

Jennifer Keesmaat, MES MCIP RPP
Chief Planner and Executive Director
City Planning Division**Etobicoke York District**
3rd Floor
2 Civic Centre Court
Toronto ON M9C 5A3**Tel:** (416) 394-8211
Fax: (416) 394-6063
Refer to: Luisa Galli at (416)394-6007
E-Mail: lgalli@toronto.ca
www.toronto.ca/planningIcon Royal York Limited
70 Don Park Rd
Markham, ON L3R 1G4

June 5, 2013

Subject: Community Planning Comments – Circulation #1
Rezoning Application No.: 13 141966 WET 06 OZ
250 Royal York Rd
PLAN 389 BLK C PT LOT 2 RP 66R21089 PARTS 4 AND 5
Ward 6 - Etobicoke-Lakeshore

Community Planning has completed its review of the material date stamped received on April 2, 2013 related to your application to amend the former City of Etobicoke Zoning Code to permit a stacked townhouse development that would consist of 111 units with underground parking at 250, 252, 254 and 256 Royal York Road and 8 and 10 Drummond Street.

The applicant is to address the following comments and submit revised information, studies and plans for review.

REZONING APPLICATION NO.: 13 141966 WET 06 OZ**A. ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION INFORMATION REQUESTED**

1. Heritage Impact Assessment – The development site is adjacent to a listed heritage building at 12 Drummond Street. Due to the close proximity of the proposed townhouses (Blocks 5 and 6) to the heritage building, a Heritage Impact Assessment is required to be submitted for review.
2. All drawings are to be metric as per City of Toronto development submission guidelines.
3. Resubmit the most recent full version of the Toronto Green Standard Checklist. Meet Tier 1 standards.
4. Resubmit the Toronto Green Standard Statistics Template. Meet Tier 1 standards.

B. PLANNING AND URBAN DESIGN ISSUES

Compatibility with Adjacent Employment Uses

The Official Plan designates the subject lands *Mixed Use Areas* on Land Use Map 15. *Mixed Use Areas* allow for a range of commercial, residential and institutional uses, in single use or mixed use buildings, as well as parks and open spaces and utilities. The proposed development contemplates a residential use consisting of 111 stacked townhouses units located in six separate building blocks. Although, the *Mixed Use Areas* designation allows for the proposed residential use not all sites with this land use designation are suitable for residential uses.

The development site is comprised of 6 properties municipally know as 250, 252, 254 and 256 Royal York Road and 8 and 10 Drummond Street. The site is located in the Mimico neighbourhood and the area is characterized by a mix of low rise commercial, institutional, residential and industrial uses. Immediately adjacent to and in close proximity of the site are a variety of industrial uses located along Drummond Street and Harold Street, as well as a rail corridor and yard that houses the VIA Rail Toronto Maintenance Centre and the Go Transit Willowbrook Rail Maintenance Facility. While three residential dwellings currently exist on the development site, every attempt should be made to buffer, isolate or limit the interface between industrial and sensitive land uses to avoid unmanageable conflicts in keeping with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan.

In order to deal with potential compatibility issues, this application proposes to locate and connect residential buildings along the perimeter of the site (Blocks 4, 5 and 6). These blocks would be designed to act as sound barriers to mitigate noise impacts from surrounding employment uses and have windowless rear walls that would be setback 1.8 m to 2.6 m from the property line. This building form would create an approximate 9 to 10 metres physical barrier between itself and the adjacent neighbouring lands to the north and west. Although this proposed construction is necessary for noise attenuation, upon further review it suggests that the surrounding industrial/employment land uses may not be compatible or amenable to the proposed use.

The design of the proposal appears to be dictated by the required noise mitigation measures to support the proposed residential use and not on what land use or building type may be most suitable for the site given its context. Although the City supports intensification through infill development, the location of this subject property, along with the attenuation measure necessary to make this project viable, call into question the appropriateness/suitability of rezoning this site to permit additional residential uses.

The applicant is strongly encouraged to explore redesigning the proposal to reduce and/or eliminate the need for the proposed noise attenuation measures. Possible options to consider include but are not limited to the following:

- introducing a mix of uses that may be used as a buffer to the adjacent employment uses;
- reducing the number of residential units and building blocks;
- using a different residential building type; and
- exploring alternative noise barriers that are not part of a residential building;
- eliminating residential uses on the site.

Noise and Vibration Impact Feasibility Study

The City will require a Peer Review to be conducted of the Noise and Vibration Impact Feasibility Study and any associated documentation or revised reports provided by the applicant. The Peer Review will be conducted on behalf of the City by a firm with expertise in conducting noise assessments that the City has selected. The cost of the review is to be funded by the owner.

Prior to the Peer Review the Noise and Vibration Impact Feasibility Study is to be revised and resubmitted to address the following issues:

- a) Information should be provided on the history of noise complaints in the area received by both the Ministry of the Environment and the Canadian Transportation Agency.
- b) The Noise and Vibration Impact Feasibility Study is unclear as to how the loudest sources of noise from the identified list of commercial/industrial noise sources are being addressed through noise control measures for the residents who would reside in these units. The study references sound level criteria based on the MOE's publication LU-131 for the development's outdoor living areas (i.e. terraces, exterior living room window). Publication LU-131 also provides Indoor Sound Level Criteria, however no information has been provided as to the anticipated noise levels within the dwellings units.
- c) The Noise and Vibration Impact Feasibility Study describes the activities and major noise sources of existing adjacent commercial/industrial businesses. The study states that these noise sources are "unpredictable and fairly uncommon and thus are not considered for their cumulative effect". The study also states that these noises sources may occur hourly (i.e. chisel is used 15 minutes each hour). Given that these activities are necessary to the operation of the businesses and may occur frequently, the report should consider the cumulative effect of these noise sources at any given time.
- d) The study concludes with an extensive list of mitigation measures that are required to be incorporated in the design of the proposed development in order to meet applicable Ministry of the Environment and other noise guidelines. While some residential developments incorporate a small degree of noise attenuation measures or warning clauses, in our experience it is rare for a development to require the number of mitigation measures that has been proposed for this development. In order to understand the effectiveness of these measures in a real life setting, the study should identify other residential development projects that have been constructed in a large urban area that have incorporated the same number and type of noise attenuation measures. Commentary should also be provided on the history of noise complaints following the construction of these projects.

Building Design, Number of Units and Site Layout and Organization

a) Number of Units

The proposed development contemplates a residential use consisting of 111 stacked townhouses units located in six separate building blocks. The proposal would have a combined residential gross floor area of 10,250 m² and an overall density of 1.42 times the area of the lot. The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site; reducing the number of units will allow for increased landscape open space, greater building setbacks to adjacent properties, and increased separation distances between buildings.

b) Building Setbacks

The proposed development locates buildings and acoustical walls 1.80m - 2.6m from the rear and/or side lots lines. The provisions of residential zoning codes in both Etobicoke and Mimico typically require minimum rear yard setbacks of 7.5m. This is the same setback that has been established in the City of Toronto Infill Townhouse Guidelines. These setbacks typically apply between two residential properties. For industrial zones that abut a residential zone, side and rear lot setbacks are 15m and 18m respectively. For commercial zones abutting a residential zone the rear and side yard setbacks are 15m. These zoning provisions are used to mitigate potential impacts from incompatible land uses by requiring greater building setbacks so that uses are distanced from visual blight, noise, vibration, environmental factors and other impacts that may be associated with industrial and commercial uses. These zoning standards should be considered in a revision to and/or a redesign of the proposal.

c) Site Design

In addition to the proposed rear and side yard setbacks, the buildings located along the perimeter of the site (Blocks 4, 5 and 6) would be designed to act as a sound barrier with windowless rear walls approximately 9 to 10 m (30 ft) high. This design scenario creates a void along the side and rear lot lines that may pose a potential safety and liability concern to future residents as it will be difficult to monitor activity in this area given that the rear walls of the buildings adjacent to this void would be windowless. Locating buildings in close proximity to the lot lines would make it challenging to maintain this area without encroaching on neighbouring properties. Given the proposed building heights, this development will also negatively impact neighbouring properties by causing shadowing.

This design would create an infill development that totally isolates itself from adjacent properties and creates a development pattern that would be inconsistent with the character of the neighbourhood. Given the proposed building heights and reduced setbacks, this design may also limit the redevelopment potential of adjacent properties, particularly if those properties also seek zoning permissions for residential uses.

d) Distance Between Buildings

The distance between the proposed building blocks are to be increased to ensure appropriate light, view and privacy. To achieve these conditions, it is recommended that the front-to-front facing distances between the blocks be a minimum of 15 metres consistent with the City of Toronto Infill Townhouse Guidelines.

Pedestrian Linkages

When grade related residential units cannot take their address from existing streets, new streets are required. This avoids dead end streets and creates strong visual and physical links into the site, thereby increasing the sites safety. It also creates a strong public realm condition with front entrances both framing and facing the street. The proposed development includes a number of blocks and pathways internal to the site that are not clearly visible from either Royal York Road or Drummond Street.

The proposal is to be redesigned to create clear access and strong visual and physical links to and through the site from the public streets. Primary walkways are required from Royal York Road and from Drummond Street for pedestrian orientation and circulation through the site. All primary walkways leading into the site from the public sidewalk should be a minimum of 2 metres in width.

Driveways/ Other Vehicular Entry

The proposed fire route, loading area and hammerhead terminates in the front of the landscaped open space and Block 3 entrances. In order to avoid vehicular and pedestrian conflicts, the hammerhead turning movement is to be relocated away from these areas.

Parking and Servicing Layout and Organization

The garbage storage area is to be relocated to the underground parking level. To prevent issues associated with odor and visual impact, garbage storage areas are to be located away from unit entrances, outdoor amenity areas and where possible walkways leading to building entrances.

A garbage loading area to permit weekly garbage pick-up may be accommodated above ground, provided its design is enhanced to match the residential buildings and it is located away from residential unit entrances and outdoor amenity areas.

Grading Relationships

A key issue related to new infill townhouse development is the perception of excessive height and potential impact on the abutting properties and streets. In some new developments, the naturally occurring grade has been artificially altered with extensive use of retaining walls. This creates less than desirable streetscapes and backyards with negative impacts, including drainage problems on adjacent properties. Any manipulation of site grading that leads to extensive perimeter retaining walls and grade changes between the subject property and the surrounding area is to be avoided. The existing natural grade at property lines are to be maintained and clearly noted on all drawings.

Landscape Elements and Pedestrian Amenities

On site shared landscaped outdoor amenity space is required to support the proposed development. The proposal should be organized so that the layout and design of buildings face onto open spaces and windows overlooking these landscape open spaces are maximized to ensure clear views for safety. One of the most important considerations for safety is to locate these private open spaces to be accessed and clearly visible from public streets.

In addition to the location, the proposed shared landscaped open space is not sufficiently sized for the development proposed. Increasing the size of the landscaped open space should be considered in your revisions to and/or redesign of the proposal.

Community Services and Facilities

A community service and facilities study (CS&F) was prepared in support of this application. The area for this CS&F study includes the Gardiner Expressway to the north; Park Lawn Road to the east; Lake Ontario to the south and Kipling Avenue to the west. A review of the study indicates that there is a need for: outdoor public space and amenities; additional day care especially infant space; additional community space for programs; and capital facility expansions for the Toronto Public Library. Further comments related to this study can be found in Attachment A.

Toronto Green Standard

Commentary to be provided once a full version of the most recent Toronto Green Standard is submitted.

Bicycle Parking Requirements

The plans illustrate a surplus of 1 visitor bicycle parking space. The visitor bicycle parking spaces must be dimensioned and indicate the type of bicycle parking provided (i.e. horizontal, vertical). The visitor bicycle parking spaces must be covered/protected from the elements, and meet the Toronto Green Standard - Tier One Guidelines and the City of Toronto Guidelines for the Design and Management of Bicycle Facilities www.toronto.ca/planning/bicycle_parking_guide.htm.

Required Parking

Occupant Parking – 111 units @ 0.6 spaces per unit	= 67
Visitor Parking – 111 units @ 0.15 spaces per unit	= 17
Total Required Bicycle Parking	= 84

Proposed Parking

Occupant Parking (below grade)	= 67
Visitor Parking	= 18
Total Proposed Bicycle Parking	= 85

Surplus = +1

The below grade resident bicycle parking spaces must be located in a separate room with secure access. The main door to this room must open to a clear area, clear of vehicle activity.

Bicycle access must be from a separate, dedicated bicycle entrance into the underground parking areas. Adjacent stairwells must be constructed to accommodate a small channel for bicycle wheels along the stairway edge.

C. NEXT STEPS

It is recommended that the applicant address the issues noted above and undertake a substantive revision and/or redesign of the proposal to address comments related to this rezoning application.

Included in Attachment B are comments, technical in nature, related to the corresponding Site Plan Control Application No. 13 141977 WET 06 SA. If you have any questions related to these comments please contact the Planner assigned to the file, Luisa Galli at 416-394-6007.

Yours truly,

Sharon Hill, Manager
Community Planning, Etobicoke York District

Attachment A – Review of Community Services & Facilities
Attachment B – Site Plan Control Application No. 13 141977 WET 06 SA.

cc: Icon Royal York Limited, 70 Don Park Rd, Markham, ON L3R 1G4
J. Krubnik, Urban Design, Etobicoke York District
T. Le, Development Engineering, Engineering & Construction Services

Attachment A

Review of Community Services and Facilities Study

A community service and facilities study (CS&F) was prepared by Bousfields Inc on behalf of ICON Homes in support of for application for the lands located at 250-256 Royal York Road and 8-10 Drummond Street to allow for the development of 111 stacked townhouse dwelling units on a Brownfield site.

Study Area

The area for this CS&F study includes the Gardiner Expressway to the north; Park Lawn Road to the east; Lake Ontario to the south and Kipling Avenue to the west.

Demographics

Bousfields Inc. has identified the largest demographic cohort in the CS&F study area as those between the ages of 25-64 years of age at 65.2% which is higher than the City of Toronto at 57.5%. The second largest cohort is seniors age 65+ at 14.8% which is slightly higher than the City of Toronto at 14.4%. In the study area children ages 0-14 years of age comprise 11.2% of the population compared to the City of Toronto which is much higher at 15.3%. Lastly, youth ages 15-24 years of age comprise 8.8% while for the City of Toronto youth comprise 12.8%.

Child Care Services

Bousfields has identified 10 child care facilities in the study area of which there are a total of 7 vacant spaces of which 3 are pre-school (2.5 to 5 years) and 4 are school age (6 to 10 years). There appears to be a shortage of both infant and toddler day care space. The number of day care spaces to be generated from this development is 7 spaces (111x 2.5 x5.4% x 50%).

Schools

The Toronto District School Board (TDSB) utilization rate which reflects the enrolment to capacity ratio shows that there is one elementary school and one secondary school serving the study area. Both schools still have capacity so that more students can be accommodated from the increase in population as a result of this development.

For the Toronto District Catholic School Board (TCDSB) there are three elementary schools serving the study area of which all three still have capacity. There are also two secondary schools of the TCDSB which serve the area and both are over capacity.

Bousfields Inc has identified the pupil yield from this development as generating 4 elementary school children and 2 secondary students. For the TCDSB it was 4 and 3 students respectively. Since the pupil yield from this development is not significant the additional students generated from this development can be accommodated in the existing schools.

Public Libraries

Bousfields listed both Mimico and New Toronto as serving the study area but did not address capacity at these libraries but gave an inventory of collections, service and programs. Capital needs were also not addressed base on the increase in residential population. Capital needs may include renovation, revitalization or the addition of space for early learning, quiet study or computer learning centre.

According to the Toronto Library Board neighbourhood libraries offer fewer hours than District libraries so some consideration should be given to extending hours of service in the future. A reading garden would be desirable for Mimico as well as a Kids Stop, User Education Centre and/or Media Lab. Services currently provided in this area need to be reviewed and adjusted to meet the needs of additional populations and incorporated into the service planning for the library.

Parks

Map 8 B of the Official Plan shows the existing ratio of local parkland provision per 1,000 residents. The site is within an area showing the lowest provision of parkland with only 0 to 1.42 hectares of parkland per 1,000 people. The largest two parks serving the area are Humber Bay Park West and Humber Bay Park East but both these parks are used by residents from across Toronto and not just the study area so that the two parks are already well used.

Community Centre

Located in the study area there are two community centres. The top priority needs for Ourland community centre is more community room space to accommodate additional programs. The centre has to currently turn away space request because the meeting room is too small and the gym is always booked. There is also a need for a gymnasium. Since seniors comprise the second largest cohort group in the study area consideration should be made regarding capital upgrades to the New Toronto Seniors Centre.

Human Service Agencies

Bousfields Inc. did not address Human Service Agencies which serve the study area but generally there is always a need to provide additional community space to run these programs.

In conclusion

Based on the information provided in the study, there is a need for:

- outdoor public space and amenities
- additional day care especially infant space
- additional community space for programs
- capital facility expansions for the Toronto Public Library

Attachment B
Site Plan Control Application
No. 13 141977 WET 06 SA

The following planning and urban design issues noted below are to be addressed as part of your site plan control application.

Building Siting and Organization

- a) Identify all materials and colours proposed on the elevations. Under Section 114 of the City of Toronto Act, the City has power to approve drawings that contain matters relating to exterior design, including without limitation the character, scale, appearance and design features of buildings.
- b) All drawings and plans are to include the following standard notation:

"Building permit issuance shall be subject to the building permit drawings not being in contravention with these approved plans and drawings including, but not limited to, the exterior design of the building and exterior building materials." The notation is available under "General Requirements for all Plans/Drawings" in Appendix 3 of the Development Guide.
- c) A third accent material is to be introduced on the elevations to further refine the blocks and assist in the reading of the components that comprise the facades.
- d) The applicant is asked to introduce vertical and horizontal relief with the building materials, so that some elements come forward of the primary façade and others are recessed. This breaks down the height and width of the blocks into a more nuanced architectural expression. For example, protruding the cement fibre panels forward of the brick.
- e) The steps leading up from the ground level to the townhouse units should be widened to provide more prominence to these addresses.

Parking and Servicing Layout and Organization

- a) The ramp to the underground parking has to be treated decoratively or in a material that is compatible to the residential units. Consider examining a decorative screening and/or a metal trellis to further reduce the visual implications of the ramp to the underground.
- b) Vents and transformers should be incorporated into the design of the building and/or incorporated into landscaped areas to minimize their unsightly visual impact on pedestrian areas, streets and adjacent homes.
- c) Air conditioners and hydro meters should be incorporated into reveals/notches in the units themselves and/or incorporated into landscaped areas to minimize their noise and unsightly visual impact on pedestrian areas, streets and adjacent homes.

- d) Show location of mail boxes and how they are integrated within the sites landscaping and open space.

Pedestrian Linkages

- e) Any private driveways should be provided with special surface treatment (i.e. precast concrete pavers or impressed asphalt/concrete).
- f) All primary walkways leading into the site from the public sidewalk should be 2m in width.

Landscape Plans and Details

- g) Provide a minimum of 30m³ for trees in soft landscaping, with a depth of 0.8 to 1.2m of soil. Clearly indicate soil depths on a site cross section.
- h) The details of all landscaping elements on the plans are to be provided for review.

Streetscape Improvements

- i) The public sidewalks adjacent to this development should be rebuilt to municipal standards.
- j) A public sidewalk should be provided along Drummond Street to Drummond Street pedestrian walkway to the Royal York Road public sidewalk.

Others Landscape and Pedestrian Amenities

- k) Provide a Lighting Plan.