



Sixplexes Citywide Study: Expanding Multiplex Permissions

Consultation Input and Survey Results

Public Consultation Overview 2025

To effectively solicit feedback from a wide range of stakeholders for the Sixplex Study, staff used various engagement strategies and coordinated with the public on numerous occasions. The consultation process included four virtual resident association meetings, five in-person open houses (at least one in each district of the city), and one virtual city-wide community consultation meeting.

A survey was posted on the study webpage from March 25, 2025 to April 24, 2025 and paper copies were provided to attendees at the five in-person open house events. A total of 383 surveys were completed and a summary of the results are provided below.

Survey Overview


Survey Results

This section provides details on the results of the survey. It includes the questions asked and the results of the responses.

1. Total Respondents (Digital and Transcribed Handwritten Surveys): 383
2. Survey Open between March 25 and April 24, 2025.
3. Results represent all surveys completed both digitally and on paper.

Question: The current Multiplex by-law permits 4 dwelling units city-wide. Do you support amending the current by-law to permit an addition two units, increasing the total to six dwelling units in a multiplex, city-wide?

Results:






Sixplexes Citywide Study: Expanding Multiplex Permissions

Consultation Input and Survey Results

Question: If a height increase to 4 storeys is deemed necessary to accommodate a sixplex on narrow lots, what building design features related to the additional height increase would you like to see included?

Results:



*Results rounded to the nearest whole number

of Responses: 343



Sixplexes Citywide Study: Expanding Multiplex Permissions

Consultation Input and Survey Results

The Sixplexes Citywide Survey provided an opportunity for respondents to provide their comments in an open-ended way. The following themes and specific comments were received:

Supportive	Neutral	Negative
Theme 1: Housing Supply, Location and Design		
Widespread support for more housing, especially “missing middle” solutions like sixplexes	Suggestions to pilot sixplexes in certain areas (e.g., near transit or in wards with declining population).	Concerns that sixplexes will clash with the existing low-rise, detached housing character.
Desire to remove or relax setbacks, landscaping, and design restrictions to make projects viable	Suggestions to pilot sixplexes in certain areas (e.g., near transit or in wards with declining population).	Strong opposition to building next to smaller bungalows or in “quiet” neighbourhoods.
Many supported increased heights (4+ storeys) as reasonable or necessary.	Requests for good architecture, natural light, privacy, and accessible units.	Objection to four-storey buildings, especially on narrow or small lots.
Some suggested going beyond sixplexes (e.g., 10-plexes).	Support for flexibility but concern over poor interior layouts or cheap design	Belief that added height blocks sunlight and harms privacy
Support for as-of-right four-storey buildings.	Strong belief that context (lot size, street type) should determine what’s allowed.	Rejection of one-size-fits-all policy citywide.
Belief that denser, infill development lowers GHG emissions per capita.	Support for sixplexes only on major streets or large lots, not on interior residential roads	Do not support the addition of two more units
Support for alternatives to urban sprawl.	Comments highlighted the need for mobility-accessible units	Concern that sixplexes will decrease property values in neighbourhood, and destroy investment in house
Theme 2: Application Process, Fees and Inclusion		
Calls to speed up approvals and reduce bureaucracy	Need more Indigenous engagement in planning.	Calls for neighbourhood consultations and ward-by-ward implementation.
Requests to waive development charges (DCs) for multiplexes to incentivize building		
Theme 3: Traffic, Garbage and Other		
Additional comments all in opposition to proposal:		
Worries about inadequate parking, traffic congestion, and snow removal.		
Fear that the city’s infrastructure (e.g., schools, roads) can’t handle increased density.		
Belief that developers will outbid residents, turning neighbourhoods into speculative zones.		
Concern that Scarborough is being disproportionately impacted.		