



Municipality of North Grenville

To: Council

Meeting Date: December 10, 2025

Report Title: PD-2025-074 Zoning By-law Amendment – Housekeeping Amendment (General Amendment)

Prepared by: Phil Mosher – Deputy Director of Planning and Development

Recommendation

THAT Council approves By-law 97-25, being a housekeeping amendment for the Municipality's Comprehensive Zoning By-law (50-12) to amend various provisions of the existing By-law, save and except for paragraphs 3-5 related to Backyard Hens;

THAT Council directs Staff to bring back a specific zoning by-law addressing paragraphs 3-5 related to Backyard Hens at the December 16, 2025 Regular Council Meeting.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To add in a new zone category to distinguish Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPA) with a vulnerability score of 10, 8 or 6 (WHPA-A, WHPA-B, WHPA-C) and to add related zone provisions for uses within 100 metres of municipal wells or for dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) in other wellhead areas.
- To remove the requirement for additional residential units to be no greater than 50% of the gross floor area of the principal residence when constructed within a single-detached, semi-detached or townhouse dwelling, and instead allow a "greater than" provision which would allow more flexibility for unit size.
- To add in general provisions that allow for backyard hens within residentially zoned properties, subject to the provisions of a future licensing by-law.
- To allow any form of accessible-style entry (lift, ramp, etc.) to be erected on a property and extend into any required yard, provided they do not pose a visual obstruction to neighbouring properties.
- To specify that walkways are distinct from driveways and that they may extend an additional 0.5 metres towards an interior side yard, provided they do not interfere with drainage or access easements, while still maintaining a 0.5 metre setback.

- To re-name the Residential – First Density (R1) zone and Residential – second density zones to “residential low-density zones” “a” and “b” and to re-number all R1 and R2 zone provisions to R2A and R2B accordingly.
- To waive parking lot setbacks for a recently passed special exception zone, being the R3-29 exception zone.
- To correct the required interior yard setback of the R4-21 zone from 5.67m to 5.5m.
- To allow for exterior side yard projections for porches only within the R1-37 zone category.
- To allow “buildings, structures and uses accessory to a permitted use” as an additional permitted use within select zone categories.
- To re-zone lands near Dickinson Trail / Concession Road from Institutional (I) to Residential low density A – R2A.

Key Findings

- This is a municipally-initiated zoning amendment and primarily in response to direction of Council regarding the request to abolish the R1 zone, vary certain zone standards, contemplate backyard hens and evaluate parking requirements.
- Staff also proposes to bring forward necessary amendments to introduce WHPA zone overlays and land use restrictions in accordance with requirements under the *Clean Water Act*.
- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, Counties’ Official Plan, municipal Official Plan and related legislation in the opinion of the planner.

Financial Implications

- N/A

Background/Analysis

The Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 50-12 was passed by Council on July 9, 2012 and had the effect of consolidating all Geographic Township by-laws into one document. Through consolidation of documents and through general amending by-laws throughout the life of the document, irregularities are identified. As well, staff identify inadvertent errors built into the by-law that require amendment.

Details of the proposed amendments, and staff’s analysis are provided below.

Source Water Protection – proposed zone changes

Staff proposes the imposition of an overlay zone, which would be added into the Zoning By-law, together with an update to the general provisions that regulate source water protection areas. Staff are proposing an outright prohibition on certain land uses within WHPA-A areas that would include the following:

- Airports and related facilities
- Commercial fertilizer storage facilities.
- Gas bar / fuel outlets / fuel storage facilities / gas station
- Geothermal installation
- Heavy Industrial Use
- Outdoor confinement area of farm animal yard
- Pesticide storage facilities
- Road salt storage facilities
- Snow Disposal Facility
- Solid waste disposal facility
- Storage yard or warehouse, limited to storage of chemicals, liquid fuels and pesticides
- Storage facilities for agricultural source material
- Storage facilities for non-agricultural source material
- Storage for organic solvents
- Stormwater management facility
- Utility installation, limited to a BESS
- Utility installation, limited to sewage treatment, sewage pipes and pumping stations
- Waste management and transfer facility

In addition, staff is proposing a prohibition on use and storage of dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) where their use is considered a significant drinking water threat. Staff has been made aware that certain retail businesses store quantities of products that may be considered DNAPLs. Therefore, the proposed wording of the new general provision would not prohibit these liquids in quantities less than 25 litres, while still requiring risk management plans. A further exemption is proposed for retail establishments that may store and sell greater quantities.

Clean Water Act

Section 42 of the *Clean Water Act* notes that certain sections of the Act apply to zoning by-laws.

Provincial Planning Statement

Section 4.2 of the PPS can be broadly interpreted to support source water drinking requirements. Section 4.2.1 requires planning authorities to "...protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water..." Listed requirements to achieve this include "identifying water resource systems" (section [c]) and "implementing necessary restrictions on development and site alteration to...protect all municipal drinking water supplies...." (section [e]).

Counties' Official Plan

Section 4.4.2 of the Counties' Plan contains policies for Source Water Protection. The Counties' note that municipalities will support and participate in initiatives that implement

the *Clean Water Act* (Section 4.4.2[a]). It points further to the local Official Plan to implement restrictions on municipal drinking water supplies (Section 4.4.2[b]).

Municipal Official Plan

Section 2.6.4.1 of the Municipal Official Plan contains policies regarding Source Water Protection. Of note to this housekeeping by-law, Section 2.6.4.1.1[b] lists general policies for wellhead protection areas. Subsection 2.6.4.1.1[b][iii] notes that lands shown as WHPA-A, as well as WHPA-B and WHPA-C have requirements for a clearance notice from risk management officials in accordance with requirements of the *Clean Water Act*. The policy further establishes that some uses may be permitted within WHPA where required risk management plans are in place or in accordance with a prescribed instrument.

Paragraph viii of Section 2.6.4.1.1[b] notes that the Zoning By-law is required to be amended to ensure that it is in conformity with the Source Water Protection Plan. Previously, a general prohibition was established within the 100 metre setback of any municipal well. Through ongoing discussions with risk management officials, the proposed provisions should be refined. Since the prohibition has been in place, there has been an evolution of Source Water policies and changes to the *Clean Water Act*. The Municipality, in consultation with our partners at the Rideau Valley Source Protection Office, have collaborated on approaches to update our zone standards.

The proposed amending text in the attached by-law is found within paragraphs 1 and 10 (Attachment #1).

A map delineating current WHPAs has been included with this report (Attachment #2) for assistance with demonstrating where the proposed restrictions would apply.

Backyard Hens

Provincial Planning Statement

The PPS is largely silent on this type of land use.

Related Legislation

The *Protection of Livestock and Poultry Act* was identified by By-law staff during our regular request for comments on this housekeeping by-law. This act specifies that any person may kill a dog that is found killing or injuring livestock or poultry (Section 2[a]) or that is found straying at any time and not under proper control, upon premises where livestock or poultry are habitually kept (Section 2[c]). Staff note this only because there is no differentiation between livestock or poultry between urban and rural areas. By-law staff have raised this as a potential concern as hens are permitted.

Counties' Official Plan

The Counties' Plan is also silent on this type of land use.

Municipal Official Plan

Section 2.2.6 of the Municipal Official Plan indicates that the Municipality has the discretionary ability to investigate the adoption of a backyard agriculture by-law for areas designated Residential, Hamlet and Rural Residential to determine the feasibility of limited agriculture within these land use designations.

Backyard Hens – proposed language

Staff is proposing a sub-section of the existing general provision “non-farm agricultural uses” of the current Zoning By-law. There is an existing provision for Rural and Agricultural properties less than 10 acres in area. An additional section should be added with the title “non-farm agricultural uses in residential zones”. The proposed text would specify that in a residential zone (R1, R2, R3, R4, RMHP, LSR and RR) accessory keeping of hens would be permitted. Hens would not be permitted on commercial, industrial, institutional or hazardous / environmentally constrained lands.

The draft text would propose a maximum of five hens per property, with a prohibition on roosters. There would be requirements for coop and run locations, including minimum distances from coop and run to lot lines and neighbouring dwellings and maximum sizes for the coop and run based on the number of hens housed. Runs and coops would not be permitted in front or exterior side yards of properties. No part of any coop or run would be permitted within 15 metres of a cased well or 30 metres from a non-cased well. The coop and run would also have a minimum setback from septic systems and not be permitted to occupy drainage or access easements.

Finally, the Zoning By-law would require that any individual looking to house hens at her property would be required to obtain a license from the Municipality. Licensing provisions would be introduced by a separate hen licensing by-law.

The proposed wording of the by-law text can be found in paragraphs 3-5 of the attached draft by-law (Attachment #1).

Staff has received direction from the CAO’s office, following drafting of this report, to specify that the minimum required setback from an interior or rear yard for any part of the coop or run be set at 1.5 metres, whereas staff proposed 3.0 metres within the amending by-law. In the opinion of the planner, 3 metres is prudent, as it provides a conservative approach to the establishment of this new kind of land use within residential areas. Should Council desire more discussion on this matter, yet still see merit in implementing the remaining proposed housekeeping changes, the planner would propose to bring forward a separate zoning by-law addressing chicken provisions at a future council meeting. This would allow remaining proposed changes to be implemented.

Additional Residential Units (ARU) – proposed modifications

During the previous housekeeping amending by-law, Council passed zone standards that permitted up to two additional residential units as of right within single-detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings. Since this change was enacted, staff have processed several applications that have prioritized multiple ARUs. While this can be seen as a success of the changes Council enacted, the requirement that ARUs be limited

to 50% of the gross floor area of the principal dwelling on-site has led to some challenges in interpretation and, at times, hindered construction of ARUs or resulted in delays.

Staff completed a jurisdictional scan of other municipalities and found that the 50% rule is the dominant metric used to ensure that ARUs are subordinate to the principal dwelling. Additionally, some municipalities utilize a maximum dwelling unit area, such as 100 m² and further specify that the unit can either occupy 50% of the principal ground floor area or 100 m², **whichever is greater**.

Staff is of the opinion that introducing a “greater than” approach for units would add additional flexibility and continue to permit a wide variety of housing forms, types and sizes. This flexibility is seen as continuing to further the goals of Section 11.3.3.2 and Section 11 more broadly of the Official Plan.

The proposed changes are captured in paragraphs 2 and 6 of the attached draft by-law (Attachment #1).

Miscellaneous additional proposed changes

Accessible ramps

Current zone provisions allow for barrier free ramps within Section 6.50[f] to extend into any yard. However, the language is limited and does not extend to other forms of accessible structures that may permit an individual to access their home. Staff is proposing that the language be broadened to include allow for any kind of accessible structure on any property. The only limitation that staff recommends is that the placement of the accessible structure not be permitted to become a line of sight, or visual obstruction for traffic safety reasons. Broadening the language in this section would permit lifts or any other type of accessible apparatus or structure in addition to the currently permitted ramps.

The proposed changes are captured in paragraph 7 of the attached draft by-law (Attachment #1).

Walkways

Walkways are a distinct and separate kind of feature that allows access to a person’s property. Sometimes, they are constructed as a standalone feature, such a sidewalk from the front of a property to the front door. Other times, they may be added adjacent to a driveway to allow some extra space when exiting a vehicle. Currently, there are no policies regarding these kinds of features. As urban parts of the community continue to urbanize, staff felt it important to add general provisions about walkways. Currently driveways are required to maintain a 1 metre setback from mutual lot boundaries. Staff is proposing that walkways could extend into this space by up to 0.5 metres, but would not be permitted to be located over access or drainage easements.

The proposed changes are captured in paragraph 8 of the attached draft by-law (Attachment #1).

Abolition of the R1 zone

At a recent meeting, Council directed staff to consider the abolition of the R1 zone category. Staff is presenting an option to Council regarding this request. A simple change would be to re-name the R1 zone as “Residential Low Density A”, and also re-name the R2 zone as “Residential Low Density B”.

Given time constraints, this is the most straightforward way to remove reference to the R1 or, single-detached only zoning reference.

If Council wants, this change could be deferred to a later date. Staff would actually recommend this approach to ensure full and proper integration of the R1 and R2 zones, rather than just a name change.

The proposed changes are captured in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the attached draft by-law (Attachment #1).

Buildings, Structures and Uses Accessory to a Permitted Use

Staff was aware of certain zones where permitted uses failed to include the use “buildings, structures and uses accessory to a permitted use.” Staff reviewed the entire by-law to see if there were other zones where this omission occurred. As a result, staff is of the opinion that “buildings, structures and uses accessory to a permitted use” should be added to the following zone categories.

- SAK-1
- A1-9
- RU-32, RU-42, RU-53
- R1-19, R1-33, R1-45
- R2-1, R2-6
- R3-1, R3-5,
- R3-9, R3-22
- R4-11
- C1-11
- C2-1, C2-4, C2-5
- C3-1, C3-2, C3-3, C3-4-h, C3-5, C3-6, C3-12, C3-19, C3-22, C3-23, C3-27, C3-28, C3-33
- C4-5
- C5-1
- C7-1, C7-2, C7-3, C7-4
- M-2, M-3
- MXP-4
- MXQ-2, MXQ-3, MXQ-4

- FEP-1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 13

Site Specific Provisions

Both the R3-29 and R4-21 zones recently proceeded through site specific zone amendments. In the case of the R3-29 zone, the request to locate parking closer to an interior side yard was missed. Based on the proposed development, staff are comfortable to recommend this additional exception to the zone and this can be found in paragraphs 15 and 16 of the attached by-law (attachment #1).

In the case of the R4-21 zone, the interior side yard setback was modified from 5.67 metres to 5.5 metres via an application to the Committee of Adjustment (A-06-25). Therefore, it is appropriate to make this minor change to the R4-21 zone.

The R1-37 zone is an older zone standard established for the Oxford Village subdivision. Recently, several homes within this zone category have asked for porches to extend into the exterior side yard. The Committee of Adjustment did approve such a request for 309 Remillard Drive (File No. A-07-25). With more applications for homes with extending porches being requested, staff has reviewed the request to encroach into the exterior side yard and can recommend its approval within the R1-37 zone category.

Staff solicited comments from Mattamy's transportation planner, who indicated:

"The Municipality of North Grenville Zoning By-law (No. 50-12) requires a 5m x 5m sight corner triangle for collector-to-collector intersections and a 3m x 3m sight corner triangle for local-to-local or local-to-collector intersections. These requirements are specifically mentioned for the Oxford Village Subdivision in Section 13.4.1 q) R1-R17.

In the case of either Lot 57 or Lot 62, neither of the sight corner triangles encroach on the A 5mx5m sight corner triangle. See attached. Therefore, from a transportation perspective, there are no sightline concerns associated with either arrangement."

Following this opinion, staff consulted with Public Works, and they indicated:

The encroachment into the exterior side yard for Lots 57, 62, 46 will not negatively impact the approved sight triangles or measured approach/departure sight triangles in accordance with TAC GDGCR Ch.9.

Based on these comments, and the proposal, staff is comfortable to recommend this change for Council's consideration. Marked up reviews of the subject lots are included as attachments #3 and #4 for review and the wording of the proposed change is found within paragraph 14 of the draft by-law.

Schedule Changes

Occasionally, staff identify errors in the zone schedules. Based on our continuous review, lands around the Dickinson Trail / Concession Road cluster have inadvertently been zoned as Institutional (I) and were previously considered to be part of the Campus lands. Staff proposes that these be placed into the R1 (or R2A) zone category to reflect that these lands are residential, rather than institutional in nature. This is captured in Schedule "A" of the draft by-law (Attachment #1).

Relevance to Strategic Priorities

Strategic Pillar	Pillar #4 - Efficient Governance and Service Delivery
Goal	Goal #4.4 - Commit to Continuous Improvement
Key Action	Action #4.4.2 - Implement a continuous review program for existing processes and policies at both the departmental and corporate level

Options and Discussion

1. Approve the recommendation – **RECOMMENDED**
2. Do not approve the recommendation – not recommended

Financial Impact

This item has been identified in the current budget: Yes No N/A

This item is within the budgeted amount: Yes No N/A

Staffing implications, as they relate to implementing Council’s decision on this matter, are limited to the existing staff complement and applicable administrative policies as approved by Council.

Internal/External Consultation

At the time this report was written no comments had been received. However, should any comments be sent, staff will add them to our report and bring them to Council for review and consideration.

Communications

Notice of any decision by Council will be provided to the public in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act*.

Attachments

- Attachment #1 – Draft By-law
- Attachment #2 – Sourcewater Protection Map
- Attachments #3 and #4 – Sight Triangle Analysis sketches