- The city needs more affordable housing FAST
- Garden suites will be exploited and used by developers to increase return on building projects. There are better ways to increase rental housing than to ruin the density and livability of our neighbourhoods.
- I think there should be thought given to overcrowding in neighbourhoods. There should be a certain minimum percentage of yard space on every lot.
- I think they are a great opportunity for densification in a thoughtful scale. Helping create a really walkable and livable communities. A desirable scale of additional housing,
- A fantastic idea for properties where there is enough space

- My only concern is many people building garden suites and converting them to short term rental stock, as opposed to sustainable long term rentals. The other concern would be size, we have an abundance of small one-bedroom or studio housing in the city, but limited 2-3+ bedroom housing options, or even spacious 1 bedroom with room for home office or dining even. Some guidelines about that would be welcome.
- Given our current housing crisis in Toronto, I see nothing but positives to allowing garden suites with minimal regulations. A separate detached dwelling unit is why many renters want and allowing homeowners to provide this will do nothing but good for the city at minimal cost to other taxpayers.
- are there checks to prevent a property owner from renting to self or family to get fast tracking through reduced rent? What is the city stand on this housing possibly becoming AirB&Bs? Feel this initiative will provide much needed housing
- I do but I'm still working on my thoughts..
- density is good, but the risk is poor quality and crowding - think of garbage, cars, etc - will need to be sure the units can be serviced and that the trees and peace and character of the neighbourhood can be maintained -
- I live in an area that is zoned for low density housing. I bought my house in this area partially for that reason. To change the zoning to allow for higher density would change the character of the neighbourhood in a negative way. I understand that the city needs more housing but I believe the new housing should be built vertically in areas that are already designated for high density. It also seems to me that this idea will only perpetuate white privilege. It may add more to the housing stock but it will result in people who are already wealthy getting more wealthy. If this idea is passed I would strongly urge a height limit of one storey.
- No
- The policies/regulations must be clear if the City wants to avoid lawsuits! That does not mean giving in by creating loopholes. Certain neighbourhoods have room for garden suites, not all. A blanket policy will do more harm than the good intended!
- Garden Suite should never been added to any single detach community. It will affect the value of properties in the area. Crowding also affect the safety & security of the surrounding areas
- I believe that garden suites will completely change neighborhoods for the worst. Garden suites will increase the population in areas that were not originally designed for larger populations. Infrastructure will become over-loaded. More and more long time home owners will end up moving out of the city to get away from all the additional noise and lack of privacy.
- I oppose a lack of limitations on how many GS could be located in neighbourhoods (crowding). Nothing shd be permitted as of right. Environmental concerns: what about rain/snow drainage? Tree damage? Tree health and shading? Green space? Emergency access and exits? Impact on house insurance. Impact on property tax? Impact on property tax on adjacent properties? Would neighbours' assent be necessary to build a GS?
- There needs to be a limit to the number of these as they will change the neighbourhood. Don't focus on quantity. Focus on quality. Don't let this plan to increase housing (density) turn into something that devalues, or in other ways is detrimental to our extremely precious good neighbourhoods. Sometimes you don't know what you have until it is gone. Let's not do that. Any job worth doing is worth doing right.
- After seeing a nearby neighbour build a huge garage which looms over the neighbour's backyard I think that the rules for garden suites really need to be thought out carefully so that all people concerned, owners and neighbours, have clear direction on what is and isn't permitted before and construction starts.
- No
- My Neighborhood is already too dense with multiple rooming houses, with multiple unrelated families renting the same house. Sometimes an entire family is living in just one bedroom of each house. Adding Garden suites will contribute to increased and unwanted density in my neighborhood. The schools and other social services will not be able to support all these extra Garden suites. The quality of life for the residents in my neighborhood will certainly go down. The area will just get too overcrowded. The lots in my neighborhood are not even big to begin with. This is a terrible idea.
- Garden suites are a terrible idea. It's just a money making scheme. Rooming houses are bad enough. Please don't mess up our neighborhood.

- it increases the population density in areas not intended current infrastructures will be overloaded decreased greenspaces decreased privacy increased noise level might be okay on a huge estate, or rural area, but, not in a highly populated city like Toronto
- Privacy is an issue. You should have a minimum land size to build or you size allowed depends on land size. Windows should not look into your neighbors yard.
- Garden Suites should NOT be allowed, period.
- It is difficult to respond given the generalities of the questions. Until such time as issues such as height scale, massing impacts on soft landscaping, drainage are dealt with it is not possible to make a comment. Further the impacts on matters such as assessments given the introduction of such uses may increase the value for taxation purposes gives me pause for cause. Also I doubt this will provide affordable housing but will drive speculation and the profit for developers.
- **THEY WILL TURN TORONTO INTO SLUMSS!!**
- the City doesn't have sufficient staff to enforce the by-laws already in place for properties without Garden Suites - Garden Suites should not be allowed for all the reasons stated in this survey - but I worry if this survey is being sent out the City has already made a decision to go ahead with Garden Suites, which is sad - the general public really doesn't have a say as to whether there will be Garden Suites
- no
- I fully support additional housing options for the city of Toronto - what concerns me is that it isn't exploited by investors who own homes. It would really have a negative effect on the neighbourhood if, for example 20 suddenly cropped up and were rented out for temporary vacations
- I'm not at all sure that they can work unless on very large lots due to problems of over building, access and parking. The key's will be to maintain existing lot coverage rules and to be able to have a separate access and that no new structure should affect the privacy of neighbours.
- More density in an already congested core lacking green space is not the answer.
- Construction of a Garden Suite in an adjoining yard could radically diminish an owner's enjoyment of their property, and, potentially, its value. Lots in my area are narrow - around 25 feet wide - so the impact of a neighbouring suite will be huge. The city has been allowing increasingly higher condo developments in the area - that is more than enough contribution to greater density without jamming additional structures and more people onto small, already crowded lots. Local transportation infrastructure cannot handle existing needs, let alone future increases. This factor, and a potentially permanent shift in workstyles post-Covid, suggest the prudent course is to slow the increase in 'densification' that the city seems hellbent on forcing through.
- I'm firmly opposed to this and other densification schemes
- As I said they must have green roofs and be built on lots large enough for a minimum 24' between house and studio
- Toronto really needs this. Why have we been dragging our heels? It's embarrassing and backward that we are even having to do further studies on this issue.
- I am an artist who would like to have a studio/ workshop in my garden. We have a large lot. I am also extremely concerned about housing affordability in the city for my children and about the possibility of aging in place. I feel that while there is a demand for affordable housing there are many properties that are under utilized. This would go a long way to dealing with many of these issues. I also feel that the laneway suits is an excellent initiative. I have been watching various projects in the city with great interest and am impressed with what has been done.
- can be introduced to meet current affordability issues and work from home
- Against developers buying property and building suites. Should only be done by private owners. Not by developers.
- We need MUCH more information on the proposals being considered before being able to form reasonable opinions. Is it just a rooming house split across two buildings, or is it a rental property business for homeowners? I'm against many things that might be proposed, but have no idea what's being suggested.
- Sustainability is important but not mandatory, if too expensive.
- It will increase the population density of residential neighborhoods. Why don't the people in Toronto deserve to live in low density neighborhoods if they can afford it. Canada is a huge country with lots of unoccupied or sparsely occupied areas, and small towns and cities. Why not

provide incentives for businesses and factories to move to other areas so that they can be built up and more people live in low density more affordable neighborhoods. Why does such a huge percentage of Canada's population have to live in Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. Spread it out.

- I think it's about time we make this happen, it's the most logical step to follow the legalization of laneway suites. We need it
- I strongly believe there should not be one rule that allows garden houses. Any building erected on a property with an existing house should be looked at individually to see the impact on the neighbourhood. And nearby neighbours should be consulted.
- We need them!
- Will absolutely not vote for anyone in city council who even thinks of supporting this preposterous idea! I would like to think that my hard earned money that pay the salaries of the city bureaucrats are spent wisely on far more important issues. Who came up with this nonsense?! I do support lane way suits since the lay out is different and and lane way suite would be saver to access and away from main units.
- I believe that maximizing independent living spaces in low density neighbourhoods is the best way to maintain the overall beauty of a neighbourhoods. I strongly support the idea of providing family based support and safety to elderly members. within the compound they can be provided with individual living space for independence.
- #1 issue- the zoning MUST allow for mature tree protection. Since backyard trees are the jurisdiction of the homeowner and not the city, garden suites could create the potential to seriously impact backyard trees and the overall canopy of the urban forest at a time when it's needed more than ever. Construction must be monitored and must always comply with tree protection zones and a sustainability plan to protect trees. Backyard trees that are lost are usually not replaced and we must protect this important element of the urban forest. #2 issue- an affordability plan must be enacted to ensure that homeowners aren't gouging tenants and using the rental income as a primary source of income. There is a frightening dearth of affordable housing in this city. Garden suites risk recreating what is already happening with basement suites, etc. \$2500 for a crappy basement so a rich homeowner can fast track his mortgage. This whole country but especially this city are now in a new serfdom of homeowners vs renters and renters will never be able to save to own because of too many greedy owners. What will the city do to prevent this? #3 a plan to outdoor space needs must be considered to prevent people from being too cramped into a small property footprint. #4 More than anything, the city needs to do something about rental prices in general in this city and STOP the gouging of renters!!
- If you want to live like this, you can move to the favela's of Brazil. No need to ruin my lifestyle. Please move on with your intensification concepts: you can already live like this in New Delhi!
- They work well in Vancouver!! Let's go Toronto.
- Ideally they would not be permitted to operate as a business location- incl AirB&B
- Do not allow garden suites anywhere.
- i love the idea of tiny house living. so the size of a garden house may appeal to many the apartment situation currently is horrifying. Unless a person has lived in the same rental unit before the housing 'boom' - rent has increased up to 400% just in my neighbourhood. garden houses, are a wonderful solution to add sustainable and affordable housing for those in need. great idea. in reality if the homeowner has to voluntarily offer land space (even to rent out) the hopes for a significant impact may be low. a better solution is to use city owned easement land. homeowner has no say because their lot is sized without easement portion. NO LOSS OF NEEDED green space is essential. perhaps no lawn but insist on a pollination garden etc. no trees removed. we are slowly losing more and more greenspace to sustain our city
- Terrible idea
- Garden suites are one strategy to increase housing options (and if done right, provide increased affordability)
- Wonderful
- The developers will find a way to make this non-affordable living, to further reduce the canopy in neighbourhoods and to cause additional noise, light, and privacy impacts and lead to more and more conflict. An incredibly bad idea.

- As this is a new housing type I suspect that the majority of the structures will be brand new. This seems like a really good opportunity to require much higher sustainability standards for new construction. A lot of the new laneway homes in the city look like they only just meet building code standards.
- Impact on neighbourhood should be a major factor, plus availability of schools, doctors, transportation etc.
- If the pandemic has taught us anything people are craving more land, so all levels of government should enable that through proper investments and policies. I believe that we have more than enough land in Ontario to expand on. To enable people to live outside of Toronto and still have access to high paying jobs you need to invest in our road and internet infrastructure. The jobs 20 years from now won't need as much physical presence. Further, to reduce our impact on the environment we should be driving less, even if we all had electric cars.
- Strongly opposed to garden suites
- Stop densifying our city
- We are so very behind other countries regarding this and really need to stop overanalyzing the situation. This will help housing affordability, aging in place and the environment. THIS IS COMMON SENSE. Figure it out.
- Many houses in my neighbourhood have lots that are only 16ft wide. There will need to be a lot of variances to build a unit (minimum side setbacks etc). Can there be an option to keep the garage as is and build a studio apt above it?
- Make them truly affordable/rent-geared-to-income units. I've paid 75% - 80% of my monthly income on rent for the past 30 years. I'm subsisting on less than \$200/mth after rent, gas (stove) and my phone are paid. Make it so ALL new developments must have a minimum of 10% affordable units in them.
- I think it's great to support young people and housing stock. Supply is our biggest issue for housing prices and rental costs and this will help
- Limit the number of people who can live in garden suite- to 2. Don't want 10 uni students in the neighbours back yard. Single story to maintain privacy for neighborhood. Some regulations/standards about building materials so is consistent with neighbouring buildings.
- Finish drawing up the guidelines and present to your community steering groups for vetting. Then draw up your policy. Same as Laneway housing which I believe went fairly well. Develop some prototype options to test out regulations. Test out on existing known rental properties where the owners motive will be increasing profitability rather than anything else. Test a street like Triller for instance. Try a model in central Etobicoke where you could do an amazing suite for a recent university grad flat on their parents lot. Try a building with 4 garden suites at the intersection of 4 separate properties rear property lines. (a cluster house) Does this work with new-build lots as well? (test this out) Try everything in between.
- Stop making it so difficult to build in Toronto. Just let us build what we want our need in our own properties. Do NOT let neighbors have any ability to influence the process.
- We need more housing in Toronto especially in low rise neighborhoods where missing middle units have been outlawed. Garden suites can be a part of the solution.
- Very bad idea. Strongly opposed.
- should not be used as short term or holiday rentals.
- Much needed housing in Toronto, hopefully will pass quickly without some of the constraints of laneway homes
- Providing affordable housing solutions should not include doubling up on existing properties and creating a plethora of problems covering everything from privacy, parking, infrastructure and opening the gate to a host of problems. Affordable housing decisions by the city should address more competent solutions than shoe horning back yard housing into stable residential areas.
- They would reduce the number of lonely seniors.
- Privacy of adjacent lots is important. If a neighbour suddenly has a three storey suite overlooking their backyard, that's an issue. Protection if trees and planting of new ones is important
- My community already has an existing problem of rooming houses. A rooming house does not have enough parking on the driveway so they cut into the lawn to park or park on the boulevard. Too many boarding tenants create a garbage crisis. I see household putting garbage in the recycling bins or in bins in parks or near TTC stops.

- Really important to allow these. These provide an affordable path to keeping family together - housing prices being so expensive in Toronto, these allow a real option for families trying to keep eldering or in-laws together. Depending on the age of children/adults/etc, these could be rented for a few years until the family has need of it again.
- It appears that basement flats in some neighbourhoods are no longer a desirable extension of personal space, or do not satisfy an expanding family. I think such a reality is quite luxurious. Once these owners have 'extra space' they may be able to supplement their income through rental at market prices. This does not seem to solve housing affordability in any way.
- This concept offers many solutions to the housing problems facing Torontonians especially providing for the elderly. It is a very efficient from a land-use point of view and can transform neighborhoods in a very positive way.
- I am in support of the concept of Laneway Housing and Garden accommodations with the caveat that they be used for residential purposes only to effectively provide housing at cost effective prices to help provide additional housing for those in search of more cost effective accommodations.
- Invasion of neighbours' garden privacy should be a major concern.
- I am fully in support of garden suites to the extent that they provide a dignified extended family age-in-place format. I am equally in support of the premise that by moving into a garden suite, it allows our children to live in the main house which they would otherwise not be able to afford given the high cost of housing today. The shared occupancy is a win-win at every level. However, Garden Suites that are built simply to generate profit for the landlord by doubling or tripling the number of residences on the same property, without generating any benefit for the neighborhood as a whole is something I do not support.
- no
- <http://tinyto.ca/>
- Close neighbours should be consulted regarding the placement of the garden suite. Absolutely no short-term rentals should be allowed.
- Garden suites are a good option for increasing housing supply in Toronto. It also allows for families, particularly intergenerational families, to stay in close proximity and take care of each other, especially when housing affordability has continued to be an issue for many recent years. It also allows for increased density without having to build more high rise buildings. Allowing garden suites is also an opportunity for the city to increase its property tax revenue by having more individuals live in Toronto. In short, allowing garden suites would be of benefit to the City of Toronto Government and its citizens.
- To promote the rapid uptake of the initiative, property tax incentives and construction rebates should be offered for Green/Sustainable construction methods and practices, in order to promote the use of Net-Zero housing construction. If we continue to build new accommodation exactly as we are doing now, then we gain nothing and only increase greenhouse gas emissions. There should be huge incentives for solar , heat-pump, thermal efficiency, alternative foundation construction, self-sufficiency, waste-water/grey water reclamation, the list is endless when it comes to building sustainable self-sufficient homes that do not overburden the municipal energy and resource grids
- I am totally opposed to them. This is the perfect opportunity to turn carefully planned neighbourhoods into something they were never intended to become. Whoever came up with this plan, needs to look around in neighbourhoods where there are low income high density living arrangements and see what results. I don't wish to see my community reduced to an overcrowded, rat infested, third world experience. Surely there must be alternatives to this nightmarish initiative!
- I am oppose to garden unit. it lower community living quality.
- Yes - parking is already a huge issue in the city - as well as sewage infrastructure - adding more houses /units to a system that is not managing does not make sense. Families can share their existing unit/home. Green space is decreasing and the addition construction will impact the ecological balance. More is not better. Let's use our existing better.
- This is a long time coming. Kudos to you for initiating this, as it will likely vastly improve the rental situation in Toronto and provide space for many of the people that have been driven out (due to the expense), but offer so much rich texture to our communities (ie. artists, musicians, etc.) I am very concerned about the cost of building materials (and all the other expenses associated with

building.) If the costs are prohibitively high, many people will not be able to participate, and the ones that do will be forced to continue to charge high rent to be able to recoup the investment. This would defeat the purpose of this initiative. Judging by a few of the questions you asked in the survey, I feel like you have thought about this. This will be a big obstacle to make this work the way you are aiming for. Best of luck. Stay safe.

- Cannot allow garden suites to happen
- I love the idea of creating living conditions for people within the existing infrastructure of our City(smart use of money) ,and increasing the value(and prop taxes) of the home owner. Giddy up!
- This will not lead to affordable housing. It will infect increase the price of homes with big lots that can support an income property.
- The biggest concern for homeowners is ' will the new tenants be invested in making the neighbourhood a better place for all who live here?' If the city would define the behaviors of a good neighbor, and make a way of encouraging this behavior, everyone would benefit. Younger tenants, renting for the first time, would have a clear idea of the behavior that is appreciated by the neighborhood. The problems arise when the new tenants, whatever their age, are not onboard with making a neighborhood that is a good place for all. (Trash in the yard and on the porch, loud and unconsiderate behavior, the building in disrepair, are all things which condemn a loved neighborhood, and make it a 'teardown', ripe for the condo developers.
- Absolutely and totally opposed. My neighbour is a slumlord with two large 250 ft lots and guaranteed he would built many of those units to create more income without a care for what it does to his neighbours or the property value. I am very opposed and will mount a campaign against this with my community association and councillor.
- I think it is important that architecturally they blend in with the neighbourhood.
- I often look across the border and admire American cities. They are well planned with large enough roads and appropriate infrastructure to accomodate density. The housing is harmonious, architecturally designed and pleasing to the eye. We need to create a Toronto that marvels any North American city. Please do not proceed with garden suites!
- I think they should've been allowed years ago. I'm really happy that the city wants to take this on. We need more housing options. Just don't make the cost of creating them so expensive that nobody ever does it (I know, this problem rests partly in the political process which city staff have no control over -but make sure you recommend an affordable plan)
- I will move out of Toronto if this is approved. This is trouble with a capital T. With this and your rooming house proposal I will be selling if you go ahead with this.
- Do not allow
- I don't think garden suites are a viable solution to Toronto's housing problems. They would create confusion and insecurity in neighbourhoods, parking problems, and probably be costly to install making them not affordable. The patchwork of bylaws and enforcement might be untenable too. Low rise affordable rentals might be more efficient than too many condos. Thanks
- I think they will add more people to an area that is not properly equipt to handle more people and more issues. There is a crime issue in scarborough and we do not have enough policing in the areas. Not to mention the community supports to support more tenants and lower income families. Not to mention the sewer capacity and impacts of having additional structures on properties and potential flooding issues and Capacity issues for the sewer and privacy issues for all neighbours around these spaces. It is not the place for these types of houses to be allowed.
- Land is under utilized. This is an essential step for young adults and future generations to start their own lives.
- I currently have a 12x 16 Summerwood cabin that could be upgraded and converted to garden suite at low cost. Interested in city planning support for such a project.
- see comments already mentioned
- i think this -- like laneway suites -- is long overdue :)
- Ruins looks of neighborhoods. Overcrowding which leads to problems, not safe and huge parking problems
- See previous comments
- There should definitely be an affordable rent option for renters
- The garden suites should not obstruct the views of neighbours. It should be as minimal as possible. I would be very annoyed if my neighbour built one in their backyard and it blocks my

view. I would also want to make sure that if I ever build one in my backyard, that it doesn't disturb them.

- I don't particularly like the look. I think they overcrowd the neighbourhood and reduce the green space available to pollinators that are already in decline.
- I worry about noise pollution and rentals in areas that are primarily not rental areas. Garden suites are a great idea if they CAN'T be rented out. They should belong to the family that owns the house. They should never be short-term rentals like Air BnB. The owner of the property should be fully responsible for the garden suite, which is why it should be family accommodation or work space such as a work-from-home studio used by the same family.
- It will be a huge help for people to have this option
- **DO NOT BUILD THEM AND RUIN THE CITY OF TORONTO!**
- Allowing Garden Suites to be built in backyards means that the city's backyard greenspaces will be drastically reduced. These backyard greenspaces contain lawns, gardens and trees, which not only provide us with privacy, but clean our air and water. They also provide habitats for birds, butterflies and pollinators, which are already in serious decline all across North America. Green spaces are also essential for our mental health. Unfortunately, much of our green space is already being lost every year, and it is a shame that the little that remains in our backyards, is now also at risk of being lost.
- Any increase in the property tax after I build my own Garden Suite?
- This is a great idea that's being implemented in other cities. I'd love to see Toronto allow these dwellings.
- They'd be a great way to increase density in established neighborhoods!
- As a senior couple, maintaining a large garden is becoming more difficult. By reducing the garden by adding a garden suite, the maintenance problem would be reduced and, in addition, would produce a rental income to supplement our pensions.
- I think they are a really important piece of unlocking the housing affordability potential in Toronto.
- I am completely opposed to these suites unless they are built in place of a garage and are located right beside/attached to the main house where a garage would be. I am opposed to buildings being built in backyards. It is not fair to the neighbours who will lose privacy, quiet, and will suddenly have to deal with noise and light pollution from an unexpected source. This is an infringement on the rights of neighbouring houses. The neighbours who bought their houses have rights. You cannot take those rights away.
- I am concerned about short term rental.
- Allow people to build an office on there lot, reduce traffic, ghgs.
- -regarding protection of trees, this should be within test of reasonableness ...neighbourhood should not be depleted of green trees unnecessarily, but owners not denied right if workable solution can be reasonably achieved (mature tree replacement or relocation should be shared city costs, so as not to randomly impact one owner over the other, as benefit is shared by community.
- -privacy regarding windows and close proximity low level views into neighbouring yards should be strictly managed...perhaps permitted time windows/seasons when privy is required/not required ...ie summer months neighbours deserving of 10 am-8 pm privacy, thus blinds/ required...but evening hours open views allowed, and off season months allowed during the days
- The City should create bylaws to ensure there is adequate access to the street. The access should be large enough so that furniture, appliances and residents all have unfettered access to the street.
- Thank you for this information, as I was not aware that the city was planning this. I approve of this if it really does provide more options for affordable rental housing.
- they will degrade neighbor hoods
- Just the they should be doe protection of the environment and not direct money-making by outside home owners which is so often the case.
- Just do not wish to see them
- This is a terrible idea, stop money laundering if you want affordable housing
- I think the idea is good generally but have many concerns about it being abused by developers and inventors and landlords as a profit making opportunity instead of providing options for a homeowner to remain in place or afford a low density property. Unfortunately adding a Garden Suite might infact making it harder for people to own a home because it will drive up the prices

because of the rental potential for investors. There should be a reduction for Lot coverage if a garden suite it being requested or if they have already received adjustments to the existing rules when the principal home was built - they should not be permitted a garden suite to ensure adequate green space and privacy are maintained in low residential areas

- Concerned that Garden Suites will lead to pressure for front-yard parking pads (and the like such as widened driveways) that will impact on street trees and reduce space for on-street parking. Reduced area in backyards should not be a justification for more development of front yards for parking, etc. We still need whole street with adequate area for street trees and real soft surfaces (grass, gardens, trees -- not hard surfaces such as paving stones that are passed off as landscaping). If there are more people in the area with additional units, there is greater need to avoid proliferation of front yards that simply transfer displaced functions (like parking) to the front yard. If people want to use their backyards for additional units, they should accept the consequences of that, and not impose migrated backyard uses to the front yard and create impacts on the street, the sidewalk, and street character.
- Prioritizing accessible housing - by making financing vehicles available to homeowners that wish to build one
- It could work well outside of Old Toronto, but the reality is that most of the core needs more than just new secondary units. Gentle intensification like this would have sufficed 20 years ago, but now we really just need to move the floor area ratio above 0.4 for most of downtown
- I am very worried about height and design plus access to these garden suites. As well, density in single family neighborhoods.
- Great idea if the owner of the main house does not have more than 1 car. Parking will be an issue with owners who complain about street parking as it is now. It would be best if it were rented or used by the family of the owner residing in the main house. Too many unrelated people on 1 small property may cause problems if the landlord is not very caring, only in it for the money.
- I need to know much more about it. It strikes me as slapdash in terms of the housing crisis. There is PLENTY of rental housing in Toronto, but people can't afford it. THAT is the real problem. Rent control might be a better solution. Get rid of Air Bnb too.
- I think the general population needs an education on 'affordable housing', as so many owners of single family homes hear the phrase, and assume that means their own property values will go down, which of course historically has not been the case (ie even with all the push back originally on the low rise multi home buildings in Rosedale, those buildings have increased the character and value of those neighbourhoods).
- Priority is to build to allow seniors to age in place
- I feel they will be a positive impact to the neighborhoods of Toronto
- Fire safety, keep the trees, require eco friendly materials, required solar panels on suites
- regulate the size of the garden suite proportional to the green space of the back yard.
- It is not affordable to buy a duplex or home large enough for extended family. My parents who are 92 have moved into my home, as the best option, but it is tight. I would have loved the ability to renovate a space for them to live in, on my property. The other option is going to a home which isn't ideal at any time, but especially now. Loved ones need to be close together.
- I consider this a good idea to help people find a good place to live in our city. Toronto is growing extremely rapidly. Garden suites could also help to live in a more private place, more dignifying!
- They should be limited to a single storey. They should not have platforms or decks on the roof which will impact privacy. No windows should be permitted in the walls which faces neighboring properties. The lot coverage of the main dwelling and garden suite should not exceed 33% of the lot coverage.
- Not in support. This seems like a distraction on potentially more impactful initiatives that address affordable housing that have less impact on existing Toronto residents.
- In Germany I lived in a 'converted' garage or so called Garden Suite. It was 1 room with a galley kitchen and toilet located outside the 'unit.' I paid a high rent which was cheaper than in the city (Wiesbaden is expensive). It was, in short, substandard but allowed by the township because it offered affordability. Don't force the poor into substandard living!! Totally ban Garden Suites!! I lived in one and know what REALLY happens when owners try and rip off the poor who have few choices!! Toronto should be increasing the number of affordable apartments, maybe with strict rent controls like New York City. A person's rent should not be going up every year, when the building has no major improvements and tenants pay their own utilities. More needs to be done in

this area, not opening up more issues when numerous independent owners want to make money and the City doesn't have enough inspectors to make sure everyone is complying with the rules -- look at the problem with Condos and short term rentals -- this issue is STILL not resolved, even with new rules in place.

- I would like the process expedited to allow grander suites to be built asap.
- How big are these garden suites anticipated on being? Are they a fraction of the size of the detached home they share a yard with? Single bedroom garden suites don't solve the affordable housing crisis affecting Toronto. They sound like a stupid idea that benefits homeowners but not those who are trying to purchase their own property someday, which is near impossible to do so in Toronto in this current market. It also feels like a poor excuse to put the onus of making affordable housing onto the individual homeowners rather than having the city build and maintain affordable housing options. Why would a multi-generational household opt to have the seniors live in a glorified outhouse when they could just stay in the main home? There doesn't appear to be a benefit to the residents of the garden suite as they are still sharing space with the homeowner. Nothing about the laneway houses or garden suites sound like it will benefit those who live in them.
- My property has a detached two-story barn style garage facing the street. If laws permitted converting this into living space, I would seriously consider doing so. It might be necessary to limit the number of occupants. I know in our area, Agincourt, some homes have been turned into rooming houses with large numbers of cars parked on an off the property.
- It should not be allowed to be built
- Should be for immediate family only
- It is a terrible idea . It will infringe on privacy of neighbours, reduce sunlight in yards, lower property values, bring in people of lower socio-economic levels to residential neighbourhoods, enable more transient residents to change the character of a neighbourhood, reduce leisure garden space , make for more noise, more insurance risk. DO NOT ALLOW THIS.
- I am strongly opposed to the increased resident density that will occur in neighbourhoods.
- In theory, they are a great idea to solve the housing crisis in Toronto, provided they are NOT visible from the street. In practice, they may reduce the appeal of homes with large lots, and cause congestion/density issues, especially concerning the need for extra parking. Homes beside homes that have them c/b devalued.
- No garden suites. I do not support this stupid idea.
- please do this quickly, make them easy to build and get approvals if they are energy efficient buildings.
- Make the process flexible and easy for an unsophisticated homeowner to understand.
- Easy permit process for garage conversion
- Consideration needs to be taken when the property of a garden suite runs perpendicular to another property. I currently love laneway suites, but have a laneway suite two storey tall built across the BACK of my back yard without any consultation, blocking off sun and views (our backyard is only 15 feet deep to begin with, so we lost all views of the sky). This can't happen in garden suites.
- Hopefully these garden suites will follow Official Plan rule 4.1.9 and have massing height and scale that respect adjacent properties and neighbouring houses. (A small space should have a small building) Thanks for taking feedback.
- How would sanitary requirements be resolved in garden suites?? Washroom/shower.
- It would be great if there could be financial incentives for passive heating and cooling/sustainable design, e.g. solar panels, green roofs, etc. which would allow to intensify density while reducing energy consumption.
- Height and impact to neighbours should be a priority. The garden suite should not be taller than the main property or surrounding properties. Shadowing is a major concern. The garden suite should not be permitted if it casts a shadow on neighbouring properties without consent for the impacted property owners. Another concern is sewer, water and utility connections. Those should be separate from the primary residence and new lines/connections should be installed for the garden suite.

- Green roofs should be strongly encouraged, but also as an amenity space (not permitted with Laneway Suites currently). Outdoor amenity is more important than privacy in dense neighbourhoods.
- I think we're delusional if we think this will make housing more affordable. We need hundreds of thousands of more units for that to happen (more supply to reduce demand). But I do think this is a good way to build more residential living spaces through gentle densification.
- Some areas are very crowded with homes and people these units should not be allowed. The lot size should be a certain size before one of these units is allowed. eg (Min. 50'x150') All affected neighbors have to say 'YES' before permitting a unit to be built.
- It is a bad idea. The suburbs will deteriorate. Garden suites is a band aid to address housing crisis. Build well connected public transit that precludes people to live in certain municipalities/towns to work. Canada has no dearth of land and resources. Don't pigeon hole families in suburban locales via garden suites. It is bound to put pressure on lots of other amenities that cities will be forced to deal with at that time. Escaping from one solution to land in another (Frying pan to fire!)
- I'm supportive of this initiative, and any initiative that helps to address the housing shortage in Toronto.
- Short term rental questions??
- I strongly oppose Garden Suites in my neighbourhood.
- If this comes, it must be phased in very carefully
- Destroying single family neighbourhoods is not the way to provide increased housing.
- Garden suites are good to allow and a no brainer, but the zoning of most single-family residential areas should allow for more density and small apartment buildings.
- Impact on property value in a zoned area for Garden Suites
- There definitely need to be lot size, set back and shadow restrictions.
- Garden suites should not be a replacement for a robust housing policy that aims to increase supply of proper housing (condos and apartments) to Toronto.
- I do not agree with the concept of Garden Suites. I think it opens the door for irresponsible and unsafe building practices. I think there is a great risk of increasing the same issues as there are surrounding rooming houses, like parking on the street, excessive garbage build up, transient occupation of suites which becomes a safety issue. The by-law officers are already stretched and cannot commit to checking up on the rooming houses that are currently reported on by residents, adding this to their check list will be an impossible task for them to keep on top of. I strongly feel that this will bring down not just the property values, but will ultimately turn beautiful residential neighbourhoods that people expected to live out their lives in into clogged, over populated trashed communities.
- May be suitable in areas with low residential density and large lots, but will increase density and related pressures in areas of multiple dwellings with small lots and minimal parking.
- APPROVE!
- Building a garden suite that is too close to the back line of the lot or is very large is a serious detriment to the rear neighbour
- No
- This area is overbuilt now with little or no consideration of increased traffic density and school availability
- The neighborhood needs to have a say
- Creative idea glad that they are being considered
- It seems unlikely to make a serious dent in available housing and yet may substantially diminish the character or liveability of a neighbourhood if extra cars are crowding the street and new renters are living pressed against one's backyard fence.
- No
- Check out the Ontario small family business called Bunkie Life. They build bunkies that would be ideal for garden suites! I dream of buying one for my grown kids to use and enjoy when they come to visit and need some privacy and space.
- If front-pad parking requires agreement from neighbours, there should be something similar in place. When I bought my property and worked hard to afford payments, it was because of the privacy and low density. All of a sudden, government will change neighbourhoods radically. This

will bring in vulture developers who don't care about anyone else and only want to make a quick buck. Solve infrastructure problems like services and school capacity first. This is exactly what hasn't been considered allowing the explosion of condo development throughout the city. What's the point of affordable housing when people are clawing for school spots and condo basements flood because sewers can't handle the load they weren't designed for. Older people won't throw away their money building a smaller unit since they need to guard their savings. They aren't sure how long they will be able to live there since once they start to become unable to live in their houses (after modifying them as much as they can) they understand they will have limited time before they need institutional care. This isn't for older adults but for developers with short-term gain and no long-term commitment to people.

- Short-term rentals and real estate speculation (especially title flipping) are the biggest contributors to unaffordable housing in Toronto. The city needs to ensure that Garden Suites are protected from these practices if they are to have any impact on Toronto's rental housing market.
- The devils in the details
- The by-law for both Garden Suites and Laneway Suites should take into account a variety of situations in the relationship between the original house and the new 'suite'. The assumption in the current by-law for Laneway Suites and the discussion about Garden Suites is that existing house is large and adequate. In fact, though, many properties that would qualify for a second building have a small house. For some time owners who need more living space have been demolishing the old houses and putting up much larger buildings. Garden and Laneway Suites could provide an alternative, which would preserve the old house as a rental property (or for other permitted uses) and use the new building as the primary residence. This objective could be achieved with a little more flexibility than is provided in the current by-law for Laneway Suites. The main objective of this initiative is to provide more housing without substantially changing the character of neighborhoods. There are also potential secondary objectives that could be made more explicit: energy efficiency and accessibility. The by-law could include ways of promoting both these objectives.
- Should be buildable anywhere on the property. Need to make sure there is still greenspace on each lot.
- I am really interested in this because my father is getting up there in age and requires more assistance. I would love for my partner and I to live in a garden suite on the property so we can remain in the city, have a space of our own and be able to help my dad as he continues to age. This is very important to me.
- It will bring riff raff into the neighbourhood.
- This is a very tame step to providing more housing stock and filling in the 'missing middle'. Unfortunately, there will be people who will be fully against this coming from a place of privilege to deny access to their neighbourhoods to others, and benefit from it. Garden suites are a no brainer, and the city should be doing much more to enable more housing stock. Further, there is a lot of red tape and financial barriers to building more housing in this city that must be addressed. Reduce the opportunities to say 'no' and create paths to automatically say 'yes' with zero resistance. I say this as a renter, but I'm also at a point where I'd like to own soon. This city is out of reach for me if I want a small fraction of space to myself that isn't in the sky, while others have profited 10x over the years. This change is a move to rebalance things. Montreal is very attractive because it strikes a fair balance.
- I think topography and capacity of a lot to reasonably accommodate a separate building must be taken into account. I also think a tool kit, with some one-page fact sheets in simple language, on best practices in constructively dealing with one's neighbours, for people who are interested in building one, would simply be wise. Too many myths abound about the damage extra units can have, and there is no point in every single applicant learning the hard way about how to mitigate this likely challenging situation.
- I think they are a great idea!
- Ideal for extended family, nanny quarters, ideally only when the main property is owner occupied.
- NOT Air B and B short term rental.
- There should be strict limits on the Committee of Adjustment's authority to allow minor variances to prevent creep on size and other elements of garden suites
- Toronto has already become a concrete jungle. "Major" variances are now referred to as "minor" variances. Our city will soon look like one big slum.

- While I am generally supportive of this scheme, I am very concerned about parking impacts in midtown neighbourhoods which are already under increasing pressure for parking/shading/loss of trees/loss of privacy due to balconies and decks on new higher homes, etc. etc. Rents will not be low. Building costs and locations will see to that. No legislative program at the City will make it happen. Claiming increased low rental as a probable outcome is specious. If this is intended to help seniors downsize at home, the bike only idea is a stab in the eye for that. It is completely unrealistic to expect an elderly person to do their shopping, attend appointments, etc. in this way. These suites will eliminate garden spaces on private property. the City will need to find ways to increase public amenity spaces and recreational opportunities. Building codes will need to provide a scale relationship so that the Garden Suites cannot dominate the main house or neighbours. Creating potentially a 'second street' of houses will have direct effects for light, noise, fumes, etc. in previously quiet yards. There must be mitigation requirements written into the building code to minimize the loss of reasonable use and enjoyment of the adjoining lots.
- Street parking permits should be used or offered where garden suites are built.
- with very small backyards in our area, garden suites would be an eyesore. I did not purchase my property for this nonsense.
- Overall, I support the City adjusting the zoning laws to allow garden Suites. My hope is that Garden Suites will help alleviate some of the pressure on the housing/rental market in the city, but I am still concerned that particularly when the worst of the pandemic restrictions are behind us, that these units will predominantly become short-term rentals (AirBnBs) and will only exacerbate the supply issue. The relative size of gardens in different areas of the city is also a concern. As has been shown in the majority of condo units built in the last decade, its possible this opportunity could be exploited by those who want to try and create as small a space as 'legally' qualifies as housing with little thought into the actual space required for people to live comfortably.
- The increase in overall population density needs to be matched or exceeded by increases in public outdoor amenities like park space, recreational venues, wide sidewalks, etc. that prevent people from simply being cooped up in tiny boxes and instead result in an improved quality of life compared to living in a highrise apartment.
- no
- As a young professional who spent some time living in a Vancouver laneway house, I was absolutely shocked when I learned about all the restrictions on laneway/garden suites in Toronto! I think there is a lot of interest from homeowners and prospective tenants (such as myself), and making the process easy + offering financial incentives can go a long way to helping increase housing availability in Toronto. Frankly, I think we are way behind on this front!
- I wish the city would not seek to further intensify R zoned neighbourhoods. We are creating density with laneway suites and existing zoning.
- Occupants would be expected to adhere to all rules and regulations that apply to homeowners.
- I would build one immediately if permitted!
- Key requirements will be proper building codes, for safety as well as requirement for power consumption / efficiency.
- A great idea! I welcome this in my neighbourhood to help reduce the insane housing costs, as long as large trees are preserved as much as reasonable. PLEASE eliminate any parking minimums. Toronto is falling behind many cities that have already eliminated parking minimums city wide.
- allows for overcrowding on peoples properties, noise level, parking issues and destruction of green space
- The designs and materials used must be of good quality, in order to enhance the neighborhood and not lead to its deterioration.
- Developers will promise affordable rental housing and there will be no accountability once properties are sold. Density and parking issues will persist and only the wealthy will benefit from these suites. Bad idea.
- Is the size of the lot the deciding factor in deciding whether or not a Garden Suite will be allowed?
- Don't force them to have a basement. Keep it simple.
- Concerned about lane way traffic and safety. Concerned about snow removal in lane ways in winter, REALLY concerned about street parking being overwhelmed with both additional parking

reqts plus guest parking requirements. I believe that the reqt for 2 bicycle spots in folly and wishful thinking that it will relieve the problem. There will be one car per household even for garden suites in higher end neighbourhood a where rent will be higher and people can afford cars.

- Interested to see how this discussion works out
- Lot size should be a determination on whether a permit and or zoning change is allowed
- I think it's about time!
- I feel there may be merit to properly evaluate Garden Suites, but do not approve then as-of-right. Each suite needs review and approval. There is much friction in neighbourhoods due to the disrespectful practices of a majority of current residential contractors. The City's Building Department does not effectively monitor building sites or enforce regulations. Without enhanced contractor behaviour and City enforcement Garden Suites will seriously undermine current neighbourhoods. The policy needs to identify appropriate contractor behaviour and provide for effective enforcement.
- I am very concerned about garden suits because of the elimination of tress, increase in blocked views for neighbours, increase in density for roads and parking. City road parking is bursting at the seams.
- We are not in favour of over developing lots in Toronto.
- I think we need to see other cities experience with garden suites. I like the concept in that it might address affordability Bu want to make sure it doesn't wreak neighbourhoods. We need way more information and examples to speak intelligently on these issues.
- Yes. I have already seen reports that the first permit requests in our neighbourhood have asked for much larger suites than are allowed. I worry that these will not be approved and then everything will be approved by the Province. These units could be a, aesthetic, privacy and environmental nightmare if they are allowed to turn into mini-McMansions. My other concern (related) is to ensure there is enough space left for water runoff.
- Strongly support. Need more housing of all types.
- We need to proceed cautiously by ensuring that we apply full diligence. There should be very specific specifications as to sq ft and height. There should be no ability to make exceptions to the defined specifications. There should not be any rear or side windows i.e the windows can only directly face the main dwelling on the property. The privacy of neighbours should be held sacrosanct. There should be noise mitigation measures applied to the building specification so that any noise created in a garden suite does not negatively affect neighbours.
- I really love the idea as there's probably a lot more potential garden suite space than laneway housing space. More units would allow more people to enjoy living in the city. It also allows another type of housing - renting a condo-like space without having to use stairs great for those with mobility challenges
- They should NOT be built in Toronto. There are MANY MANY areas of the city with low density. All that Garden Suites will enable and encourage is even more concentration in the city's core overly dense areas. Instead, the city should be intensifying development of areas in the North, East and West end areas of the city. This would also help pay for more public transit and subways/LRTs.
- I don't want to see Garden Suited used for airbnb or other short term rental where they add strangers to a neighborhood. i think they can add character to a neighborhood if used by people that become part of the neighborhood.
- concern that the concept may be abused ... Could attract far more people in a small space than envisaged....
- Please extend the area where Garden Suites are allowed to be built. Our home is located on Eglinton & Keele which is outside the area allowed for the laneway housing.
- This is a terrible idea. You should look at other ways to provide affordable housing in the city, such as purchasing run down buildngs and converting them. Garden Suites will create a whole bunch of issues that the city probably does not have the finances to support, which will the result in passing on the cost to the taxpayer. These issues include needing more transportation in the area and community services, when the panademic is over.
- I think this is a great opportunity for homeowners to create 2nd space to rent or house elderly family members.

- Given the current situation I think it's an amazing inter generational and live work option
- Need to keep parking where it is and replacing with bikes in unrealistic
- Great for grandparents and work from home options
- I hope these go through. Would love to have additional housing options for my family
- 1.Watershed impacts on surrounding lots and neighbourhood as green space is lost. 2.Garden suites should NOT be permitted as short term rental units. 3.Location of garden suites and impacts to neighbours'privacy. 4.As density increases, other amenity or infrastructure impacts must be considered as part of urban planning (i.e. Transportation, sewage, hospital capacity, schools, etc) 5. Garden suites should only be permitted on lots over a certain size.
- Garden suites are not appropriate for small lots, especially in the old City of Toronto, which is overcrowded already. They will also add to demands on city services and infrastructure, which are inadequate for the existing city residents. Number of occupants should be strictly controlled for garden suites. Neighbours immediately adjoining garden suites should be able to veto construction, to protect their privacy and enjoyment of their outdoor areas.
- How are we to improve our carbon footprint if we build on all the green spaces? Where are kids to play - in the city parks that have broken beer bottles and trash scattered around, or have teen gangs taking over the play space? The city can't keep on top of the by-law infractions happening now, how are they going to keep up with more?Generally bylaws and policies like this favour the landowner who is building the unit with all the rights of the neighbours stripped away. Transit in suburbs is already overloaded and now you are going to add to that burden?
- Please don't allow commercial infill in residential zones and limit the amount of hardscape on properties. Please require trees on every property. We need to maintain green, healthy space for our residents even while we intensify.
- they must be less than a single-detached house they are a 'unit' size, height and scale, and functioning, is very significant can Not impose adverse impacts on adjacent, nearby or surrounding neighbours
- City would need to ensure mature trees are not cut down to do this.
- It's a massive opportunity to reduce crime and increase positive and safe lane ways
- N/a
- garden suites will become retnal housing increasing the density of the property and changing the low density residential nature of the neighbourhood. It will increase automobiles and traffic, reduce parking and affect the privacy of neighbours and require more city services.They will be used for all forms of commercial uses (eg. home buisines, air bnb, and other commercial activities not suitable in a residential area. This is just the commercilize of the neighbourhood. It forces additional units and population in low density areas. This is about money not about housing. New housing construction will be allowed to double the unit count in each lot. It will make homebuilders happy and leave the existing resident paying the price for an ill thought out plan.
- The Garden Suite should be smaller in size than the main home. One level only. Perhaps there needs to be a maximum number set for the number of occupants (eg. maximum 2 people). The structure would need to comply with all current building codes.
- This will be an excellent initiative for families who want to keep their aging family members close but at an arms length for independence. I doubt there will be significant interest in other rental options given the limited space but I might be wrong
- No
- Must adhere to strict architectural design restrictions, e.g., height, square footage based on size of garden Must allow for small garden/green space to be enjoyed by renter easy access to garbage pick-up Renter must abide by noise restrictions, and number of people allowed on site by fire regulations. Outdoor lighting restrictions.
- I am not a fan of garden suites or laneway suites but because of the times we live in with most housing unaffordable especially for younger people and such a big lack of housing over all they seem like a good alternative.
- I bought many years ago into a residential area which is mostly single detached housing. I look out my second floor window into my back yard and enjoy seeing not only my garden but the gardens of others. Jamming more buildings onto already small lots takes away the feel. I didn't buy into a 'tight' townhouse or condo environment. I can only see garden suites on large lots. In

my area most lots are 25 feet wide. This is just too small. We already have street parking issues with existing homes. This would worsen the situation.

- I really think this should be something that is fast tracked and done sooner rather than later. housing in Toronto has exploded in price and made it unaffordable for a lot of people that make decent money. this could help add to the supply and hopefully start to even out the demand and steady prices before a bubble forms
- Very concerned about privacy
- Adding more density for neighborhoods where room in schools is already an issue.
- This is such a great idea. We need more affordable housing! This kind of housing is more social (you see people outside/hang out outside) than a high rise building, and allows people who might not otherwise be able to afford to live in the neighbourhood a good place to live.
- As a single parent, the income provided by a garden suite would help me be financially secure in these very unpredictable times.
- In general I'm concerned about the negative impact on private land green space. Backyards are already taken up with garages, patios, decks, hot tubs, fire pits, etc. We are quickly losing the 'city in a park' character of Toronto. It seems better to focus on low-rise multiple-unit dwellings that add density without changing the whole character of a neighbourhood.
- I think garden suites are a great idea! I am interesting in building one on my property.
- Residential or other quiet use. No mechanical processes.
- environmentally friendly
- Keep it Classy and respectful on neighbours. Decide if structure must or must not have utilities (facilitate installation of utilities if allowed). Permission for off-grid should be allowed. Can they be 'temporary' or removable? ie pre-made kit container houses just dropped in with cranes (no onsite construction). Really like the bike parking requirement. Pref eco friendly themes. Define how to remedy views and privacy issues (green walls etc)
- If parking in the area is a serious problem for residents, then garden suites should be built in areas where more parking is available. Our area is already too congested.
- Will lead to: Congestion Privacy and Safety issues Overloading existing infrastructure
- This could remedy rental shortage in the city.
- Consideration for density ie housing, people, cars, etc
- No.
- stop talking about them and make them happen
- Garden Suites are a stupid f***ing idea that will destroy neighborhoods and will cause serious conflicts with neighbors. There will be no control over who will occupy the rentals Garden Suites - could be large turnovers of undesirables, bums, criminals, etc. What moron in the planning dept. dreamed up this certain disaster?
- require them to have one of:composting toilet, green roof, capped water use, innovative energy generation/conservation. i.e. require them to be a new type of housing solution that demonstrates living lightly on the land and does not increase burden on infrastructure. At the same time I can see how noise, # of occupants, equity, space sharing, tenant/owner relationship can be tricky. I do think it's worth pursuing this however. By the way, is there any work being done on tiny houses being allowed to park in places in Toronto? Tiny houses can move & so are more flexible should things not work out. (Sorry, I do not have much time to provide comprehensive comments, so these are just some quick thoughts! Thanks.)
- The garden suites should remain 1 story only, only occupation by a maximum of 2 people, make sure there are trees and green space to prevent pollution and for recreation
- I think Garden suites could be useful in certain areas where the lots are large enough to accommodate them. I do not think they are suitable for the average city lot where density. lack of infrastructure and parking availability are already problematic.
- I like the idea that parents can help their children by allowing them to take over the family home while they downsize and stay on the property. I just hope that there will not be some taxation problems doing this that may make this idea impractical.
- What an awesome opportunity to extend on ground, single lot living in our city - this is truly forward looking - I hope to see it become a reality.
- Inexpensive (affordable) rental rates could benefit lower income renters but at the same time raise serious security and safety concerns for the neighborhood.

- LOVE THEM!!!! We absolutely need these in T.O. I'm a mortgage broker and see so many seniors living in poverty even though they have \$1M in home equity. They could use reverse mortgage or other financing to pay for a laneway...create housing for family....or rent it out for more income...also increasing value of their home for Estate....and helping create more housing for Toronto's growing population who can't afford to buy here.
- It would be really great to open up garden suites to houses with limited side access - put in new fire hydrants in the alleyway if it's a fire safety issue. or require sprinklers in them.
- I am scared Garden Suites will do what Laneway Houses have done: raised the wealth of homeowners, providing only upper end rental housing.
- this survey is contrived to support the construction of garden suites neighborhoods are being negatively impacted without any democratic process to vote for or against these garden suites
- My concern would be population density in the central neighbourhoods of Toronto. There is insufficient "services": schools, police, fire, public transit...
- We need to efficiently utilize the space within the GTA and not expand into viable farm land or environmentally sensitive areas.
- I am very much in favor of Garden suites being implemented across Toronto. The only solution to improve the affordability of housing in Toronto is to increase the Supply. Condominiums and high rises are one way but there is a caveat. Our city's infrastructure is clearly not robust enough to handle all of the densifications in such a small area (for example, look at our public transit system, parking availability, public highways). Garden Suites is another method to provide more supply. In my community, single detached homes are sitting on an average lot size of 40-50 feet+ (some in the neighborhood is 65+). I do recognize that this neighborhood is a little older but I am seeing more and more newcomers as the older generations downsize. For newcomers like me that are just about to start a family, our generation does not need to live in this type of size/excess. We, statistically, will not have more than 2 children. We absolutely, do not need, to live on a 50x60 lot land to survive/be happy. Garden suites is just one way to utilize this excess land in our property to improve affordability for tenants/parents, etc. Another is the approval of land divisions but that is for another survey.
- Focus on expanding zoning for duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes where the building envelope can accommodate and the property fronts onto roads with public transit. In addition to properties fronting onto main roads.
- Garden Suites should NOT be allowed. There is already too much noise, traffic, congestion and pollution on city residential streets. There is very little privacy as houses are built with a couple of feet of each. The privacy is already compromised. Music, Loud conversation and parties are already creating noise pollution. If more construction is allowed on the limited backyard spaces, this will obstruct natural light, sunshine green spaces.
- N/A
- visibility from street might not always be feasible, flexibility should be given. Remove development fees and allow landlords greater ability to quickly remove problem tenants (noise, damage etc) when they share land. You will only get buy in from expensive neighbourhoods if they have control over evictions.
- what are we waiting for
- They are essential for the proper use of city space and offer an affordable way for people to remain in their homes as their income changes or their families grow.
- I think it's a great way to increase density and affordability in the city
- Garden suites are a great idea overall, but not every lot has the capacity to accommodate a garden suite. Soft landscaping, adequate separation and scale are important aspects of the Neighbourhoods - that's why many people move out of the dense downtown area.
- This is an opportunity for housing intensification AND an opportunity to increase the supply of affordable housing. Also, it provides an opportunity for provision of multi-generational housing. This could alleviate the need to house seniors, or other family members, in the death traps that are Long-Term Care facilities.
- this is a perfect opportunity for people to find affordable housing - adult children helping their aging parents while each has their own private dwelling and independence - keeping aging people out of nursing homes, where they can live a happy life being near family or friends.

- Quality Materials and sustainable practices. Minimal impact to existing building stock. Incentive to reuse old coach/carriage houses and garages.
- All new dwellings must meet site control rule ex, build to blend and compliment the area
- Access, both emergency and not are a big concern. keeping the character of the neighbourhood matters
- Perhaps more rules to protect tenants as the home owners can be invasive.
- Also should be allowed next to a public lane way. Otherwise you're limiting who can build a garden suite to wealthier people with large backyards
- Get it done!
- Think it is a good idea depending on scale, location. Don't want to lose character that exists in some neighbourhoods
- I'm concerned about strain on sewer systems, on the electrical grid, on privacy, on overcrowding. With all the condo buildings being approved and the parking spaces being lost with laneway suites there will be a lack of street parking spots. It is already a struggle to find a spot when I come home from work. I can understand a need for change for improvements, but this feels like a money grab that will annoy more people than it would help them.
- they could be a workable solution. I need to learn more to fully endorse this as a broad solution. For instance, where would converting a large home/mansion into triplexes or congregate housing fit into a seniors living strategy as compared to garden suites?
- Only some properties are large enough to allow garden homes. Many practical issues - Fire/EMS, plumbing, right of way access for tenants, construction equipment, services.
- Don't waste time and money with endless studies. The city is obviously incapable of providing quality rental housing (see TCHC - disgraceful) The private sector does everything better including building, managing, and running quality rental stock for housing and business use. You already allow laneway homes - there is no need for this to take long to approve. Get to work
- I will reach my retirement age in a couple of year. A smaller place for me to retire in, like a Garden Suite, would accommodate me and the house would accommodate another family.
- I think Garden suites are completely different from laneway suites which I strongly support.
- Permit fees should be waived for agreements to provide affordable housing to qualified candidates
- Make it flexible, preserve green space, limit on street parking permits to encourage transit and active transportation, allow many different uses not just residential.
- Extremely beneficial for the elderly and young generation. Will continue to promote family oriented neighbourhoods.
- The rents will be high rent not helping out low income. Even with incentives people will raise the rents or become slum lords. How will existing infrastructure keep up with extra loads who will pay. Why do we want a concrete jungle and losing green space
- I see Garden Suites as a great potential for aging in place, making more room for intergenerational families as they grow and for creating greater density with less negative environmental impacts. Garden suites also allow for people to self-isolate from family members should Toronto be struck by another pandemic in the future.
- I think we should rethink the empty property / office spaces downtown and or retrofit to affordable rental units. We already have enough empty buildings. We don't have enough green space. Why take more away?
- We should think about having max occupancy limits on garden suites to minimize disturbances to nearby neighbours.
- Certain areas that have density and subsidized housing issues already should have those problems addressed before adding Garden Suites
- My main concern would be overcrowding of schools, not enough green space, over-building of the lot. Developers taking advantage and pushing for more and bigger without care for the neighbourhood. Maximum hard surface coverage should be set and enforced, one standard across the board. Front lawns can't be turned into parking lots. With continued flooding in the GTA, garden suit footprint s/b kept small and driveway for properties should be reached with permeable material.
- It would be great if they were portable options especially if a person with an intellectual disability had to be relocated upon the land owner's sale of the property or their death in the case of a

parent or other person providing support. It needs to be sustainable for the individual(s) occupying the unit.

- We are opposed to them. They aren't a solution. Shame on you.
- I think that there should be some degree of flexibility. Putting up garden suites downtown wouldn't work and would just cause the suites to be used as short term stays (i.e. AirBnBs). Short term stays in these units should be banned in general. Also, I believe that extreme care should be given to not allow sheds that masquerade as garden suites as some unscrupulous landlords will inevitably try to use garden suites to take advantage of the high Toronto rents by having substandard living conditions. Maybe an enforcement system should be set up for inspections? Lastly, I believe that it should be extremely crucial to stop NIMBYs from quashing legitimate plans for garden suites. They should only have a say if the suite would cast shade (the garden suite is to the south of the neighbour) or if there are windows which allow peering in to the neighbours property (like the individual with the illegal garden suite who lived in the Beaches).
- They do not address housing issues in the city. Developers and government need to address affordable housing NOT homeowners. Build family sized apartments.
- I think that the use, or creation of garden suites where properties are large enough might make sense. There should be a requirement for a minimum lot size (eg. 100' x 100'). The lots that are prevalent in our area are much too small. I don't see how it is practical to build a structure that can house someone in an backyard area that is so small. Additionally, the City has an abysmal track record of bending to the will off developers. Once introduced, if developers are interested in this, you will have larger, taller garden suites popping up.
- I think this is a really great opportunity to add a new type single dwelling units to the city that give occupants a different experience that a unit in a MURB while utilizing already developed land. I think attention needs to be given to the environmental requirements.
- No
- Garden suites are a fantastic way to increase urban density and provide affordable housing in the city and can help eliminate sprawl.
- I 100% support Garden Suites. I think this is a fabulous idea, and I just hope there is not too much red-tape to make the process unappealing to home owners.
- I worry most about privacy and overlook and about the design quality of the buildings (not temporary) and about the potential increase in impermeable surfaces. I do think the idea offers a lot of flexibility for both homeowners and renters, and provides the potential for quite a few additional housing units. (The survey needed to add 'all of the above' for some of the questions... just saying).
- stop involving yourself in every part of your citizens lives and treat us like adults. we dont need to live in a nanny state that is directed by toronto council
- There should be no air bnb or temporary rentals. Should be intended for long term housing.
- Would not want businesses that service clients in person
- Once allowed, I don't believe it will be possible to prevent them from being abused.
- On larger lots allow larger suites if outdoor space can be provided inside the perimeter of the suite. I am envisioning an O shaped unit on my 8250 sf lot that would build a small courtyard in the middle with virtually all glazing facing inwards for maximum privacy both ways.
- This would be a good opportunity to implement rules that mandate a landlords responsibility toward tenants. Landlords should have to prove properties are up to safety standards and that they understand their responsibilities before being allowed to rent them out - especially since there will be new precedents like ensuring clear paths to garden suites doors. If a landlord doesn't maintain the properties they should face actual consequences, like having their ability to rent out the property revoked. When it comes to parking, I live in the Annex where there are already way more people then there are parking spaces (as I'm sure is the case with most condensed downtown neighbourhoods). I love that I don't need a car where I live but occasionally I rent one or get one from work. It's already difficult to get a permit, often they're at capacity, and when I do get a permit I have to spend ages driving around looking for spot. More people equal more cars. Reducing the number of parking spots will add to the already crowded street parking. All houses should be built with places to put bikes regardless of parking. And as for incentives, theoretically I like the idea of affordable rental properties being incentivized but there has to be a firm structure in place to make sure landlords don't take advantage of the opportunity. There should be very specific definitions of what is considered affordable housing, especially if it's being incentivized.

Everything is 'affordable' to someone. I've seen plenty of places branded as affordable that are still financially inaccessible to most people. Since new rental units aren't subject to rent control there should also be rules about how much landlords can raise rent if they receive these incentives.

- This is a great and to my mind a very obvious way of increasing living and live/work affordable density in the city.
- The City - and the climate - need green space and this will eliminate much green space. It will also lead to additional street parking, creating further problems. Finally, new homeowners want to build bigger and bigger homes. Even if garden suites are supposed to be modest in size, people will go to the Committee of Adjustments to get variances and garden suites will become huge
- We are in a housing crisis. Homeowners should be able to quickly build supply without being dragged down by lengthy approvals processes. Density should be encouraged.
- The City continues to look for ways to increase density but the infrastructure and schools continues to lag way behind. Although I am supportive of affordable housing, I do not believe Garden Suites are anywhere close to being part of the solution
- I think it's an awesome idea, and I hope it will become a reality. Perhaps prioritize for people on long waiting list for affordable housing.
- Nope.
- Garden suites should not be allowed to be used as an Airbnb or any short term rental. Currently noise and light pollution are concerns. These issues that negatively affect our health will increase with garden suites. This type of planning may offer higher density but is a less efficient use of space. More low rise buildings is better solution to increase density. Low rise communities retain more green spaces and create communal outside areas for recreation.
- Its best way to accommodate people who can not afford house with high rent.
- I would love for garden suites to be allowed throughout the city, more specifically the Scarborough area. This may help improve home supply in Toronto, and allow for more affordable housing options. In addition I believe green or environmentally friendly methods of home building should be rewarded through credits/rebates to the owner.
- First of all, this survey doesn't fully allow me to address my concerns, due to the questions I was asked, and the responses I could choose from. Not happy with that. Secondly, I am VERY concerned with every loss of green space in the city. There is more and more built up environment, more covering up of the ground, forever lost. I am fortunate to have a semi house, and a yard, but I still struggle with quiet and privacy due to the fact that the lots here are narrow. We're already living on top of each other, and garden suites in backyards such as these will only make it harder to find peace and privacy. In this increasingly difficult housing market, I also wonder how people like me, who are newly retired and looking to 'downsize', can even afford to build a garden suite. I worry that more moneyed owners will rent out both the house and the garden suite, and landlords don't care so much about the immediate environment that neighbours value.
- Should be equally matched in integrity to house and neighborhood
- I think that they all must be net zero and that tiny homes be allowed. I think that I have a very large yard and it would not bother my neighbours - I think that smaller yards should not be allowed.
- In downtown Toronto we are already losing trees and green space at an alarming rate in residential areas. Look at the travesty of Liberty Village as an example. COVID has made it clear we need more green space not less. Finding lots or parking lots or setting a maximum percentage of green space that must be preserved if a build request comes in is essential if you move forward. Making it mandatory to preserve all of the trees and shrubs on the property...setting a maximum size for the garden suite if approved to ensure a lot doesn't just become a TWO HOUSE lot!! How can you guarantee it is affordable and that they cannot raise the rent over time? Can they all be made to be mandatory rentals and what if you approve that...they build it and then sell it/the property. Where is the City's legal hooks to continue it as affordable?
- There is already overcrowding in Toronto-this makes it worse.
- make sure fully accessible by people with disabilities in and out
- Absolutely do not pass this ridiculous suggestion. No garden suites and no boarding houses. If you can't afford to live here, move.

- Fantastic opportunity for unscrupulous developers to have bidding wars over income property opportunities which will exclude all reasonable hope of individual home ownership in Toronto
- Make them permanent with the option to buy into the main house on the property
- I think that they are a fabulous idea, along with laneway housing to gently increase the density of Toronto neighbourhoods. They must NOT be used for Air B&Bs.
- Allow them...bring people into the city, they will increase tax revenue.
 - net increase over-all permeability, must have green roofs, no on-site parking, protect all trees, all servicing upgraded e.g. sewer (replaced) and water connections (no lead), effective storm water management (functioning downspout disconnection that eliminates run-off to street, decent separation distance between buildings and set-backs. Shadowing is a consideration for solar units of abutting properties, gardens etc. - there should be minimum lot size, maximum coverage and height standards, to permit a suite. New suites will not be affordable. They will just make property owners wealthier in the core. Allow more duplex, triplex and small walkup apartment buildings on appropriate corner lots and other larger lots.
- There need to be regional or subregional bylaws based on the types of lots, dwellings, lot coverage and character of the neighbourhood, One set of rules cannot fit all neighbourhoods
- Affordable housing is a huge issue in this city, but I do not think this is the best way to deal with this issue. I have serious concerns with this suggestion. I think there are safety concerns, especially being in close proximity to other houses, but with limited access by fire vehicles. I do not think it is okay to be covering and developing every inch of green space. We are going to have issues with flooding and run off and quality of air and I worry about mature trees being cut. This already happens without permits (and people get away with it). I think resources should be focused on substantial affordable housing developments as part of holistic communities that will serve large numbers of people. People already have the opportunity to rent out portions of their home and have multiple generations living together under one roof. Moving beyond those options is truly pushing the limits of our neighbourhoods, infrastructure and crucially important green space required to have a healthy city.
- should only be allowed on lots large enough that there is no encroachment on neighbors (privacy, noise, loss of light and sightlines)
- Currently there are not enough public community amenities for the density of population where I live in Toronto.
- Adding Garden Suites to desirable neighbourhoods will remove the characteristics that made them desirable in the first place. Do not implement your current plan. All other COMPARABLE cities that have tried this or something similar have not successfully solved their problems and have introduced new ones. Some issues took years to surface. Please check your plan. For example, don't propose a solution that has bicycles replacing cars when historically similar plans have never succeeded for reasons that cannot be changed including: its not practical to commute via bicycle from Scarborough to downtown, we get snow and icy roads every winter, one may be physically challenged. The current plan doesn't take into consideration proper service planning especially power, sewer/water as well as Police, Fire, Hospitals, and vehicle transportation levels of service. Today the only way to properly integrate 'low income' housing is to have a maximum of approximately 3.5% of homes in the average desirable neighbourhood occupied by people/families that receive subsidies to pay for living so they appear and behave fully integrated. History has proven that creating blocks of 'low income housing' as a group of tens of homes/apartments and as after-though backyard structures always creates less desirable neighbourhoods over time. I strongly suspect this plans projections didn't include the future drop in tax revenue and the increased cost of policing in perpetuity. Please properly examine the issues you are trying to resolve. There is a better solution than this. Yes it will be harder and costlier in the short term (30 years) but will be much better for future citizens of Toronto. A multi-generational plan is the only kinds of plan that has a significant chance for success since it takes generations for behaviors to change and the billions required for a successful change must be spread out over time. Please fix your fundamental assumptions and create a new plan.
- I do have concerns about privacy and noise in addition to my concerns on the impact of parking. In my neighbourhood of semi-detached dwellings, we are already living very close to each other. I'm a bit worried about increasing the density, if the idea is to use the garden suite as a rental

property. How large are they allowed to be? I'm also worried about the decrease of green space and trees. I love my street because we have trees and gardens.

- Further strain on water / hydro / schools & opportunity for abuse of rules
- People who own freestanding homes want privacy, space and freedom from overcrowding. The added pressure on infrastructure, schools, community resources, traffic, etc. is extremely undesirable.
- No Garden Suites to be built
- Love the idea of making more living, working spaces in Toronto, lower rents, keep families together, and green building (rooftop gardens/greenery etc)
- Yes to Garden Suites! Yes to density being more evenly spread!
- My biggest concern is not being able to contact a building inspector or a city department in case of a disagreement. If this is not available then I would vote against a proposal to allow Garden Suites. That kind of nightmare is not worth it.
- Yes we need our arable land the way it is. Flooding is a huge problem here. Garden suites bring a transient element nearby elementary schools. Parking and traffic flow are already problems in our neighbourhood. We do not want our neighbourhood to be student housing dominated. What about the environmental impact on Highland Creek and the ravine which is already eroding? The City needs to stop screwing over people who want their own space. There is plenty of space in Richmond Hill, The Bridle Path and Forest Hill. Share the wealth and stop dumping in Scarborough which is a major hotspot. This speaks to the already high density in the area! Scarborough has more than its share of lower income, multi-tenant housing and rental units. It's time to level the playing field.
- This could lead to multiple people crowding into a garden suite. Renters do not always respect the property. It will lead to multiple vehicles parked on the street.
- This is a really bad idea. If there is a garden+suite, will you raise taxes on the property (as more people will be serviced by the property) and when the suite is no longer in use, reduce the tax?
- Many Laneway suite eligible properties in my neighborhood do not qualify as they don't have sufficient fire access to laneway suite, or neighbor consent or easement is required. This makes the policy inequitable and not relevant. There need to be alternatives (sprinkler system, access through main house etc) that give the new policy maximum impact. This will be the same for garden suites. If only 1/10 lots qualify then there will be no impact of generating additional housing in downtown Toronto. Also, public infrastructure needs to keep up with growth in respect to schools and other facilities.
- approved standard designs to reduce costs of development. Los Angeles has something like this for garden suites.
- Will tax infrastructure, schools, parking etc. As always, people don't follow rules, would be a disaster! Will turn neighbourhoods into slums!
- I would like the City of Toronto to not be bullied by Residents' Association. Laneway and Garden Suites must be allowed to be built in their neighbourhood!
- Affordable housing is needed but not in areas where people have purchased homes designed as one family dwellings per lot.
- Normally Garden Suites are upkept when they first start then are neglected. I strongly disagree having them in my neighborhood.
- This would be a great opportunity to provide more housing stock for student and young renters to help control the fast increasing housing price. It will also help the city in increasing residential density in areas of low density without massive changes to the urban fabric. The garden suites will be a good way of widening income diversity in a neighbourhood.
- The amount of green space in the City of Toronto continues to be diminished by individuals and companies wanting to exploit opportunities to make money. The proponents of garden suites are not altruistic people who want to provide shelter for poor people. I have great confidence that garden suites will rapidly become Air B&Bs attracting transient populations and partiers. Meanwhile, special purpose buildings designed for this purpose (hotels) will be half-empty. Air B&B does not pay income tax in this country hotels do. People who own homes are already trying to distance themselves and enjoy more green space for which they pay a premium and significant property tax. If people want to live in denser accommodation with less green space,

they would be better suited to high rise living. Taking away additional green space in Toronto will have a material impact on the habitats for birds and other small creatures.

- Allowable size of the suites needs to be determined depending on lot size, size of existing buildings and number of applications in a particular area. Also availability of services and amenities in each particular area in order to avoid overstretching of existing services before additional ones are provided, e.g., transportation, schools, public health, etc., etc.
- Destruction of canopy, The creation of more high-end rental apartments which does not help affordable rent objective, current landlords adding more revenue to the rental stream, The creation of new construction in protected environmentally locations
- Short term rentals should not be allowed no AirBNB, no Bed & Breakfast,
- Key has to be the design, desirability and affordability of the unit
- i think it's a great idea
- i am worried about the appearance of these units and how they will affect neighbourhoods
- I'm all in on the idea of allowing garden suites to be built. Love the idea.
- There might be more interest in the denser parts of the former old city of Toronto because of past willingness to adopt change like laneway houses. However, the city should also actively target and reach out to areas with larger lots close to subway lines. An area that comes to mind is the residential area north of the Wilson Station (between Bathurst and Dufferin). Properties are large and they are near subways. Areas like this already are seeing condos being built on their main streets - garden suites could be a good fit in areas like this as well as in other areas of the city.
- Well planned and managed...garden suites should be able to provide some affordable living options for young or old. There are some fine examples of these type of accommodations in Southern California cities like Corona del Mar and Newport.
- affordable housing is the goal but it is unenforceable you can not compel a owner to only have affordable housing no matter what the owner commits to
- My neighbourhood is up in arms against them. These are the same people who build monstrous homes, already cutting off sunlight and ruining back yard views. So anyone having enough backyard space should be allowed to build a garden house.
- Affordable housing is a problem. This idea won't solve it. The idea leads to many possible abuses. There maybe some specific situations where you might use this idea but they are few. Better city planning is part of the answer. Politicians need to be able to say no to big money. At the present time they invariably buckle to big money. The result is the large cities of the world all have the same problems. Enforce the laws we have, don't allow the OMB to side with the developers so easily. Through better and more stringent city planning and laws give the politicians the tools they need to stop the mess the developers are creating. Tax vacant housing to the point where speculation is greatly reduced. Where are the politicians with vision who are thinking not only the present but of the future of Toronto when ideas and projects are up for debate. We used to have them. The Bloor St via duct is an excellent example of politicians thinking not only of the present but of the future.
- Security
- yes, I don't want them in my neighbourhood, we already have enough problems
- Lots in Toronto are often tight, the current setbacks for structures would need to be considered so it's not located too far off the property line into the backyard to maximize usable green space and patios. Setbacks of half the height from roof midpoint result in dead space around the building.
- easy accessibility for first responders (fire, ambulance etc) is key also wheelchair accessible should be mandated if used for rental accommodation
- Garden Suites will have no impact on affordable housing unless there are clear rules about rent that can be charged - what we are seeing with laneway housing is that it is being marketed as 'luxury', with suites rented for 3000+ for a 1-2 bedroom. Garden Suites also need clear understanding on protection for tenants: if the home owner changes, does the tenant become at risk of eviction?
- There should be minimum lot size restrictions.
- Priority given to those on ODSP and geriatrics.
- Garden Suites can use existing services.
- Build build build! Garden suites are a bare minimum for the housing crisis this city finds itself in. Homeowners can take it, or we can go back to demolishing neighbourhoods to build high rises.

- Toronto needs more housing options located away from major arterials. This is an important first step.
- Encourage solar panel usage, separate hydro metres/panels, height restrictions - no 3 story units!
- As long as garden suites do not impact hard landscaping more than the square footage of the suite, I have no problem. I object when hard scaping covers most of the property.
- Do not agree Do not want this
- The cost of housing in the city has increased significantly. It would be helpful to have my children and their family live in a separate house on the lot. Also, it would be helpful if a caregiver for an elderly family member could live there as well.
- The living space on a lot with a modest sized home (say, a bungalow) and a garden suite wouldn't have to exceed the living space permitted for a single dwelling on the same lot. Is there a housing policy to preclude the garden suite option, or can concerns be addressed in the by-laws?
- I am worried that Our city infrastructure cannot accommodate more. Our streets have no room for additional parking. Privacy.
- I think that Garden Suites are a good idea, since they allow for flexible living arrangements (especially as people age) and add additional rental options, while only gently increasing the density of a neighbourhood. I think it is important to give due consideration to privacy and shadowing concerns (amongst others), but to not impose overly cumbersome or illogical rules with regards to any specific concern that people may raise during this process.
- Urge to view this as less of a way to offer more housing affordability (it will likely not impact housing costs as owners will likely not agree to rent control) but creating more capital for land owners to leverage. Focus should still be on providing affordable rent geared to income and rent control scenarios.
- Fully supportive
- Our city will become like Medellin, Colombia or Rio in Brazil. Is this what we aspire to?
- Great idea. How many years of bureaucratic wall climbing will it take to initiate this great idea?
- Big mistake. Will increase waste disposal water usage and create further parking issues. We have enough issues to deal with to have a neighbour build another residence in their yard create more noise and block views. Stupid idea.
- Important not to create R-BNB - that would change the make up of neighborhoods - we want to favor multi-generational dwellings, that would be part of a family's financial planning, and that would reduce the strain on Ontario's long-term care and healthcare of elderly, and increase urban dwelling density (in a right way).
- I think it is a great opportunity for home owners to have "guest suites" on their property for family members and also to rent out to small families and students! My sister is a single mother and having a "garden suite" would be such a nice option for them.
- I am concerned with the quality of construction, the impacts to neighbours when building a suite, and the height, shadow and privacy allowances, as well as the impact on runoff. More coverage on a property with impermeable surfaces will lead to more runoff, which will lead to more flooding in our neighbourhood. I live in an area with relatively small lots and low tree cover and would not want to see trees going down to allow more poorly constructed suites to go up. The opportunity for a suite should be related to % of the lot covered by a building. Preference should be given to converting existing garages into suites, vs new buildings. Additionally, our neighbourhood has many houses built too close to the property line due to older bylaws. Careful consideration of how to grandfather allowances between property lines etc. is needed to ensure that this is not exploited.
- I think this could be a fantastic initiative and help increase affordable housing stock in a city that is currently failing to provide affordable housing options for a sizable portion of its population.
- I am thoroughly looking forward to this being an as of right situation, I am disabled (7 years ago) and I will need to live in an accessible space. Before the prospect of garden suites I would have needed to move elsewhere. I love Toronto and have no interest in living anywhere else and this will enable that to happen.
- Entire neighbourhoods should be rezoned, garden suits exploits renters and expands the wealth divide between landowners and renters. Lazy landowners making money off renting their garden suits. They're already won the lottery with their land

- allow this kind of housing asap.
- there are lots has access to streets such as corner houses, this should has more advantage
- Multigenerational living has many benefits in providing care for seniors and children. Garden suites will allow for such living configurations.
- I'm really focused on this as an inter generational opportunity. Along with most of my neighbours I have a deep lot that could be redesigned with a suite to accommodate my aging parents or my son who won't be able to afford to live in the city in the future.
- I think this is a small, but important step forward to increasing housing supply in Toronto - and for making it more affordable for us who can't afford to buy in the city to actually live in the city.
- I think garden suites could provide an opportunity for us to age in place - build with aging in mind - single floor, wheelchair access. At the same time, it could allow for the younger generation to live in Toronto with their growing family.
- Traffic and parking in the areas with garden suites would be worsened.
- I think that this is a progressive solution to affordable housing, down-sizing parents, work from home, etc. This needs to happen, and any incentives that can be offered to encourage people to get on board would greatly benefit the city.
- Legalize them and get rid of OPA 320 so we can build the missing middle and not price people out of the city
- If Garden Suites are approved allow home owners to creat a parking pad or car port on their lot.
- Don't overly confine them. They will be beautiful if you let people build beautiful things.
- I believe they are a great way to help the housing supply in Toronto if done correctly
- Similar allowances are made in Los Angeles. It allows for inter generational living. It also allows for seniors to subsidize their cost of living without leaving their homes by having income generation. Furthermore, experientially, I havre found it adds to community.
- I hope the city proceeds to allow them ASAP.
- Preapprove 4-6 models in different configurations that meet all requirements and buildings code, this will speed up approvals and not bog down the application system and add to costs - see city of Ottawa and Los Angeles preapproved ADU plans.
- Excited that this is being looked into. As a young adult, it's important that these get built to allow for housing that is more easily attained by younger generations. Too many negative decisions are being made by older NIMBYs that strips housing options away from younger populations, who are now the largest contributors to the city. If something isn't done, Toronto stands to lose young professionals who make the city more competitive. There will always be roadblocks to approval, but ultimately it would be great if the city could find a way to get this done. Thanks for starting the initiative and let's make it happen
- Please do not restrict garden suites by having requirements such as having a minimum 43 foot lot which will defacto exclude majority of prospective detached homes. I urge the city to be not so strict under the aegis of privacy and to allow garden suites even if the lot width is 39 feet plus (unlike kitchener where it is 43 feet plus)
- This is an amazing opportunity for the city to show leadership
- Don't do this. The city is too full. Stop packing people in so tight
- I think that garden suites should not be permitted as they will destroy the quality of life in single family residential neighbourhood by increasing the population density and changing the demographic structure of the neighbourhood. Also, building new structure in existing green spaces will reduce the available growing space for trees in neighbourhoods. This will have negative impact on City's canopy cover.
- It is likely that the already richer people will get richer and the additional housing will be substandard. Also, the reduced green space should be replaced by an equal amount of publicly accessed green space, i.e., parks.
- let's go!
- it's important that the revised zoning for garden suites be made easy and simple for all homeowners to adopt. Simplicity is key. Interactive zoning map should highlights lots that are garden suites friendly.
- This is an excellent move forward by Toronto, please ensure this happens and swiftly! We're in a space where too few people have options for antiquated rules and by-laws. Thanks!

- City by-laws should mandate caps on the scale, specifically, 1) the size of a garden suite must not exceed 25% of the size of the existing lot for the property 2) height restriction, specifically, the garden suite must be x meters shorter than the full height of the existing property 3) any property owner intending to apply to construct a garden suite must seek public input in his neighbourhood, including posting the design, height, and size specifications for full public viewing and consultation. All of the above will be taken into consideration by the City of Toronto and the homeowner must abide by all the City-mandated amendments prior to issuing approval
- Good luck! Will be a tricky policy to develop given the huge range of lot types in the City, but this could unlock more rental supply and bring more people into our mature neighbourhoods to keep them vibrant. Wishing you much success
- Absolutely critical to do this in order to build supply, create value, and maximize the best and highest use of land in our city.
- Please do this! I'm afraid to send my parents or my child to long term care after seeing what a shambles this sector is in right now in Ontario
- Yes, they should have been allowed long ago and please cut with the angular plane stuff. You made laneway housing far too prescriptive and now they are far too difficult to build. Just let people build stuff in their backyard. If they are unpleasant to live in no one will live in them so let the tenants and owners worry about amenity space.
- Make our city more affordable already. We need more houses. Tell city planning to stop saying no to everything.
- I think it could be practical and look esthetically pleasing and provide income to homeowners
- As long as there are no short term rentals, and they don't overtake the architecture in the area, I think they are a good idea.
- Please expedite the process of changing zoning by-law to provide the opportunity for multi-residential units in the same lot of single-family houses.
- I would like to build a garden suite for my son and his family. He currently lives in a very small condo downtown. He can't afford to buy his own house and may have to move to another city in an effort to do so. Eventually I would like to live in the garden suite and he can occupy the main house. Thank you for considering other alternatives to the city's housing stock.
- Lot area should be considered when determining the size of a garden suite.
- Garden sweets help create a more equal society. Its not just he downtown core that gets the better transit or the ability to have a laneway, but now all of toronto can have the same types of opportunities to build wealth and provide better living accommodations to more people. So much of the outer burrows have larger lots that can double the housing stock as of right if this were to pass. Small businesses which were hit the hardest can rent office space in these sweets as well, or home run businesses. There is a lot of possibility and this decentralizes a lot of development and control. I rent in a nice neighborhood now with walking amenities, I was in Scarborough before and all i could do was walk to a no frills or a shoppers. Give people more choice and more opportunity.
- Make them as-of-right as soon as possible.
- Designs for Garden Suites that conform with basic building code and occupant health and safety considerations should have as-of-right approvals in all Neighbourhood-designated areas of Toronto's Official Plan. The city should stop prioritizing dated built-form requirements over housing affordability as this does not make for progressive land-use policies and disproportionately affects young people and marginalized communities. Expediting the approval of garden suites is a way of saying through policy that all people belong in Toronto and specifically, that Toronto's Neighbourhoods belong to everyone.
- This issue has already been a proven winner in Vancouver and other cities globally. It is a no-brainer for Toronto. Let's lead, not follow. Let's make the most progressive and encouraging policies possible.
- I fully support a flexible approach for the widespread adoption of garden suite development with clear as-of-right conditions.
- We need more affordable housing options in Toronto. I am 100% supportive of this concept.
- Increase density AND affordability in our city!
- Fabulous initiative, thank you

- I am supportive of Garden Suites with the following conditions: There should be a parking space allocated to a garden suite as there are currently many people who are parking on the streets. Garden Suites should also be allowed to be 2 stories in height as many lots are not large enough to support a Garden Suite. Garden Suites should not fall to NIMBYism. Garden Suites should only allow for residential living and not be allowed for any commercial or industrial use.
- I think it's a great idea, and will provide more housing opportunities and affordability to one of the most expensive cities to live in (in the world). Toronto really needs to consider other housing options to address housing stock and affordability.
- They should be designed with an aesthetic consistent with the period and form of the architecture of the main house, and respectful of the design of houses in the immediate vicinity.
- I don't think cramming more people into already dense areas is a good idea. If allowed where my house is located the lots would have almost no green space (backyard) left. Garden suites will make house more expensive because it increases property values which are already too high. We will lose many young and mature trees. The city already doesn't adequately protect trees or green space. The laneway suites are enough, soon we will all just be staring into each other's windows it mostly feels like we're already there.
- Allow them as of right on all sites in the city and make them as easy to build as possible.
- I think it's an interesting idea that I would like to see implemented
- Just imagine the disruption to the neighbourhood if you allow these suites to be built. Guaranteed that they won't be used just for affordable housing--yoga studios, fitness classes, who knows what else. Parking, if allowed, would cause all sorts of traffic issues on streets that are already very busy.
- This is not the solution. Stop protecting and enriching single family home owners. We need mid-rise buildings built, and single family neighbourhoods completely demolished. Downtown Toronto is desperate for housing - adding one or two units in a backyard is a pathetic waste of time and does absolutely nothing to solve the issue. No other city on the planet fills their downtown with such low-density housing. Absolutely pathetic planning policy.
- Let's use this opportunity to encourage sustainable, environmentally friendly building options!
- Suburban residential areas should not be destroyed by the City's quest for more housing. Garden suites have a much bigger impact on a neighbourhood than a laneway suite would for reasons previously mentioned - parking, emergency access, transient renters, affect on trees and green space bylaws of residential lots, enforcement (requiring more city employees) which will be weak as per current bylaw enforcement.
- Garden Suites add livable space to our neighbourhoods in a density-friendly manner.
- City should allow it in ALL neighborhoods that it has space for and ensure that the wealthy neighborhoods don't block it because of "NIMBY". City needs to make sure that it's not taken over by hoarders or squatters....and that people living / renting in the garden homes don't have more rights than the home owners.. i would like to build on our property, but since we have young children, I want to make sure their safe. Bylaws need to be updated to ensure no illegal housing, and that tenants and owners have rights
- We fully support the Garden Suites initiative and believe this project is a necessary and important step forward for the City of Toronto.
- Should be large enough for at least two co-habiting people (whether a parent and child or two adults), should have equal access to private outdoor space or its own private outdoor space, should have at least one eye-height window (not just skylights) and should always be rent controlled.
- I think this is a good idea. I think that we should also be considering allowing tiny homes to count as garden suites, especially if they're self sufficient and eco friendly. I don't think it should be a consideration if it will bother the neighbours - there is a housing shortage and if you're privileged enough to have space, you should be required to use it to help others.
- Garden suites are a good idea if they are targeted towards increasing the rental stock in Toronto, especially if owned by home owners and small operators. Not for short-term rental, or a way for large landlords to overstep density requirements.
- My husband and I have a garden suite (a tiny house) on our son's farm in Grey County, one of the few counties that currently have allowed this, especially for seniors. This allows seniors to have housing close to family, giving seniors support (and sometimes allowing seniors to provide

support to sons and daughters and grandchildren), delaying or eliminating the need to move to long-term care (and we all know the reasons that this is a good idea).

- I want to be able to care for my elder parents in their later years and not send them to a home. By having a garden suite, this can be done with added use of cameras/monitors to make sure they are ok at all times. By doing this, this should save the social security system monies as seniors will have more alternatives and rely less on government assisted/funded housing.
- We really need them for future generations at all income levels to be able to live here.
- This would be a positive move for our city!
- Please provide financial incentives eg non payback loans to homeowners (those who will be investing their property to a incorporate the Garden Suite). Also can the City provide a list of trusted professionals (eg builders and designers) to assist homeowners? Please provide a list of materials which are environmentally friendly, and cost efficient, as building options.
- further loss of green space -with the ensuing environmental impacts
- Neighbourhoods filled with garden suites will be terrible places to live and many Canadian residents will flee Toronto leaving it to new immigrants that come from crowded congested cities. The culture and lifestyle currently associated with living in Canada will quickly disappear. NOTHING BENEFICIAL WILL COME FROM GARDEN SUITES, except more profits for foreign investors or Canadian passport holders that reside in foreign countries.
- Parking, emergency services access and construction debris and site safety (during the construction phase) are issues that concern me in any additional laneway suites or 'granny flats' zoning amendment proposals. On the other hand, I think laneway and other adjunct housing units are very important for helping with the limited housing stock in this city, as well as providing homeowners with an option for continuing to live with familial elders and other extended family members, as well as the potential for additional sources of income through long term rental and/or short term rental (ex air b&b). Existing car parking requirements for each additional suite should be maintained and not waived, otherwise you'll be faced with an on-street parking nightmare.
- As I said before I support this initiative but given the housing crisis it doesn't go far enough. Citywide, single family zoning should be abolished in favour of any residential housing 3 stories or less. People's aesthetic whims are being catered to at the expense of ordinary people being able to afford living here and sustainable development patterns. You need to show leadership and put the city on a new course.
- My concern would be multiple families living on one lot, and the municipal infrastructure can't keep up with the added usage.
- Land value for detached homes will increase even more as the land is more productive than before. This is making it even harder to buy in and will make the problem worse. At the very least, and I mean very least, in this day and age people should be able with hard work to buy a condo, move up to a triplex or duplex (ie missing middle) to raise a family and then maybe detached if their dreams are dead set on it. I believe it will just add flame to the fire and do the opposite if mismanaged. I understand this is intended to try to make the missing middle but in order for someone to do it they will make a fancy shed and charge rent up the butt. There needs to be a minimum living square footage so more condo style shoeboxes aren't being thrown everywhere. We are talking 1200 plus square ft homes designed for young families. If it doesn't work for a young family this proposal is useless!!! If geared towards developers that they can tear down the place, make a quadplex and list the 4 units for sale then holy momma your on to something as well, but by the sounds of it no one is selling the land unless the 'original owner' (ie developer) can be allowed to. To conclude if unregulated the good intentions of increasing rental units will turn into micro homes rented out by the rich making their land more valuable. Garden Suites NEED a minimum living size that can accommodate a small family or else the entire project is useless. The garden suite needs to result in grandparents moving into it, in other words the unit should be up to family standards if you want meaningful change
- NO short-term rentals allowed. This isn't a homeowner enrichment plan, this is an affordable housing plan.
- This goes way deeper than garden suites... We need electoral and significant tax reform.
- strongly support increasing supply of housing in any way possible, but especially in a way that would allow every day torontonians to potentially benefit directly from this both as renters (more options) and as owners (supplemental income) instead of relying on large builders only

- Size and height should be a major consideration. It does not necessarily contribute to the affordable housing initiative since the rents charged follow the guidelines of square foot in the neighborhood where it is located. A 1500 sf building commands a hefty rent in my neighborhood. And instead of housing a family with children as the size would allow, the owners are going to make sure it houses one professional, salaried person. In other words a usual condo renter.
- The goal of our housing policy needs to be increasing the availability of long term rentals suitable for couples. This means the minimum space should be on the order of 700sqft. There should be large taxes applied to Garden Suites used for short term rentals
- I think that it will enable more housing to be affordable, and for seniors like me it's a source of some retirement income.
- Most of the detached and semidetached house in Toronto is too old (need to rebuild soon). Garden suite is an opportunity to build a modern house. Size restriction could hamper this process. If someone has space, garden suites should not be smaller. It will slowly replace the old houses with modern architectures.
- Landlords and tenants must be held mutually accountable for the maintenance, repair and use of the structure. We cannot create a whole new class of 'laneway or backyard people'. Because we are increasing density within a fairly small space, the possibility of conflict will also increase. Perhaps give some thought to a system for conflict resolution, outside of the courts, that will support both parties.
- No
- If affordability is part of the project, then how do you protect the rent level? What is the definition of affordable? Affordable to whom? Fast-tracking for affordability seems like a potential for a future problem. Sure affordable for the first tenant, then they are asked to leave and then rent goes up. I'd much rather see environmental incentives. Sound and noise issues are not addressed at all in this survey. The more enclosures that are built, the more intense the noise levels. Studies show that care for the sonic environment is also important for healthy living.
- Affordable house and aging in place are critical for the city. This will allow older couples to downsize without having to sell their properties and open up more rental options for families.
- I think this is a fantastic idea and I encourage the city to consider this as an option, and make it flexible in terms of size/height/look & feel/etc. and do not overly restrict when creating by-laws. This will create housing stock in the city in otherwise unused space and homeowners should be incentivized to do this.
- Allowing properties with laneway suites or garden suites to be severable would increase the stock of housing for sale, allowing more people to become property owners, build equity, and escape the cycle of poverty tenants endure due to skyrocketing rent.
- There are already a lot of owners trying to capitalize on their properties as Airbnb. Although City may invent laws or bylaws to enforce people renting out their garden suites as Airbnb (if the garden suites ideas do become effective), I am afraid there will still be a lot of Airbnb operators not following the rules. On the whole, I disagree with the idea of garden suites as this will affect the safety, privacy, traffic, utilities, increased population, green space and community facilities of the entire neighbourhood. When your neighbour's property is an Airbnb and with the addition of a garden suite, there are as many as 6-8 people coming and going at different times every few days with suitcases, you will understand.
- We need to vastly increase the stock of affordable housing in Toronto, period.
- Fully support this initiative and so glad to see the City finally looking to innovative solutions for which we already have the infrastructure, to help provide housing within existing neighbourhoods.
- Expand to all areas of the city currently zoning for detached housing that do not yet exist on a laneway. Allow for additional units or greater size in units if the lot permits it, through some percent of lot coverage maximums.
- The policies about lot size, visibility of the street, separation distances, etc should not be too restrictive otherwise there will be very few lots in Toronto where garden suites will actually be able to be built.
- Housing prices are high. Developers in this area try to put as much building as they can get away with- bigger, higher, down deeper below the grass, closer to the property line, paving over front lawns, widening driveways and putting in parking pads. And there are still cars parking on the street Lots of pressure on the infrastructure- water, sewage etc. The bylaws don't do much to protect us. I am concerned the garden suites will end up not being small at all and lose the intent

of allowing children, grandchildren on a parent's property or housing for younger people or flexibility for older home-owners. Instead it can turn into more high priced expansive housing. Residents should be informed if our neighbour wants to build one since it will impact our garden, sunlight, street, privacy, noise etc.

- N/a, just make it affordable
- I think it's imperative that the city move forward with allowing garden suites. More than any other missing middle typology, this has the potential to benefit home owners (through 1) ability to afford a home due to income stream from rental of gdn suite, 2) ability to have family stay with them e.g aging parent or kid or visitor) as well as renters (through 1) ability to live in a better neighbourhood and not get stuck in a highrise). Keep in mind that a garden suite is more likely to be 'affordable' in comparison to a purpose built rental. Furthermore, it offers a far more dignified living mechanism than a 'basement' apartment. I recognize that there will be pushback regarding 'neighbourhood character', but this must be resisted. Neighbourhoods must not be static - they are meant to be dynamic. We are a growing city with a fast increasing population. We must find ways for more people of different means to live within the areas of the city that are accessible to culture, transit and amenities. Otherwise we will increasingly become a city of 'haves' and 'have-nots' and that is not the Torontonion or Canadian way. I recommend making these 'as of right' city-wide subject to certain 'fairly applied' design parameters. In particular, for the 'suburbs' where there are standard 40 by 120 ft lot bungalows, there should/could be some sort of standardized approach. I encourage the city to look at 'modular' and 'prefabricated' options, and encourage 'global developers' who have experience with this to bring best practices here. Make sure to prioritize 'density' over 'trees' and 'sustainability'. These things are important, but the most important thing is allowing helping people first. Sustainability should be secondary to affordability and density. As mentioned, don't prevent a unit from being built due to a parking problem - if there is no parking on the lot, enable street parking (change the rules - within reason). Make it fair (don't let pricey neighbourhoods avoid this).
- This is not a solution to the housing affordability crisis. It's a minor improvement but a drop in the bucket. Get rid of the yellowbelt if you want to start seeing some change.
- It is a great idea. Let owners be creative but also ensure that they look good and use good quality materials but still affordable to build.
- I like the idea. BUT it makes me nervous with young children in the main house and having strangers living in my backyard. I don't want to feel like an intruder in my own backyard if I have to share my backyard too.
- n/a
- n/a
- It would cause more problems, sewers, garbage, parking transportation, noise pollution, policing, and environmental.
- Garden suites are a great idea. great for having older parents live close by and help to care for. Great for adult children to sample being independent. great for neighborhoods - im seeing housing blocks being turned into large, high density apartments drastic intensification- totally ruining neighborhood in my opinion. Garden suites is a great way for subtle intensification. everyone wins. why are we so slow to adapt this?
- About time
- I think it's a horrible idea, in an already cramp city. City should look at encouraging lower condo prices or a higher percentage of low income condos or Rental condos instead of allowing builders free range to sell at unreasonable prices. These programs only encourage people to give up personal space on their property for a quick buck. All this does is create a race to the bottom of the barrel. This idea makes me think of poor countries with cities with over population and building dwellings to try to accommodate 20 people in a small area. Just half fast ideas, but nothing shocking from this city as most of the ideas from Council are horrible anyway. I'm embarrassed to be a Torontonion and have to hear our Mayor keep saying we're a world class city and I've lived here my whole life. Here's an idea, an idea I'm surprised the city hasn't come up with, why not stack shipping Containers 3-4 high and all along the Queen's Quay and retro fit them for livable spaces and you can call the living by the harbor...(Of course this is just a joke but I'm sure there are people in the city Council that might think it's a great idea, only time will tell... Haha)
- tax credits from the city on property taxes

- There should be strict regulations as to size and to minimize negative impact on adjoining properties. The regulations must be adhered to and enforced to ensure existing low rise residential neighborhoods remain the community fabric that binds the city together
- This is crazy nonsense
- They will cause parking and flooding problems.
- Garden Suites are a major improvement to the affordability crisis in Toronto by addressing missing middle housing
- This is an incredible opportunity to increase the rental housing availability which will make housing in Toronto more affordable. For me and my family it would enable us to live in our own spaces with sufficient privacy, while still allowing for familial bonding and intergenerational caregiving as my parents age in place.
- Very bad idea
- I think this is a great idea and I am very keen to do this, so that we do not have to leave the city of Toronto all together.
- I think this is the right direction to go in to increase Toronto's options for affordable housing and give people more opportunities and choice on where to live. Not everyone likes living in apartment buildings or condos. Backyard garden suites will be really great for aging family members as well for multi generational homes.
- I am in full support of this project. Anything that will enable more rental units in the city is a positive.
- will lead to many people in too little space
- No
- I am very concerned about privacy, ruining green space, and our quality of life in our quiet neighborhood.
- I feel like this might take away from owners backyard space and create more crowding if there are even more people living in one area. Buses may be crowded.
- I believe garden suites can have a positive impact on Toronto's housing and provide affordability.
- You have not mentioned the horrible homes being erected (replacing the small bungalows) that fell all the tree's and completely fill the lots with a big cheap grey box for a home with no garden. These ruin the tree canopy, environment and take all the character, sun & joy from a neighbourhood. With Garden suites built in the character of the existing house, maintaining the trees and building ecologically you enhance the character of the neighbourhood, add more housing, maintain the community and enhance the owners financial situation. Bylaws would need to be put in place to maintain these qualities and prevent low end builders from ruining the neighbourhoods. In the city, parking is not as important as it used to be although the street parking is at a premium in my area.
- In Toronto the houses are very close together and there is no room for other houses on the properties. There should be a requirement for a minimum amount of green space on a property before an garden suite could be imposed. Also, there should be a minimum setback from borders so that the people suffering from the suite would be only the owners of the main house. This would mean that the 'garden suite' would probably be only about 10 feet by 10 feet, for most properties in Toronto.
- In my neighbourhood, lot widths are small, homes are close together, back yards abut back yards of the next street. Often a narrow driveway is shared by two homes, or there is no driveway. There is not much space to add a second, garden-suite home behind a home. The garden-suite home would be intrusive to at least five other properties - the two on either of side of the main home and three on the next street whose back yards would be next to the garden-suite. Emergency access to a garden-suite would be very difficult with only a narrow access to it from the main street. A garden-suite may be appropriate on a large lot with a large private driveway, where there would be emergency access and where the garden-suite home was not intruding onto the space of neighbouring homes on six sides of it.
- I am absolutely THRILLED that this is being proposed. I have a HUGE back lot. My daughter and her family cannot afford to purchase a home in Toronto. We would love to have an inter-generational living situation where I can downsize to a granny suite and they can live in the main house . We have been waiting for this!
- Sewer, water and hydro to be connected to house not to the street.

- It wouldn't provide a significant relief to increase housing supply in Toronto.
- I think short term rentals in garden suites could be an issue. I would not allow them to be registered on the cities short term rental database and require only 28 day min stays.
- I think theyre a great idea. They can provide income to struggling homeowners, allow more rental opportunities, be used for many different things. When my kids move out, my wife and i could downsize into it and rent our home.
- I don't want more people crammed into every space in this city. We can't accommodate more people. We don't want Toronto to become NYC. Keep the trees and other vegetation.
- Please don't waste this opportunity to add flexible housing stock to the housing mix by being overly-bureaucratic and restrictive with zoning requirements.
- Currently my son can't buy house for start his family , and rent are expensive in this situation I think Garden suites is best option to start his family with privacy life in my own house. I strongly recommend this idea of Garden suites. Please Go for it and give us permit to build one.
- More generally about the 'missing middle' idea: I moved into the Deer Park area a couple of years ago and am really enjoying the mix of housing types here: single detached houses houses divided into apartments semi-detached houses operating as rentals lots of older, low-rise apartment buildings (from 2 storeys to 4 or 5) plus townhouses, mid-rise apartment buildings and high-rises. Lots of use of brick, in quite a range of tones. A varied and interesting streetscape. Would love to see this kind of diversity preserved, and fostered in other areas as well.
- please fast track so we can add much needed housing to our city
- Eliminating the need for parking is key
- I am very concerned about privacy impacts of garden suites and laneway housing. If they can be built to not overlook the neighbours then I am fine with them. My neighbours built a raised deck just a short distance away from my patio, cutting down 3 trees to do so. My privacy has disappeared. Garden suites would be similar unless care was taken with windows, sunshine issues and sightlines.
- Should be allowed for short term rentals
- It would ruin the appeal of the city people don't behave it will be a slum Don't ever do this please.
- Potentially too high density in already dense downtown neighbourhoods / lack of privacy.
- all for them.
- Please regulate and monitor with utmost care for the neighbourhood itself and all residents of the neighbourhood. Do on sight consultations with the neighbours to reveal specific concerns for example if all of the living rooms of multi-unit building face the backyards that is not a good location for a garden suite. It is not clear whether the owner must reside in the 'main' house and the renter in the garden suite, but if no owner resides on the lot, this is a wide open invitation for investors to buy properties with no regard for the neighbourhood, just to make money and squeeze as much out of the land. I doubt if this will solve the affordability crisis. It will just be for investors. It sounds wonderful when pitched as a suite for granny, but the sharks will be out and we will ruin our Toronto neighbourhoods unless this is extremely highly regulated. Remember what happened with Air BnB? I may sound alarmist but I am sincere. This is only for the rich. It will not solve the housing crisis. It will make it worse since big lots will be bought by the wealthy as investments with no regard for anything but money. Rents in these places will be high. They will be too small to accomodate families. The size and materials and even colour of these garden suites need to be regulated. We have seen in the past that without regulation and oversight, people will do anything to make money. In our neighbourhood, there are already signs up for companies to build garden suites.
- They could provide much needed housing forsingles and couples especially.
- Fire safety access
- Would love to see this expand to include tiny homes as well. Also would love to see the city support building more rent-geared-to-income housing by providing the incentives/initiatives to homeowners to support this. We're past due for affordable housing options in Toronto. Really worried that this could be another opportunity for investors to gouge the vulnerable the same way REITs have and holding up or sitting on valuable space while waiting for the most profit. This needs to be done in the most equitable way to ensure folks aren't exploited. Not just 'inclusionary zoning', not just affordable housing, but deeply affordable housing.

- Strong concerns to whether the city will support and protect the landlords from delinquent tenants. The first step for Toronto is to consider upgrading the LTB Tribunal to ensure more responsive and expedient processes before considering more affordable housing options. Unless you protect landlords/owners ... this idea of garden suites is not sustainable
- There MUST be enforcement of the requirements on car parking. Many existing sites have 'illegal' parking methods including parking on lawns and in Fire Requirements. Moreover, there MUST be a limit as to the number of Residents in each unit that IS ENFORCEABLE to municipal standards.
- If the city wants homeowners to actually rent these suites, more must be done to address LTB backlog especially for small landlords. Having problems with tenants that go MONTHS without resolution will seriously discourage landlords from renting their suites, especially at affordable rates if the risks of waiting MONTHS for an LTB hearing exists. I would suggest that LTB hearings be expedited for all 'mom and pop' or small landlords in the city of Toronto. Larger corporate landlords can absorb some of the costs but for working families issues can result in them missing mortgage payments or thousands of dollars in damages etc. Especially if landlords and tenants are living on the same property, it creates and EXTREMELY uncomfortable living situation when there are issues that cannot be resolved promptly by the LTB.
- Interesting idea but needs to be done with lots of thought and respect for low-rise established areas.
- I think the idea of a 'Suite' squeezed onto a 25 foot wide lot with a mutual driveway is ridiculous. How is an ambulance going to get to Granny after one of the big trees in the backyard has fallen on her during a wind storm? Who shovels back to Granny in the winter? Suites might work on a 50 foot wide lot so the size of a lot and accessibility should be high priorities. The reality of this city is greed and that why housing has become a commodity and unaffordable. This 'granny flat' image is so idyllic and in reality will be an AirBnB rental with noisy parties to annoy the neighbours. The City of Toronto is ineffective at enforcing current short term rentals and noise bylaws so I don't have confidence with the City's ability to manage 'Grannies'
- there need to be proper regulations (reasonable) regulations so applications are not bogged down necessarily with COA approvals. City planning documents need to be more nuanced and better respect existing built forms. The City's one-size-does-not-fit approach to residential zoning is a disaster, a missed opportunity. If the best you can imagine and encourage is a detached single-family home then you need to outsource the next planning by-laws to design professionals. This City has always missed the mark when it comes to these documents and proposals. Strong start, horrible finish and after-taste. Make Toronto Great Again!
- It's a no brainer. Let people build garden suites as tall as the main house. Please eliminate parking requirements. Protect trees, yes, but otherwise most concerns eg privacy are overrated.
- Generational living puts a lot of strain on the existing family and it makes it livable to have some space separation. Many adult children are moving back home for various reasons or aging parents move in with families and we want our own quiet space to retreat to. Also, if any domestic violence tendency, this gives a safe space.
- Who pays for additional hospital, government services, police and fire required for the increased density. The tax increases may be more than I can afford. I don't wish to move.
- Allowance be made for wheelchair accessibility, additional caregiver 2nd bedroom, wider doors, extra lighting etc. I've seen some, from outside, in Vancouver and am relieved that Toronto is 'finally launching on new initiatives.
- Im glad to hear the city is open to considering this especially with the outrageous affordability and aging in place issues.
- Will the primary owner have to live in the main house in order to rent out the garden suite (I can imagine there may be issues around short-term accommodations if the owner does not live on site).
- the housing affordability crisis in Toronto should be addressed urgently. Garden suits can be one of the solutions.
- I think allowing garden suites will be detrimental for many reasons. The aging infrastructure can barely support what we have at present time. I believe they will be misused and mismanaged and if there are rules eg built for family member such as an aging parent that they will soon be used to rent to whomever. Too many buildings and not enough garden space and trees as it is. One was recently built in our neighborhood in Leaside and it is an eyesore and we are all left scratching our heads trying to figure out how the heck they built it ?

- Terrible idea, not needed, won't solve the problem of the need for low income housing in the city. Instead will be used for unnecessary home expansion
- If there is an increase in density in the city, other aspects need to be looked at, for example the availability of schools, public transit, sanitation (trash and water treatment) and down to parks and recreation programs.
- I think they would ruin the peace and quiet of a residential neighborhood. And lower property values.
- Garden suites already exist and it is part of the solution to legalize, regulate and control non-conventional kind of housing. The fact that garden suites are not regulated does not mean that garden suites does not exist. Benefits 1.It is very convenient for the city, because it doesn't impose a tax burden on taxpayer. 2.It could help to create intergenerational community. 3.Support small business. 4.Create a supplementary income for Vulnerable homeowners: seniors, single mothers, widows and/or racial minorities. 5. Help to create a robust middle class. 6. Tenants would have more variety of housing options to choose.
- They should be allowed as an option to create affordable housing at the same time they can contribute to income generation, reducing the risk of mortgage defaults.
- Yes. Garden suites allowing only one additional family at under market rate - tenant review by a city appointed 3rd party. Can build higher (up to 4 or 5 stories) but circumference should not greatly impinge on greenspace. Discrimination is hard to prove so How will this be minimized. See so many areas for abuse. We need to prioritize lower cost of existing housing and homeownership incentives and affordability before giving existing homeowners incentives to increase their wealth. We already made a big mistake allowing for offshore investment properties. Get a grip on creating fair housing market policies before considering Garden suites. Think these Suites are only going to benefit the status quo - and perhaps international students.
- They would make an incredible positive difference to people in small living spaces. They would also allow my family to continue to work from home and remain in the city we love.
- For me, the default is to support this idea. That said, I do think its important to ensure little to no net loss of permeability. As such a garden suite taking over space that was paved gets priority vs one one consuming softscape. A direct trade of a rear garage/parking spot for a garden suite is a win-win. It is reasonable to limit the height to limit shadowing and privacy concerns in general, one-storey is a free pass while 2, should be carefully considered, and ideally (but not necessarily) have the consent of affected neighbours.
- Yes. Green space is imperative, even if it is privately owned. Over crowding every aspect of our land is bad planning in the long term. If Garden Suites are permitted they should only be allowed on very large parcels of land. They would work well in a rural setting, but I don't think they belong in a big city with small sized property lots where most houses are already crammed together.
- Taller internal courtyarded tiny footprint volumes offer a good response to the constraints that cramp the design of building in backyards
- YES, in NO WAY should short term rentals be allowed in a garden suite, UNLESS the homeowner does it and lives in the home!! I had a tenant run an air bnb from his apartment in a home I owned, - he never got my permission to do this and MY homeowners insurance which was for 2 rental apartments was NULL and VOID since he was running a business from my property!! IT took me 7 months to get him out and was not charge for illegal business or anything via the landlord and tenant board!!! imagine IF THIS was your house and you endured over 9 months of stress and hell and then imagine IF the house caught on FIRE via an air bnb renter!!! You folks need to protect your tax payers NOT a tenant and allowing them to do whatever they want in a rented apartment!!
- No to Garden Suites.
- Hook up fees to sewer and water should be waived built to OBC neighbours to be consulted and if more than 2 object with reasonable cause the application should be denied lot width and depth should be considered water, sewer and garbage/ composting / recycling capacity in the area should support
- we need to upzone the yellowbelt more broadly to allow more gentle density (townhouses and plexes)
- It is great you are looking at options to make things more affordable but in all circumstances you must force by law usage, conversion rights and protect the cheap housing, subsidizing of the

renter. If you can't protect their rights you will end up losing potential space and have once again RICH Toronto owners to take advantage of land values unfairly.

- It's a wonderful solution with virtually no downside....
- I highly support this initiative and think this would add a great deal to the city. I think incentives to do this would also be good, especially to have people commit to affordable rent.
- City should expedite the approval of Garden Suite to allow more housing options for families in need.
- I believe they have to allow it for all properties in Toronto ... And they have to allow to sprinkler them fully and waive the requirements for 90m distance to FH so most of them will qualify ...
Thanks
- What makes a city viable and attractive is a variety of housing stock to accommodate different needs. Safer cities, improved neighborhood connections, multi generational opportunities to share green space, shared space family and care for others while maintaining independence
- Adult children with disabilities have no hope of finding affordable independent housing. Disability accommodated units should receive some sort of credit if accommodated by a person living with disability.
- There should be an emphasis on preserving trees and preserving some backyard green spaces, even if they become smaller as a result of the construction of a garden suite. If a property is a heritage building, it should be easier to build a garden suite to incentivize preservation and investment, provided that the heritage building gets preserved. Minimum parking standards will constrict the development of garden suites and will limit their positive impact on housing affordability and multi-generational living. The City invests so much in transit and pedestrian/cycling infrastructure that it makes no sense to take a firm position on parking requirements.
- It is very important that the rules concerning things like setbacks, parking, and access do not restrict the ability to build garden suites to a small subset of properties. One of the major issues with the laneway suite regulations are that the separation between house and suite restrict the size and feasibility excessively on many lots. If this is to add any significant supply, it must be feasible for the majority of lots, particularly in the RD zone.
- I am very concerned about the need for separation distances from neighbouring properties. It's not fair to provide protection to the main dwelling (in the form of a required separation distance) and not to give any protection to neighbouring properties. This is particularly an issue with perpendicular lot conditions. This is also a big issue with laneway suites. There are requirements for separation distances to the main dwelling but no requirements at all for distances to neighbouring homes. In cases of irregular or perpendicular lots, this means that laneway suites can currently be constructed in extremely close proximity to a neighbour's home, which introduces major issues of privacy, noise and light. This issue needs to be addressed with both garden and laneway suites.
- Garden suites should be incentivized to be built near transit, or transit service should be improved near high concentrations of garden suites to ensure residents of garden suites will not have to own a car.
- Please allow garden suites in dense residential neighbourhoods with small semi detached neighbourhoods. Consider the number of trees already on a property.
- I think they're a great idea--I wish this had been allowed sooner in the city.
- People across the GTA are being priced out of neighborhoods that support active transportation and exiled to car-dependent sprawl. People say they would prefer, if they could afford it, to live in a neighborhood where they didn't need to use a car for either shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school. However, in the neighborhoods where most people do live, a strong majority say that "I simply can't get by without driving my car." Most of the people who live in those neighborhoods, in particular, say they would choose a neighborhood where they could get by car-free, but for the cost. Toronto must change its policies so that everyone who wants to live in walkable transit oriented Toronto neighborhoods, including ground-related ones, can find a home there. An overwhelming majority in all GTA regions, neighborhoods and demographics, agree that "People who want to be able to get by without a car should not be priced out of the neighborhoods where that is practical. A strong majority of GTA residents, also say that it is important that the next generation be able to afford to live in the same neighborhoods where they live now, rather than in other neighborhoods on the periphery.

Approving a set of rules that actually produces a very large number of garden suites, in large sizes (~1000 sf which was average sfh in 1975), rather than just allowing them in theory but imposing so many constraints as to result in relatively few being built, is essential to ensuring that everyone wants a home in Toronto's ground related residential neighborhoods can find one, and afford one.

- sounds like a great idea. would be interested to better understand the impact on the immediately surrounding properties ... e.g. garbage storage, views, setbacks creating crevice conditions susceptible to garbage buildup at property line with neighbouring properties.
- This is an amazing idea, and I believe this would set Toronto apart as a major global city who cares for their citizens. Thank you.
- Great initiative! Once the bylaw is passed I think it would be a good idea to roll out a communications campaign to inform property owners about their eligibility to build garden suites. The construction of laneway suites has been low, and I wonder if there are many people who just don't know that they can build one. Laneway suites and garden suites ask homeowners to become developers and to make sure these bylaws are successful the City should provide support to initiate construction.
- Bad idea that will ruin neighbourhood character.
- Fire code must be considered Not multiple residents in one unit should be sq foot guidelines on number living on unit Ex 500 sq feet 2 people . max or something like that. I've seen very unsafe bunk bed stacked fire trap basement apartments rent to " boarders ". Safety before greed
- Although well intentioned the city does not have the ability to enforce any of the bylaws they introduce to have garden suites built properly and according to code due to the lack of resources. Existing infrastructure, fire, police, and city services were not intended to support these extra dwellings in these established neighbourhoods.
- Living in a semi detached and sharing a driveway, it is only fair that both parties should agree with the build of a Garden Suite. As my neighbour has built her 'studio' as big as a Garden Suite. I will now have clients going up and down my driveway. Total strangers will see into my backyard and will be able to look into my back and side windows. I will need to keep my gate locked at all times. This was not the type of retirement I wanted in my home. You are thinking of others as you plan. What about the existing owners who have lived their for years? What about them? What about the feuds this will cause between neighbour's? Yes, we are no longer speaking because of this build. Would you want this built beside you? How invasive.
- Fully supportive of this project.
- I think it is a wonderful idea and an easy win for the city to create gentle density in under used areas of the city. The laneway suite changes are wonderful and there are many lots with no lane that are still large enough to easily support a garden suite.
- Just what I've re-iterated earlier. Garden suites will lead to increases in residents in any given area. My fear is that this will exacerbate the already difficult issue faced by our community centre to ensure it has capacity, both in terms of programming and diversity of programming, to address these increases. Investment in growing availability of garden/laneway suites should be matched with investments in local community centers to ensure there is enough programming for people of all ages.
- Lower planning/permitting times and costs. The ROI on a lane way suite is already low given the construction costs and planning requirements. Lower fire access if the home is demonstrated to be built from fireproof materials
- The city needs an equity-seeking approach and innovation to create more affordable housing stock. Garden suites are one way to do that. In addition Garden Suites offer more options for families either intergenerational and generational living is a deep cultural practice. Also housing is deeply unaffordable. Having garden suites create more options for folxs and also would for sure better support aging in living.
- I think more time is needed to consult on this important issue than the forecasted 2022 building permit availability. Safety is at risk, the environment is at risk and the harmony and privacy rights could be compromised.
- I think each property should be identified individual based on a policy for my 4 key criteria
- Garden Suites should be mandated in all areas of the city - any new construction should not be allowed without intensification -

- The benefits of living in ground oriented housing in established and walkable neighbourhoods are clear, along with the City's extreme shortage of rental housing. These issues should be prioritized by providing flexibility around creative housing solutions like gardens and laneway suites. Even on laneway suites, there are still too many rules to give the solution maximum impact.
- Let's get this approved!! Can't be a question for the post-COVID world.
- Terrible for trees, gardens, drainage, parking, provision of services, pollution.
- Allowing garden suites for houses that do not have a laneway seems fair if the lot is otherwise suitable. It would be great to see incentives for sustainable building (e.g. solar panels, etc.).
- Radically transform established neighbourhoods - Air B and Bs all over the city - Blocking sunlight on neighbours' yards - Strangers in and out of alleys all day and night - Fastest and most efficient way to CREATE NEW SLUMS - Inspired by tax greed
- housing to land ratio should be factored into decision to allow garden suites
- There needs to be consideration as to what neighbourhoods are most suitable for Garden Suites. Residents should have a say whether to allow Garden Suites in their area. They should absolutely NOT be allowed where the owner of the property is renting out both the main house and the Garden Suite. Absentee landlords should not be allowed. They should not be allowed to be used for short term rentals such as AirBnB. Trees need to be protected. If these are allowed as-of-right as being proposed there will be no hope for trees to be retained. They should not be allowed to have garages. Heights need to be severely restricted to one story only. Green roofs do not replace porous ground surfaces. This is a terrible idea and will be poorly implemented as proposed.
- Access to the Garden Suite must be made possible to emergency services (paramedic). Garden Suites must be priced well-below the rental market at the time, otherwise, there will be more units which still many citizens can't afford. Where tenanted by family members, landlord and tenant law should make certain provisions or exceptions the landlord can choose as to the terms of the Garden Suite occupation Subsidies should exist for landlords/main homeowners who have chosen to open their space to assist ageing, lower-income, caregivers, new immigrants or refugees who need to remain in Toronto, either for medical, familial, legal or accessibility requirements.
- No
- Densification is critical to Toronto's future. Managed properly this will be beneficial for all. Specifically for all of Toronto Heritage protected districts protection of the look, feel and personality of the Heritage district should be protected.
- Make sure it is regulated and safe for the neighborhood, fire access etc. That it is not taken advantage of for slum landlords and adversely affects the area
- It's ridiculous. We moved to a single sampling dwelling to have a safe place for our kids to play and grow. We know our neighbours and take pride in our homes and know each other and help one another. A turnover in rental homes in the suites will make it harder to know who is living amongst us.
- major invasion of privacy for homeowners who purchased their properties under the assumption of stability in the zoning policies - this would have a material negative financial and property enjoyment impact on homeowners who happen to be adjacent to a property with a 'garden suite'. better to focus our resources on multi-family units in specified high density locations near transit - there is lots of capacity for more efficient housing stock there vs building tiny garden suites that will invariably create neighbour conflict
- Flexibility to build without bathroom but with a sink. For day use.
- The City should adopt policies and processes that would facilitate affordable construction to encourage owners to build such suites and be able to rent them out at affordable rates.
- No
- A lot of my neighbours in Rosedale will likely have heart attacks at the thought of creating more affordable housing in their enclave. I hope the City of Toronto will have the courage to do what is right and enable this flexibility to support multi-generational homes and to increase the ability of more to live in the city. Affordability is a crisis which needs to be addressed for Toronto to be a vibrant, living city.

- my biggest fear would be that a neighbour would build an inappropriate structure that didn't match the architecture of the neighbourhood homes, would block my view or make my own back yard seem crowded or more hemmed in.
- Garden suites will further tax the infrastructure (sewage, water etc) in older neighbourhoods.
- Most garden suites would be built where a detached garage is today and these are most often right at the property line of an adjacent property. Not only is this an invasion of privacy esp if it is made into a two storey dwelling but it means that toilets, noise, cooking smells etc are going to permeate into the adjacent back yard. This is more appropriate when you have a lane way. I am strongly opposed to the garden suite and would be very upset at having one at my fence line.
- Given the housing shortage in the city, providing garden suites plays an important part in injecting housing into urban centres.
- Would like to know A LOT more about this plan before giving an opinion. But as mentioned, not sure my opinion counts for anything anyway judging by what has gone on around here lately.
- Very supportive of the idea
- our streets are already very crowded. what about TTC service? may be to increase bus frequency. what about noise? what about maintenance? sewer capacity? cost of garbage and other services?
- The flexibility that they allow families is great. Own then downsize to garden suite and maybe have children take over main house. I really like the idea of multi generational families its helps child care, healthcare and many other community costs.
- I hope that this works without impacting green spaces in yards too much. There must be a certain percentage of green space preserved in yards. Not sure how to prevent everyone from paving over their backyards or installing turf, but this is a concern, and not just as it relates to garden suites, but otherwise, too. Finally, we will need to consider things like safe winter access, fire safety, sewage capacity, and waste management.
- Let's move forward.
- This is a really bad idea. It will result in the elimination of trees and green space and increased traffic.
- Garden Suites should not be approved under any circumstances!
- Totally in support!! Let's do it! 100% eliminate the parking requirement from every property. Why on earth are we incentivizing/legislating car ownership?? It's bad for the environment, expensive for car owners, and encourages people to drive rather than use public transit, which is better for the environment and better for liveability/walkability of neighbourhoods which leads to better overall health outcomes.
- I'm all for increasing density in low-rise neighbourhoods. Important to prioritize units providing affordable rent. Do not make it so cost prohibitive for someone to build a garden suite.
- I strongly endorse Garden Suites. I have a dilapidated garage for storage that would be better served as a small office for my work.
- In theory I'm all for it. In practice, not so much. There would need to be lots of rules in place. ie: restrictions on size, height, # of occupants and lots of enforcement of the rules. I can see them being turned into illegal Airbnb party houses. I would like to see a requirement that the main dwelling be owner occupied for any Garden Suite. The reason I've stayed in my small home for over 40 years is because I back onto properties with 250' depth. Lots of green space and privacy. I could handle 1 Garden Suite among the 4 properties touching mine but not 4. I have already lost my light on the west side when the original bungalow was replaced by a 2 story house with double the foot print. I would be in favour of predesigned plans, keeping sq. footage low, suitable for 1 or 2 people.
- There needs to be some sort of compliance with respect to use, design, noise and the number of occupants.
- We should allow them to be easy to build and with quick timelines for approvals. This city is desperate for more housing options that are in residential neighborhoods that aren't \$2m homes.
- As mentioned, too many people can live in these buildings which increases hazardous living, be it older people as family members or renting out with many renters living there. There goes the census. Lets not make area to look like third world countries. I dont know who's idea this is but it is stupid. Don't bring ideas from the east side of the world to canada
- Existing 1950s coach houses should be convertible. ie existing setbacks and height ok.

- I think it will increase the density of people living in a neighborhood. I am wondering how long can people be renting a garden suite? The market value of homes should go down as it's quick inflation does not match the rise of regular salaries.
- It used to be when people throw late night parties, you call police a cop in a uniform shows up and they turn down the sounds. Now there is a garden suite next door, blocking out ALL the sunlight in my garden. They have a stadium size sound system and won't ever turn it down. They overlook my little back yard (no garden because no sunlight any more). They blast music because calling 311 does nothing. The garden suites are a way for the city to make more tax money and the owner to make more money while ruining quality of life for the rest of us
- They should be dwarfed in size and scale by the 'main' house. The same should be true of laneway housing, but the COA seems to be allowing ginormous buildings! This is really concerning and is the downfall to either lane way or garden housing.
- Should be allowed to build in a ravine
- I'm very opposed to this. My neighborhood is very overcrowded now, parking is at a minimum, what about strain on sewers, electrical grid, etc. I'm very against this. Not to be rude, but I know my opinion will not be taken into account, but I had to share it.
- This is a way for rich people to use their land to make more money. It is that simple.
- I'd be interested in the costs of setting up utilities for Garden Suites. I'm concerned developers will take advantage of the bylaws and will overpopulate a neighbourhood creating multi family units in the Garden Suites.
- No
- I have lived in this neighborhood for the last 30+ yrs. Most of the newer home sales have lead to rooming houses, cars parked on lawns and walkways and lack of upkeep to properties(un-mowed lawns, overgrown hedges etc...) Was hoping to retire here but sadly considering moving out of this city now.
- I agree with the idea of increasing density within Toronto's core in order to limit outward expansion of the city. I agree with providing options for more access to housing within pre-existing neighbourhoods though I feel the housing should be made affordable. If homeowners are given any type of incentive to rent their units at affordable rates and build sustainably then there should be accountability measures in place to ensure that the rent stays affordable and sustainability features are maintained. There should also be consideration of noise and privacy concerns that garden suites could cause for immediate neighbours since these suites would likely be adjacent to people's own gardens and backyards. There should also be limits on height and shadows created by building garden suites next to neighbouring yards.
- I think the size of the lot must be considered in order to build a garden suite. It needs to meet a minimum size (depth, etc).
- We should be measuring uptake following regulations allowing them to ensure goals are achieved by the regulations.
- I think these units should be offered to house individuals in our developmental sector seeking independent living with supports. Possibly a larger Incentive should be given to those building these garden suites to them on their properties. These individuals do not need a lot of space, ie bedroom, with kitchen bath and a small living area. It could be Perfect for them!
- This city is in a MASSIVE housing crisis. We NEED to be creative and add DEEPLY affordable housing in ALL new developments. Garden suites are part of the solution.
- Should only be allowed on quite large lots where privacy, shading, noise will not be a factor for neighbours. Should always be fairly small and only 1 level.
- I think it's a wonderful idea. I think it will be very popular with parents/grandparents because of the shitshow of retirement/nursing homes during the pandemic. I also think young adults will love this on their parents/ property because they can't afford to buy in the city
- By allowing garden suites, the city is looking at passing the buck for the housing shortage to homeowners. Currently, the tenancy act favours tenants over landlords. There are so many concerns with allowing garden suites. Will the act change to favour landlords, will there be tax incentives for property owners instead of increase property taxes?
- I would love to build a garden suite for my aging parents as they retire and want to be close to any future grandchildren. It provides above ground living spaces and also proximity to us, but also privacy. I would like to see the City reduce or eliminate permit costs and to offer grants to help

reduce the upfront cost to produce garden suites. On the market in other provinces, prefabricated garden suites start at \$220,000+. With installation, they can cost up to \$250,000+. These would likely have to be financed through a HELOC or construction loan, which would be more debt to carry on already large mortgages.

- Suites for the families of seniors, especially those with age related disabilities should be fast tracked and facilitated in any way possible.
- Absolutely against Garden Suites in Toronto especially in hot spot neighbourhoods. Would be great for large lots such as you see in Rosedale and Forest Hill but too tight for use on 55 X 100 foot lots. What about the septic process, noise, disagreements with neighbours BUT particular the trees. Garden Suites are not the way to go. What if owners have issues with the garden suite tenants? We do have people living in garages in my area, not acceptable.
- Provide incentives for building above stores. European cities live above their stores and that creates character in the city that everyone can enjoy. I am totally against using what little land we have left for building on how does this address the environmental/climate crisis? It is my understanding that there is land available for development the size of Kingston that developers are currently sitting on. The government does nothing about it. Your plan will not create the affordable housing you want. Building above stores could be the solution.
- A great alternative for people who cannot afford a condo, the high rent prices in Toronto
- 1)Garden suites can only improve housing affordability if a majority of homeowners commit to providing an affordable rate to renters owners setting their own (higher) rent to earn better income from their properties does provide more people the opportunity to live in low-rise residential neighbourhoods. 2)Allowing the occupant of the Garden Suite (or property owner) to put the space up for short term rental such as an Airbnb will negatively impact the character of neighbourhoods where they are located e.g. increase of transient people, less care for the property.
- We need something as my children cannot afford Toronto properties
- No
- I am so grateful that the city is promoting this avenue for home owners. I have an adult son with Down Syndrome and a Garden Suite will support his semi-independent lifestyle future to live and grow in the community he has known all his life. It is also an affordable housing option where a 2 bedroom Garden Suite will allow for a roommate/future family growth that will benefit others by providing affordable rent which in turn, supports a good quality of life.
- Ridiculous idea. People will build and rent these without any regard for rules. You are barely able to keep up with the illegal rooming houses. What a f***ing mess.
- Please allow garden suites immediately and don't put any restrictions on them. We are in a housing crisis. People can't find affordable rentals. I own a home and make good money and it is not very affordable as I just bought and housing prices are insane. Future home buyers won't be able to afford a \$2 Million mortgage on their starter first home which is where we are headed. My friend just bought his starter first home semi-detached for \$1.75 million. These new home buyers and first time home buyers like me need rental income to subsidize these insane mortgages. Garden suites solves all of this for rental availability at more affordable rates than the big box store condos downtown. And the owners get rental income to subsidize the insane mortgages we need to get these days. Make the right call and allow them immediately.
- No preference
- There should be height limit even though a maximum of 2 floors is in place so that we don't have someone building a say 10 metre tall building. The wall facing the neighbour behind (if any) should not have transparent window but could have translucent ones to increase natural light and not invade privacy. The wall facing the owner's primary house could have more regular windows on the ground floor and fewer on the 2nd floor again to minimize privacy invasion. While consideration should be given to preserving any mature trees on site, stringent rules must exist so the placement of the garden suite does not infringe on neighbouring properties. Minimum property size should exist to prevent small properties from building garden suites. E.g. a property say 20'x 80' may not be sufficiently large to comply with setback requirements. No wood stoves should be allowed to be included as the smoke exhaust would surely impact adversely neighbouring properties and add to air pollution as well as increased fire risks. There should not be any rooftop balcony on the garden suite or second floor balcony again respecting the privacy of others. Probably should not include a basement for these garden suites as that could convert

these into multifamily dwellings. These garden suites should not have any parking facilities attached to the structure. These garden suites are not to be used for Airbnb as short term rentals could result in transient occupants not respecting neighbouring properties' rights. It's time Toronto get on board with other municipalities that allow this. Intensifying land use is good so that older properties don't necessarily have to be demolished to make way for monster homes which could be vacant or run as a rooming house when the original owner leaves Toronto but converts property to rental. This will also alleviate pressure on converting valuable arable land to new subdivisions, extend urban sprawl and all the accompanying problems such as forever more highways.

- I think it will help families with children. Housing prices in Toronto make in very difficult for young adults just getting started
- Reduction of green space, soft landscaping,. Increase above ground runoff and flooding. Invasion of privacy and shadow impacts on neighbours. Increase street parking. Bring in low income problems and crime. If you want to do this, start with Rosedale and Bridlepath.
- I feel that allowing garden suits in areas with sufficient amenities and transportation will give Torontonians more affordable housing options and allow them to live in the areas they grew up in and chose to live in vs. being forced to move hours away due to affordability issues. I feel that opening the gates and easing as many rules to allow more people to build these types of suites and fast tracking the permit process will help our crazy real estate market by adding more supply into this unaffordable Toronto market and lowering the demand overall. I think that we should try our best to allow as many lots in this city to have the ability to build garden houses as we are not able to create more land and condo living is not exactly healthy for everyone.
- Garden Suites would be ideal for my lifestyle. My family could have the main house and I would love to have my Garden suite all to myself and go and come as I please. A perfect scenario.
- As someone with an older husband, I would love to be able to retire into a garden suite on my sister's property when my husband passes away.
- I am a 30 year old unable to afford a detached home in toronto despite having a relatively high family income. A garden suite will allow us to house my retiring mother where she can be supported and contribute financially to make a detached home affordable. A garden suite will significantly increase quality of life for all of us. At the moment our only alternative would be to move far outside the city that we work in, grew up in and love.
- Remove the red tape. Get them started in the city now!
- Will increase the cost of housing and property taxes. It is a developer driven initiative. This is not the answer to affordable housing.
- Terrible idea. Commit to higher density along subway and bus routes. Build taller buildings. Leave our quiet residential areas alone.
- They would have to blend in and not be an eyesore.
- I'm not sure how you are going to manage increased density when there is already a challenge with infrastructure to keep pace. Garbage disposal, rain water runoff, traffic, etc. Density is outpacing infrastructure improvement.
- gardening suites should only be allowed on deep lots where the garden suite would not be close to the original house nor the neighbouring houses. gardening suites should definitely be limited in size and height, they should not be allowed to be a multi-level building, just one level
- Nothing here about density of units in a neighbourhood (rather than in a plot). Some areas may have them. Others must have none. But there must be a limit - e.g. ratio of guests to mains. I'm thinking about 25%.
- None. Due to the eventually density in houses and population, it is better not to do it.
- I think this is a unique and practical use of space. As a senior, I would personally love to have a Garden Suite. It would also be attractive for those starting out or those living on lower incomes.
- no
- the house prices in toronto are crazy high, a garden suite could help a young couple better afford their mortgage and provide much needed rental stock in single family neighbourhoods i'm concerned about how large, height, footprint, colour the units will be, they should blend into the neighbourhood as much as possible, i guess this would depend on the size of the lot etc. i'm concerned driveways could turn into parking lots, the owners of the house might have 2 cars, a basement apartment unit 1, and the garden suite 1 i see a lot of conflict with existing home

owners who bought their homes at much more affordable prices and don't need or want a garden suite and don't want one built next to them and younger new home owners who might need a garden suite to help pay their mortgage

- My greatest concern is the potential abuse of the building of garden suites where there could be an excess of habitants living in them, potential transients renting them - i.e. Air B & B - noise concerns and the local infrastructure being incapable of servicing these buildings. In addition, I believe that the residents of the locations considering building these suites should have a say whether or not to allow them in their particular areas.
- I prefer increasing density in this user-friendly way as compared to high-rises. Also because with downtown 'emptying out' we need to bring more 'life' into the city core.
- The property owner must live on site. I'm concerned about bad landlords, bad tenants, the turnover of tenants, communities turning into parking lots, the strain on the environment, municipal and emergency services. The properties used as AirBNBs have been terribly mismanaged - ruining communities due to lack of regulation and enforcement.
- I am concerned that they will be allowed to proliferate and become a source of low-cost, low-quality rental streams for landlords, wealthy families who want a live-in nanny etc. Also, house flippers and builders will use them to add value to the absurd 'hotel size' monster houses they build and destroy neighbourhoods with.
- Some gardens in Toronto, are huge enough to build a garden suite. It's just Good for seniors to continue to live independently but decent with the basic feature.
- many of us have bought homes for the large lots worried developers will take advantage and overbuild these questions were very clearly slanted to garden suites and the positive - not neutral
- Let's get on with it. It is great to see options being considered that will allow more people to enjoy Neighbourhoods.
- I think this is a wonderful idea and I hope we move forward as a city as quickly as possible as this will hopefully help with housing affordability and reducing pressure on the greenbelt from urban sprawl.
- This is one small piece of the affordability/livability puzzle, but every bit counts. We need more density rather than just tall and sprawl in this city.
- BAD idea
- Make it as easy as possible to build them.
- Garden suites provide an inefficient, and poorly targeted way to expand housing options in neighbourhoods. Given the small footprints that most garden suits have to be located on, their development will serve primarily as a source of 1 Bdrm or studio accommodations. These types of accommodation are already being developed in large numbers in apartments/ condos in Toronto. Instead of 'studio-izing' neighbourhoods, the City should instead be focused on facilitating changes to the Official Plan that permit the physical evolution of neighbourhoods over time instead of strictly adhering to rules around 10m building heights and 3 storey structures, and instead focus on how neighbourhoods can provide expanded family-suitable accommodations. For instance, Chapter 4.1 could be changed to reflect a general principle like 'Neighbourhoods are considered gradually evolving areas, currently made up of residential uses in lower scale buildings such as detached houses, semi-detached houses, duplexes, triplexes and townhouses, as well as interspersed walk-up apartments that are no higher than four storeys, but where evolution in built form, building heights and densities may be permitted on lots or assemblies of lots that are larger in aggregate lot area than typical lots, and where the new development is respectful of, and provide reasonable transitions in height, scale and form to immediately adjacent properties. Neighbourhoods should remain areas where family-sized housing can be expanded, with 2, 3 and 4 bedroom residential accommodations added.' Policies such as 9 and 10 create overly restrictive rules on how neighbourhoods evolve over time for those lots most suitable for transition. Generally, the provisions of 4.1, view the existing built form of neighbourhoods as governing or limiting the built form of future developments. The focus on form, rather than function, is unnecessarily limiting, and will restrict the provision of family accommodation in the city.
- When space is so highly desired (Covid has increased this need) for distancing and the ability to enjoy nature in your own garden at home, I do not understand the desire of increasing density, it runs against everything we are doing (lockdowns, social distancing, masks,) Covid has set a new reality and it will take years to make people comfortable being close again.

- Municipal help in garden suites with the sewer hookup so that it's done correctly.
- Yes. Renting out a basement should be legal and tax free. Changing a single family home into a semi-detached house should be made easy. Duplexes and triplexes can be attractive. Maybe even fourplexes.
- We already have ugly situations with rentals on my street. E.g.5 cars on a single car property, parked on the driveway, the lawn and the street. More noise and congestion from increased population. Lawns and garbage not cared for. I shudder to think how much worse this will be if garden suits are allowed, especially under absentee landlord situations.
- Garden suites will be great for families who have family visit from out of town. Provide private space and less cramping for the visiting family.
- They should not be built as rental units. Size of the lot is important.
- I fear that any addition of a garden suite will result in substantial increase of property taxes
- Limit # of houses allowed to add garden suites on a street. No short term rentals. Only allow if affordable housing. No adding garden suite if the main house is already rented. Do not allow garden suites and rooming houses on same property. No garden suite if house already rented. Do not allow investors and developers to buy properties to rent out as rooming houses and garden suites. Only allow garden suites where owner lives on property. Enforce garden suite rented as affordable housing. Issue with affordable housing because city has let rents in apartments and condos sky rocket as result of people owning multiple properties. Same with price of houses.
- not at moment
- ANOTHER FOOLISH IDEA - should not be allowed!
- approval of Garden suite should be fast tracked, congestion and lack of housing supply is a massive problem in the city.
- It could solve many of my housing needs going forward. I am disabled so many housing options are closed to me. I don't like the structures followed in many senior housing solutions. They are not homes by their very nature.
- Love it!
- Will you provide tax relief on property owners
- My outdoor space is extremely important to me and I've spent a lot of money on landscaping and developing my backyard and my front yard for that matter. I have created privacy and a beautiful outdoor oasis so it would definitely bother me if there was a additional home close to my yard. However it would I guess depending One what it was used for and whether they created extra noise levels and how it affects the landscape
- No
- Absolutely needed to ensure there are affordable housing options for all.
- home owners must be responsible for keeping the property respectable and clean. Many rental properties have tenants that are not respectful of this and I am concerned that the unkempt state of a garden suite would impact the property values, if there is no mandate for the homeowner to keep the property 'up'.
- not sure this is relevant to parts of Toronto that have no laneways and sideboards that are only 6 feet
- I think it is wrong, we are going to end up being a very congested area. and while they may be meant for family, it will end up being abused.
- Many families struggle with family members with disabilities who may not completely be able to live independently but have their own dwelling close to care from family members. Also for young families with children who need financial breaks and possible live close to family just not under same roof. These homes would change and help the family dynamic.
- Provide access to loans for renter and/or owner to build garden suite.
- It is hard for a husband and wife to not get divorced these days. I see problems having strangers living on the same land in peace. Also, The main home owner will probably be the wealthier one and might have to manage living with someone of a much lower class. Concerns of theft and safety then come into play. Lastly, these properties could turn into ghetto slums if land owners try to maximize profit by renting to many.
- Any Garden Suite development would have to be very carefully and specifically evaluated as to where in the City it might be permitted.

- Just do it in such that it is ethical, equitable and respectful
- Need to consider impact to neighbours with having more people living in residential areas where houses are already on small lots and packed together. If every house on both sides of street built a Garden Suite the potential number of additional people requiring parking for themselves or visitors, potential noise, the infrastructure impact to service these suites, the increased traffic on city streets. Traffic at rush hour is already awful and the buses are packed. If affordable rent is part of having a Garden Suite, what is to stop a renter from benefiting but not living in the suite but renting it out to Air BnB and potentially disturbing neighbours with different people coming and going? In areas with high water table , building more structure will direct water to neighbours house, which we have already experienced with no help from the city. Need to incentivize companies to move out of Toronto as Toronto can not keep growing at this pace. The more people, the more services needed, the more traffic etc and those people need services etc which means need more people for these jobs and at some point it becomes unsustainable.
- Worried that the enjoyment of my yard would be negatively impacted (sightline, noise, privacy, shade, etc), should a Garden Suite be constructed in a neighbour's backyard. Concerned that it would reduce my property value/saleability in the real estate market.
- They are an important avenue towards helping lessen housing crisis in Toronto.
- I appreciate seeing the types of questions in this survey. I am an architect and planner, along with a homeowner and landlord, and think being able to provide garden suites as-of-right is important to the development of Toronto as a way to build gentle density and provide more housing options and flexibility. This should be implemented as soon as possible, with financial incentives and support wherever possible. We need more housing options. Increasing density in neighbourhoods, and reducing the power of 'neighbourhood character' and NIMBYism, seems like a helpful albeit partial solution!
- Increasing housing supply in low-density neighbourhoods is a great idea, and I'm excited for the changes this project will bring about. That being said, I don't think this can be seen as a success without a strong commitment to affordability measures. I understand that the city's ability to effect these changes is limited by the province, but I'd urge it to use every bit of influence it has on things like controlling rents and tenant protections in tandem with these developments. Thanks.
- I think it's a great idea and should also include converting/rebuilding detached garage or other structures.
- would like to know what specs are being considered for size, location, construction, etc.
- Yes. I think tiny houses on wheels should be included in this. The cost of the tiny house and it's maintenance would be the responsibility of the THOW owner not the home owner. The home owner would only need to have the electrical, water and septic/sewer prepared and maintained. That means less money coming out of the home owners pocket and that more spaces would be available faster. THOW's are also typically of a certain size so preparing the spot would allow for most THOW's and therefore the home owner would be many options for renting the spot out and not be limited to what they built for a granny flat.
- This was SUCH a positively worded survey that helps to shape public opinion and sway fears. Thank you!
- Bring them on
- I know how this will go. People who already have wealth will use this a yet another way of hoarding wealth and affordable housing will continue to be a pipe dream in this city. It is disgusting.
- Make it happen. Not enough affordable housing in the city.
- The City needs to ensure that this does not become another means by which developers and/or wealthy home owners exploit the area's limited housing stock (e.g., for short term rentals or real estate speculation).
- yes I like to stay in my place when I am in the wheelchair,I get accommodation in my own backyard, familiar place and with family. more then I need for my end years of my life.
- I love the idea. I am always looking at coach homes in Markham.
- They sound like a great use of property space. Large yards are a waste and mostly for vanity
- I would really like a garden suite.
- I think this is a great move towards greater flexibility of living choices for all residents and visitors of Toronto. Especially with so much more intergenerational living, this options become absolutely

vital. I would like to see the city be as lenient as possible with restrictions beyond basic safety and consideration for the neighbourhood.

- Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this exciting and important issue. For my family, a garden suite can really help us take care of our aging parents physically (living in close proximity) and financially (with them having limited retirement plans). Please allow for flexibility and creativity, recognizing that every property is different with unique constraints and that dealing with trades especially during/after COVID has many challenges. This is an opportunity to take advantage of innovative solutions such as prefabs that can be both cost-effective and time-saving.
- I think it's a great idea to allow garden suites this will help keep multi-generational families together or provide extra income as a rental property for those who are retiring or downsizing.
- Some lots are wider than they are deep, or are more of a square shape. For this kind of configuration, it should be that garden suites may be visible from the street. There should be rules in place to ensure that garden suites are designed and built to preserve the character of the neighbourhood in which they are built. Garden suites should be required to be environmentally sustainably built and be sensitive to privacy issues and the preservation of mature trees. They should be required to be designed/built in such a way that they do not shade neighbouring properties nor overpower them. Any potential property tax increases should be communicated by the city in advance of building a garden suite as this is important information for homeowners to know in advance of considering any kind of investment in a garden suite. Thank you.
- I do think the architecture of the garden suite is relevant as well as height and scale. It should not be jarring to the fabric of the neighbourhood if possible. Contrast works, but not cheap materials that are not as suitable durable and thoughtful in design as the main dwelling should be discouraged. Not sure how to do this best, other than with incentives for sustainable materials that are durable and have a lighter carbon footprint, or are more sustainably sourced.
- Garden Suites can enable intergenerational living on the same property, while maintaining independence on older age. This is an imperative initiative by the city in assisting intergenerational living.
- Please allow these.
- This is a good idea for the city to consider. However, there are many issues to be addressed, including, availability of water, power and sewage services, excavation concerns and so on.
- residential, affordable housing
- Great idea... worried about additional load on local resources.
- I'm wondering if the City of Toronto has a process in place whereby neighbours of those applying to build a garden suite have some 'say' in the plan.
- Concerned about height and shadowing neighbours.
- No
- I am just an average citizen who is interested in the future of our city. I'm hoping to someday be able to own a property and build a Garden Suite where I can either have my aging parents live or I can rent out to a tenant. Allowing Garden Suites will be one of many ways we address the already strained housing supply. We need densification, not sprawl. The only hesitancy I have is about the list of requirements in order for one to be eligible to build a Garden Suite. If it becomes too stringent, the cost of building one will not be feasible for most people. If it's not feasible, it will only make sense for those who have the financial means - meaning, those who are privileged. That leaves out middle to low income families who might want to build a home for their aging parents or their teenage kids.
- Toronto's planning is not keeping up with the times. Let's build more. Smaller lots, smaller houses, more affordability
- Garden Suites is one way of efficient utilization of urban land.
- Not a solution
- yes I think its a brilliant idea and I hope this gets approved so that I may build one for myself
- no
- They should require green space between the house and garden suite and some policy around sharing space or allocation of outdoor space. They should also have a sense of privacy between them.

- I really like the idea, but I am curious about fire department access. I'm assuming a permit would not be issued if that was an issue. And short term rentals should be restricted.
- Too crowded, this pandemic taught us we need outdoors and space. And reasonable parking close to your home
- I love it. Keep up these initiatives!
- See answer to previous question
- I am pro garden suites
- Garden suites as a secondary unit on a lot is fine. However, if the main house has/ will be split into multiple units so that a garden suite is the fourth or fifth unit in a lot, that becomes a problem in terms of parking, trash storage, soft landscaping and tree space, heavy draw on services etc,
- Will greatly help young people who can't afford to buy a home. They can live in garden unites built by parents. Will allow aging people to live in their existing neighborhoods when downsizing. The will ensure they remain a a familiar neighbourhood with established friends snd relationships. It will lessen the cultural shock experienced in relocating to a stable setting or home. People will be happier.
- Garden Suites would be a great option to rent as added income for the retired elderly or as living space for children/young adults that can not afford home ownership in the GTA but can live independently from their parents. I visited Australia a few yrs. back and visited some families that had garden suites on their property for siblings' living quarters.
- I this is a terrific initiative, especially here in South Parkdale, where affordable housing is becoming harder and harder to find
- Can be made to enable in both back yard and front yard based on lot size.
- Toronto is unaffordable. The housing crisis has eroded the standard of living in this city, and it's only getting worse. The city needs to use every measure available to fix this issue.
- I think they can certainly help elderly people move in with relatives while also having independent space. It would also help people with limited mobility as they wouldn't have many stairs to climb. It could also assist in the lack of affordable housing as more units would be available.
- I think it's a great way for affordable housing to expand
- You have not mentioned noise levels. If you are renting a garden suite, your backyard may no longer be the private getaway that we all enjoy. Not everybody has a cottage! If we wanted to live in densely populated areas we would have moved into the city. But why bring the noise and density into our backyards? And do you really think that these will improve housing affordability and options? You should have thought of this before approving so many high rise condos and huge mansions. This will do nothing to improve affordability or housing options.
- It would have been nice during the pandemic if something like this was available so our other parents could have separated more from the younger family that was at school and working. We could still care for the parents but been separated and avoid getting them sick. Cheaper for parents on fixed income to live in a garden suite and allow for help with child care.
- Yes. It provides another housing option for every family in the house hold to stay together and it creates more affordable housing as well. It allows seniors more options. It helps the home owner with a source of income. It creates more density instead of developing green space we can keep for nature. It think it will also help with climate change. It's definitely a positive.
- I think it's an excellent idea, if designed well.
- I'm very concerned the suits will overwhelm neighborhoods causing serious privacy issues, serious issues with green space, overwhelm street parking, increase traffic dramatically, and damage the overall feel of the neighborhoods they're built in. I'm concerned all new construction will add a garden suit as the norm for financial gain without accessing the impacts, i.e. its cheap to build a garden suit when you're already building a house, and it will allow for a higher sale/profit margin on the property.
- We need to break the mold and get on with providing places to live in Toronto. Leaving the initiative in the hands of those who want the status quo is harming all of us.
- Important for the city to adapt to the changing needs of home owners. Additional housing will allow affordable housing.
- Can't wait for this to happen!!!
- 1 to 2 levels

- They should be allowed across Toronto. Many other municipalities have implemented this successfully and garden suites have been already built.
- Great idea
- Toronto must do this ASAP!!!!
- This is mostly a distraction. Why isn't the Danforth properly up zoned for development like the Golden Mile for example? Why isn't 4plex and greater being tabled here as examples of sustainable development. Garden suites are like electric cars. They are still cars, or detached houses here. And will do nothing to help the climate crisis, urban life, the housing deficit, or affordability. In fact, it will make it harder to demolish and make way for more logical, livable, affordable housing types.
- Garden suites are an excellent idea!
- It would solve a big problem for those of us with elder care to have aging parents/siblings able to live close to those who are responsible for their care.
- Implement ASAP.
- Garden suites are a relatively gentle way that a North American city like Toronto can add density within the fabric of existing neighbourhoods without affecting their character in any significant way. As someone that has lived and spent large amounts of time in other jurisdictions that have vastly different rules around lot creation and the number of dwellings permitted on a lot, I can attest that many of the standard concerns about this type of housing are virtually non issues in practice.
- The design would be very important so as not to impeded upon neighbours privacy. Uncertain how one would implement a noise restriction so that neighbours would have quiet enjoyment of their own property. Would the height of fences be allowed to increase or possibly the property that builds the suite would be required to plant a certain amount of tall privacy giving trees along fence line, or certain angles of accessory suite .(This would mean that the backyard would have to be a certain width or depth so as not to shade neighbouring property completely)
- Garden suites have huge climate change benefits by adding density on existing infrastructure (and potentially more if built green). The city should consider opening up its HELP loan program to finance planning of laneway and garden suites.
- Will not help with affordable rentals. Would make more sense for City to allow something other than single-family dwellings (semis, triplexes, low-rise apartment buildings -- such as the pre-1970 buildings seen on many Toronto streets).
- It should allow all possible sizes to suit the demand for affordable spaces to live and do business.. The City economy and livable comfort will be a model for the new urbanistic reality that will travel far and wide on an Planet with so many challenges. Toronto will be a model to be follow.
- Yes. It is a bad idea.
- I'd like Toronto to have less regulation
- Critical for intergenerational living and care for elderly.
- We need them ASAP
- If the objective of Garden Suites and Laneway Homes are to increase affordable rental stock, then they must be disallowed for short-term rentals such as Airbnb. They also should fit in the character of the neighbourhood. I support Laneway Homes but am against Garden Suites because Garden Suites will directly impact neighbours at the back (privacy, sun light, etc.). There is also a fire safety concern because Garden Suites are farther away from the street for fire trucks/emergency crews to access. Laneway Homes is adjacent to a road access.
- I think garden suites will be a blight on our beautiful communities and will destroy the feeling of space and privacy that we have all enjoyed. I think also that it will affect the environment and destroy mature trees that are so necessary. I think it is a terrible idea and should not be allowed.
- I think the only allowable reason to build a garden suite is to allow for elderly relatives who need care to live, if the primary home does not have the space or accommodations to so allow. Another possible reason would be as a work or hobby studio, but then it should be limited to one level.
- Prevent them from even being talked about let alone built! This is craziness to even think about it in our wonderful neighborhood! We need room to breathe and have space, not live on top of one another!

- Garden Suites change communities for ever and encourage transient populations which undermine stable communities. Already many long time residents of Toronto are leaving to other communities because their once strong neighbourhoods are turning over to rentals.
- I dont think they should be allowed, period.
- Restrictions on size, height etc would need to be very strict in order to provide privacy to the neighbours
- Only in desgnated/zoned areas NOT as infill.
- They should not interfere with privacy of neighbors and should only be allowed in certain neighborhoods - Limited windows - Limited heights
- **DON'T SUPPORT GARDEN SUITES**
- this is a terrible idea. it is no better than the city's idea to not oblige developers to provide public parking in high rises going forward. you are out to destroy what is attractive about this city---
- Define affordability in clear terms, as I answered the question by my definition of affordability, not really knowing how close I am from the real definition.
- Love the idea and very excited to build one. It would be helpful if there were some pre-approved designs/plans as an option to simplify and fast-track the creation of these homes. Possibly some pre-fab options or container solutions could also help. It would be great if environmentally friendly options were also included as part of the plan like geothermal, solar etc.
- Garden Suites can have 0 lot line on sides and rear. should not be 2 storey structures. no emergency requirements
- 2 stories is needed to be viable option. What percentage of a property must remain as an open space? If a max addition has already been added to the main structure, how much of the remain property could be used for garden suite?
- Prefer not allowing Garden suite but permit laneway house
- I am Strongly opposed to garden Suites. Just bought a house in this neighbourhood at a great financial sacrifice, to be close to my grandkids and still have a yard, rather than moving to a condo. A neighbouring Garden suite would negatively effect the enjoyment of my property. I can see this causing all kinds of problems between neighbours.
- I think this is an incredible opportunity to provide homeowners with an option to create additional housing options on their property. Builders are buying small homes in Scarborough and are building homes 3 times the size to make use of the lot full lot. Why create an advantage for people who are going to flip properties? Why not give home owners who live in the community and want to stay, an opportunity to build a garden suite so they can stay in their neighbourhood in a home that is a better size for them and they can rent their house or vice-versa. This is a great way to ADD value and vibrancy to neighbourhoods. It's more likely that existing houses will not be torn down by developers/builders. ALSO, I lived in a house that was split into 4 separate units in the Junction because the houses there are much bigger in comparison to Scarborough which comprises of mostly single family housing. I think this is a great idea!
- I do think Garden Suites MAY be a good option, but it needs considerable study on implementation. There are so many considerations regarding placement, size, density (and minimum lot size, square footage/footprint of any added dwellings/buildings, etc.), not to mention concerns regarding impact on shade, mature trees, environment-and privacy will be hugely impacted. I see the importance of providing for ageing in place opportunities in my own family & I can see the value in providing this option. I can also see the benefits this could offer for affordable housing options. But, as I also live in a home with a very narrow backyard, I can imagine the impacts on privacy (and noise, general enjoyment of outdoor space in principal residences and for neighbours) if the narrow & not overly large backyards are suddenly all home to 2nd dwelling, each housing additional residents. I'm also concerned about general infrastructure to support these additional dwellings and residents. As parking, even space for bike parking, etc.is at a premium in many central & downtown areas, if you were to add residents to these neighbourhoods, I'm not sure the parking availability would support it. (I do support the idea of having bike parking-but that is just not aligned with the idea of perhaps using these Garden Suites to accommodate seniors and allow them to age in place--or even if they are keeping the main residence and an additional person is renting or living in the Garden Suite (or a caregiver, professional or family member), there could easily be the need for vehicle parking--and a bike would not be an option. Garden Suites have great potential benefits and should be considered and likely move forward, however I believe this needs a great deal of study and consideration

before it is approved and a solid framework of by-laws & guidelines that consider the various types of neighbourhoods within the City of Toronto--and where & how this might work best and offer benefit.

- Having a garden suite would bring a lot of piece of mind to family members wishing to have an elder parent living close but still maintaining their independence or for family members with disabilities that are grown, need privacy but cannot fully provide for themselves/still need some supports. Would also make a great space for a home office now that the pandemic is showing many employers that work from home is possible full time.
- Do not like them. they will ruin the place we live
- our city is becoming more and more affordable. garden suites allow for more affordable housing option. they also allow for Toronto to respect its multicultural makeup by promoting intergenerational living.
- Zero lot setbacks, by-right garage conversion, allow two storey
- The proposal to have 6m or 2 storey garden suites will be extremely detrimental to open space, privacy and sunlight. It must be limited to the 4m height limit because we live in the Ontario where the appeals process will not enable planning to control these heights going to the maximum height, such as 10m. By limiting the height to 4m, you will ensure these will not erode the neighbourhoods and can therefore use the argument that Ancillary Buildings built form has been upheld and will continue to be upheld.
- Get it done the city needs it
- Am I reading it right that there can only be three residential units on the premises - including the garden suite? The property next door to me has just applied to go from a triplex (with three residential suites) to a five unit residential building. If this is to be allowed, then why should there only be three units on the premises if one of those units is a garden suite. Doesn't make sense to me.
- While I understand that Garden Suites are 'non-severable', there are hundreds for sure, possibly thousands, of generally smaller laneway properties that are not connected to any house. They are not included with any other property's deed and are independent. This are often further apart from existing houses than future laneway suites and garden suites that may be or are being built. I want to know why this category of property is being excluded from development in both the laneway suites and garden suites initiatives?
- I do not like the idea of Garden Suites.
- Property owner must live on the property, whether in the garden suite or main house.
- If every homeowner built a garden suite, you increase the density of the city and no parking available. NOT GOOD POLICY.
- Garden suites would be a great add to the city and would assist in providing affordable rental properties.