

# STAFF REPORT ACTION REQUIRED

# 1201 Wilson Avenue - Rezoning Application - Staff Report

| Date:                | May 10, 2010   |  |
|----------------------|--|--|
| То:                  | City Council   |  |
| From:                | Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning Division |  |
| Wards:               | Ward 9 – York Centre   |  |
| Reference<br>Number: | 09 106294 NNY 09 OZ  |  |

## SUMMARY

An April 19, 2010 Final Report from the Director, Community Planning, North York District recommended approval of a Zoning By-law Amendment to develop the provincially owned lands at 1201 Wilson Avenue with a campus of 309,525 m<sup>2</sup> of institutional uses. Proposed uses include the Humber River Regional Hospital, a Forensics Services and Coroners' Complex, an OPP detachment and provincial government offices. On April 27, 2010 North York Community Council recommended to City Council that the Recommendations of this Final Report be adopted and also referred a number of matters to the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning for a report directly to City Council at its meeting of May 11 and 12, 2010. This report responds to that direction.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

# The City Planning Division recommends that:

1. City Council amend Recommendation 5 of the April 19, 2010 Final Report from the Director, Community Planning, North York District to delete the phrase "within six months of the enactment of the By-law" and replace it with "within 12 months of the enactment of the Bylaw".



- 2. City Council delete Recommendations 10 and 11 of the April 19, 2010 Final Report from the Director, Community Planning, North York District and replace them a new Recommendation 10 which reads "The Province be required to prepare a public art plan for public art costing not less than 2 million dollars, in consultation with City staff which sets out an artist selection process, implementation protocol, installation phasing plan and includes the necessary capital facilities, operating and maintenance budget(s). The plan will be completed prior to the final approval of the Site Plan by the Director, Community Planning, North York District, for the Humber River Regional Hospital".
- 3. City Council amend the April 19, 2010 Final Report from the Director, Community Planning, North York District to add a new Recommendation 11 which reads "That Planning staff be directed to consult with appropriate City Divisions and the Province to determine the feasibility of locating a municipal public facility within the Provincial Campus".

#### **Financial Impact**

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

## **DECISION HISTORY**

A Final Report dated April 19, 2010 from the Director, Community Planning North York District recommended approval of a Zoning By-law Amendment to develop the provincially owned lands at 1201 Wilson Avenue with a campus of 309,525 m<sup>2</sup> of institutional uses. Proposed uses include the Humber River Regional Hospital, a Forensics Services and Coroners' Complex, an OPP detachment and provincial government offices. The report recommended the By-law Amendment include a maximum parking space provision on the campus and append a holding symbol "H" to the lands that requires conditions to be met prior to its removal for future development.

The report also contained additional recommendations related to the development of the Provincial Campus, including:

- The Province be required to fund/provide a number of identified transportation network/road improvements at no cost to the City;
- The Province be required to develop and implement within six months of the enactment of the By-law a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy to minimize the impact of the campus' trip generation and parking;
- The Province be required to appoint a permanent full time on-site TDM co-ordinator to monitor, manage and implement the TDM strategy;
- The Province providing public art contributions in accordance with the City's Percent for Public Art Program for a value of not less than one percent of the gross construction cost of all buildings and structures; and

• The Province developing a Public Art Master Plan for the campus and that it be approved by the City's Public Art Commission prior to the issuance of the Site Plan Control Agreement for the Humber River Regional Hospital.

At the April 27, 2010 Public Meeting to consider this application, North York Community Council recommended to City Council that the Recommendations of this Final Report be adopted and also referred a number of additional recommendations to the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning for a report directly to City Council at its meeting of May 11 and 12, 2010 (see Attachment 1). This report responds to that direction.

On May 3, 2010 Malone Given Parsons Ltd., the planning consultant for the Provincial Campus, submitted a letter to City staff providing commentary on behalf of the Province and Humber River Regional Hospital on the additional recommendations referred to staff. This letter is provided as Attachment 2 to this report.

## COMMENTS

## Additional Gross Floor Area for Humber River Regional Hospital (HRRH)

The Zoning By-law Amendment application filed by the applicant in February 2009 sought 111,500 m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area for the hospital. During discussions with HRRH staff, an additional 27,850 m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area was requested for a potential addition/expansion. The draft Zoning By-law contained in the Final Report permits 111,500 m<sup>2</sup> with a hold up to 139,350 m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area. The potential future development is subject to a holding provision as the applicant's supporting material (concept plans, Functional Servicing Report and Transportation Assessment report) did not incorporate this additional space.

The referred recommendation would amend the draft Zoning By-law to increase the permitted gross floor area of the hospital from 111,500 m<sup>2</sup> to 172,000 m<sup>2</sup>. This would be an increase of 60,500 m<sup>2</sup> in gross floor area. Also recommended is a similar amendment to the holding provision that would apply to the hospital, increasing the total permitted gross floor area after the "H" is lifted from 139,350 m<sup>2</sup> to 200,000 m<sup>2</sup>, an increase of 60,650 m<sup>2</sup>.

The applicant has since advised that the zoning application was based on the Departmental Gross Square Footage (DGSF) of the hospital and represented the approved functional plan at that time.

As the design of the hospital progressed, a Site Plan Control application was submitted in October 2009 indicating a gross floor area of 158,000 m<sup>2</sup>. This calculation included matters such as utility areas, mechanical space, machine rooms, elevator shafts, corridors between hospital departments, lobbies and retail space that are not part of DGSF. Recent further design revisions have apparently increased the overall gross floor area of the hospital to 172,000 m<sup>2</sup>.

The applicant has not provided sufficient material for City staff to adequately support the recommended increase in gross floor area for the hospital. For example, the current Site Plan Control submission is not detailed enough to determine if the additional floor area is appropriate. The applicant's site plan submission does not contain floor plan drawings with site statistics indicating gross floor area breakdowns. Without this level of detail it is difficult to determine the size of the various uses that had previously been omitted from the gross floor area or the size of the proposed retail spaces. Subsequently, it cannot be determined at this time if the requested increase in gross floor area by the applicant would impact the overall activity and use of the Provincial Campus. Similarly, the April 2010 design revisions noted by the applicant, which apparently increase the gross floor area of the hospital from 158,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 172,000 m<sup>2</sup> have not been submitted to City staff for review.

It is the applicant's position that an increase in gross floor area to  $172,000 \text{ m}^2$  and  $200,000 \text{ m}^2$  subject to a holding provision is appropriate as the activity levels of the hospital are not impacted, whether expressed in DGSF or gross floor area. The applicant has submitted comments from its consultant indicating that the variables affecting transportation and servicing (future employees and visitors to the site) have remained constant throughout the review of the Provincial Campus, despite the change in the hospitals floor area. As such, the applicant supports the referred recommendation to increase the gross floor area of HRRH by 60,500 m<sup>2</sup>.

Staff recommended approval of the level of development being sought in the Zoning By-law Amendment application. This level of development was supported by the applicant's Planning Rationale, Transportation Assessment and Functional Servicing reports. The impacts of the referred recommended increase in gross floor area on site design, transportation and servicing matters have not been adequately demonstrated and staff cannot support the recommended increase in floor area at this time.

#### Increase in Maximum Parking Permission for Provincial Uses on Blocks 5, 6 and 7

The referred recommendation would amend the draft Zoning By-law to increase the maximum number of vehicle parking spaces permitted on Blocks 5, 6 and 7 from 1,045 spaces to 1,195 spaces, an increase of 150 spaces. This increase is intended to accommodate fleet parking requirements for the provincial uses on these blocks.

The applicant's Transportation Assessment report concluded that a range of 3,400 to 4,200 parking spaces should be supplied for the entire Provincial Campus in 2015. This did not include the existing OPP detachment which currently has 130 parking spaces. The April 19, 2010 Final Report recommended that a maximum of 3,550 parking spaces be permitted, recognizing the minimum supply proposed by the applicant's consultant and the supply at the OPP detachment. This would provide over 2,000 spaces for HRRH, 350 spaces for the forensics facility, 130 spaces for the OPP and 1,045 spaces for the office uses on Blocks 5, 6 and 7. This recommendation was predicated on the Province implementing an effective TDM program and reducing the need for private vehicular parking.

The applicant notes that its transportation consultant recommended a parking supply of 1,345 spaces for Blocks 5, 6 and 7. The applicant also advises the site currently contains over 2,000 parking spaces and this supply serves the over 2,000 employees on site and 150 Provincial fleet vehicles. Given this, and the fact the campus will be under construction for most of the next five years, the applicant is of the opinion it will be extremely difficult for the Province to reduce its parking supply to 1,045 spaces. As such, the applicant supports the referred recommendation to increase the maximum number of parking spaces permitted on these blocks by 150 spaces.

The applicant has not adequately demonstrated a need for an increase in parking. No supporting information has been supplied for the provision of additional parking on Blocks 5, 6 and 7 beyond the minimum parking supply suggested by the applicant's consultant, which runs counter to the efforts to implement an effective TDM strategy. In addition, the applicant has not demonstrated the site plan impacts of supplying this additional parking. The recommended increase in parking cannot be supported at this time.

#### Province Paying a Proportionate Share of Improving the Keele/Sheppard Intersection

The referred recommendation would limit the Province's cost of improving the Keele Street/Sheppard Avenue intersection to "its proportionate share of the proposed upgrades". The April 19, 2010 Final Report recommended that this improvement, and other identified transportation network improvements, should be provided and/or funded by the Province at no cost to the City.

The applicant's Transportation Assessment report identified a number of road network improvements as being required to support the Provincial Campus redevelopment. These include the provision of new public roads in the campus, the signalization of a number of intersections, improvements to the campus' access to Keele Street (at the Highway 401 off ramp) and improvements to a number of existing intersections. The applicant's Transportation Assessment report also included the provision of a new northbound right turn lane at the Keele Street/Sheppard Avenue intersection.

The applicant notes that its transportation report shows that campus traffic would constitute 10 percent of the AM peak hour right turns at this intersection and 20 percent of the PM peak hour right turns. The applicant also suggests that other planned developments in the area would contribute to the requirement to upgrade to the Keele Street/Sheppard Avenue intersection. The applicant is proposing that the Province pay its "fair share" of the new right turn lane, although this share is not defined. As such, the applicant supports the referred recommendation to limit the Province's cost to its proportionate share of this work.

In keeping with City policy, the Province should provide all transportation improvements as identified in its consultants work. While it is recognized that additional development in the area, primarily from the Downsview Area Secondary Plan lands, could contribute to the need for a northbound right turn lane at the Keele Street/Sheppard Avenue intersection, development of the lands around this intersection may not occur for some time. The hospital and the forensics facility will be completed by 2015 and require this improvement to support the proposed level of development recommended in the draft Zoning By-law. Further, it is City policy that

transportation network/road improvements required to support new development be provided at no cost to the City and there is no compelling reason why this should not be the case for the Provincial Campus.

#### Province Providing and Implementing a TDM Strategy Within 12 Months

The April 19, 2010 Final Report recommended that the Province be required to develop and implement, in conjunction with City staff and the assistance of a TDM consultant, a TDM strategy/plan within six months of the enactment of the By-law for the Provincial Campus. The referred recommendation would require the Province to undertake this work within 12 months of enacting the By-law, rather than the 6 month requirement in Recommendation 5 of the April 19, 2010 Final Report.

The applicant notes that HRRH has begun development of a TDM strategy for the consolidation of its three current locations and the Province has commenced information sessions with its staff. The applicant supports the referred recommendation which would provide additional time for the appointment of a Campus TDM Coordinator and the implementation of a campus wide TDM strategy.

While it is preferable that all appropriate TDM measures be implemented as soon as possible, it is reasonable to propose an extension of this time to 12 months. As such, staff are recommending that City Council amend Recommendation 5 of the April 19, 2010 Final Report from the Director, Community Planning, North York District to delete the phrase "within six months of the enactment of the By-law" and replace it with "within 12 months of the enactment of the By-law".

#### Public Art on the Provincial Campus

In agreement with the Province, the April 19, 2010 Final Report recommended that the Province provide public art in accordance with the City's Percent for Public Art Program for a value of not less than one percent of the gross construction costs of all buildings and structures.

The applicant advises the requirement to provide public art at a value of one percent of gross construction costs is not sustainable on the Provincial Campus. The applicant notes these government projects have fixed budgets, which were not approved to accommodate a public art commitment of approximately \$15 million. The applicant also notes the hospital relies on donor contributions for much of its budget. Notwithstanding this, the Province has indicated it is willing to work with City staff to develop an appropriate public art plan for the campus.

A significant public art contribution is appropriate for the Provincial Campus in recognition of the prominence of its location, the range of public uses proposed for the campus, the extent of frontages on existing and new public streets and the scale of development on this site. However, staff also recognize the development of the campus will rely on public funding and private donations and are therefore amenable to a reduced public art contribution.

The applicant has proposed that an appropriate public art plan could be developed for the campus having a budget of \$2 million. This amount would provide an acceptable public art program for these lands. Therefore, Recommendations 10 and 11 of the April 19, 2010 Final Report from the Director, Community Planning, North York District should be deleted and replaced with a new recommendation which requires the Province to prepare a public art plan for public art costing not less than 2 million dollars, in consultation with City staff which sets out an artist selection process, implementation protocol, installation phasing plan and includes the necessary capital facilities, operating and maintenance budget(s). The plan will be completed prior to the final approval of Site Plan for the Humber River Regional Hospital. Once the public art plan after is reviewed by the Public Art Commission, the matter will be reported to City Council.

#### Burial of Overhead Hydro Wires

The referred recommendation directs City staff and the Province to continue discussions on the burial of overhead hydro wires on the site and on Wilson Avenue. Both the applicant and City staff have no objections to this referred recommendation and will continue discussions on burying these wires in the review of development proposals on the Provincial Campus.

#### Establishment of a Design Review Panel for the Campus

The referred recommendation would establish a design review panel specifically for the Provincial Campus. This would be a City run panel established to review and make recommendations on the design of structures and buildings on the campus, with a focus on structures visible from the surrounding community. It would also specifically review above grade parking structures.

On December 7, 2009, City Council expanded the mandate of the City Design Review Panel to include all *Avenues* identified on Map 2 of the Official Plan. All developments on the City's *Avenues* which meet criteria of prominence, significance and scale will be subject to review by this panel. The Provincial Campus meets this criteria and future planning work on these land will be subject to review by the City Design Review Panel. Recommendation 9 of the April 19, 2010 Final Report seeks Council's endorsement of Urban Design Guidelines that articulate a design vision for the campus and provide design principles addressing site planning, building design and layout and the connection of open spaces. Given this, the establishment of a design review panel specifically for the Provincial Campus is not required.

#### Locating Parking Structures Below Grade

The referred recommendation would require that parking structures be located, wherever possible, below grade. Above grade parking structures can result in unsightly, poorly designed buildings, which would not contribute to the development of a high quality campus nor support a safe interesting and vital pedestrian realm. In keeping with the Built Environment policies of the Official Plan, the goal of providing parking facilities below grade wherever possible is pursued with all development applications.

The applicant notes that parking for the forensics facility is located mostly below grade, in addition to the long term plan for the Provincial offices on Blocks 5, 6 and 7 which has partially below grade parking areas. The applicant also notes that the two parking structures proposed for the hospital front on a new mid-block public street internal to the campus rather than on Wilson Avenue, with the west parking structure being partially below street level and the east structure containing retail uses at grade to support the safe use of the public sidewalks. Notwithstanding this, the applicant does not support the referred recommendation.

City staff have worked with the applicant to ensure that all proposed above grade parking lots are properly located, will fit within the context for development of this site and will contribute to safe and interesting public sidewalks. These issues have been captured in the Urban Design Guidelines and each proposed structure, including above grade parking structures, will be reviewed within the context of these guidelines as part of site plan review. In addition, all structures will be considered by the City Design Review Panel. Therefore, the referred recommendation is not necessary to achieve Council's goals.

#### Provision of a Municipal Public Facility in the Campus

The referred recommendation would require the Provincial Campus to contain at least one municipal public facility, the Downsview Library being one example, to serve the local community and enhance the campus' connectivity to its surroundings. The major Provincial institutional uses of the proposed campus would be enhanced by additional public facilities, particularly if these uses are locally oriented and support non-auto oriented trips to the campus. As such, staff are recommending that City Council amend the April 19, 2010 Final Report from the Director, Community Planning, North York District to add a new Recommendation 11 which reads "That Planning staff be directed to consult with appropriate City Divisions and the Province to determine the feasibility of locating a municipal public facility within the Provincial Campus".

The applicant is of the opinion the Provincial Campus will become an activity hub as presently proposed that will be connected to the surrounding community through public streets and pedestrian connections. The applicant does not support the referred recommendation.

#### Using Parking Revenues to Subsidize Employee Transit Use

The referred recommendation would require the applicant to fund a study, commissioned by Transportation Services, to determine how parking revenues can be used to subsidize public transit use by campus employees.

The April 19, 2010 Final Report notes that the public streets and intersections around the site experience highly congested traffic conditions and that an aggressive and effective Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy is critical in reducing the traffic impacts of the campus. One component of the TDM strategy proposed by the City's TDM consultant is the provision of transit subsidies to campus employees. As Recommendation 5 of the April 19, 2010

Final Report would require the Province to develop and implement a TDM strategy in conjunction with City staff and a TDM consultant, the use of parking revenues to subsidize transit use by campus employees is an acceptable approach.

The applicant concurs that employee transit subsidies should be reviewed within the context of developing a comprehensive TDM strategy for the entire campus. However, the applicant also advises that the Province and HRRH oppose any measure which would dictate how parking revenues are used and that parking revenues for a hospital are used to offset the cost of equipment and technology that directly benefit patient care.

#### Feasibility of a GO Transit Station on the Bradford Line at Wilson Avenue

The referred recommendation would require the Province to review the feasibility of establishing a GO Transit station on the Bradford Line at Wilson Avenue prior to the approval of longer term development on Blocks 5, 6 and 7. Any enhancements to public transit availability to the campus should be encouraged.

The applicant notes that a GO bus facility exists on the Keele Street entrance to the campus and ORC will discuss the feasibility of locating a GO rail facility on the Bradford Line at Wilson Avenue. However, the applicant opposes the requirement that approval of future development be predicated on reviewing this matter and therefore does not support the referred recommendation.

#### Required Parkland Dedication

The referred recommendation would require the parkland dedication arising from the development of the Provincial Campus to be satisfied by the creation of a new park at a location to be determined through discussions involving Planning and Parks, Forestry and Recreation staff and the local Councillor.

The April 19, 2010 Final Report noted the estimated parkland dedication arising from the campus would be approximately 1,800 m<sup>2</sup> since the hospital and forensics facility are exempt from this dedication. The report notes there are two park blocks immediately to the west of the campus named Ridge Park, with the westerly block being owned by the City and the easterly block being owned by the Province and leased to the City. Parks, Forestry and Recreation staff recommended the required parkland dedication be made by the Province to the City from the leased Ridge Park lands.

The proposed parkland dedication recommended in the April 19, 2010 Final Report should remain. The leased Ridge Park lands have recently been improved by the City through the installation of play equipment and a soccer field and obtaining ownership of these lands would protect this investment and ensure going forward the lands remain as parkland. Ownership of these lands would also create a larger park when consolidated with the closed portion of Downsview Avenue, which was transferred to Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division in the past, providing for the opportunity for additional programming.

In addition, the Urban Design Guidelines for the Provincial Campus provides a framework for an enriched public realm for the campus. The existing public park would be linked to a central focal green space, and other publicly accessible plazas and open space with new public streets with generous well-treed boulevards and a naturalized linear open space on the west side of Julian Road

## CONTACT

Neil Cresswell, Manager, Community Planning Tel. No. (416) 395-7121 Fax No. (416) 396-7155 E-mail: cresswel@toronto.ca

## SIGNATURE

Gary Wright Chief Planner and Executive Director City Planning Division

#### ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: April 27, 2010 North York Community Council Decision Attachment 2: May 3, 2010 Letter from Malone Given Parsons Ltd.

#### Attachment 1: April 27, 2010 North York Community Council Decision

| NY33.52 | ACTION | Amended |  | Ward: 9 |
|---------|--------|---------|--|---------|
|---------|--------|---------|--|---------|

## Final Report - Rezoning Application - 1201 Wilson Avenue

Public Notice Given

Statutory - Planning Act, RSO 1990

#### **Committee Recommendations**

North York Community Council recommends that:

- 1. City Council amend Zoning By-law 7625 of the former City of North York substantially in accordance with the draft Zoning By-law Amendment attached as Attachment No. 5 to the report (April 19, 2010) from the Director, Community Planning, North York District and that the Zoning By-law Amendment shall append a holding symbol "H" to the lands that requires conditions to be met prior to its removal for future development.
- 2. City Council authorize the City Solicitor to make such stylistic and technical changes to the draft Zoning By-law Amendment as may be required.
- 3. City Council direct the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning to consider the redesignation of the Provincial Campus from Mixed Use Areas to Institutional Areas within the context of the five-year municipal comprehensive review of the City's Official Plan.
- 4. City Council require the Province to fund and/or provide the identified transportation network/road improvements as outlined in the Technical Services Memorandum dated April 19, 2010 (Attachment 6 to the report dated April 19, 2010 from the Director, Community Planning, North York District), at no cost to the City of Toronto.
- 5. City Council require the Province to develop and implement, within six months of the enactment of the By-law, in conjunction with City staff and the assistance of a TDM consultant, a TDM strategy/plan that would minimize the impact of the proposed campus' trip generation and parking by implementing a strategic plan with a focus on multi-modal transportation planning, demand management program, and stakeholder outreach.
- 6. City Council require the Province to appoint a permanent full time on-site Transportation Demand Management (TDM) coordinator to manage, monitor and implement the approved TDM strategy for the entire Provincial Campus.

- 7. To address the requirement for sustainable transportation impact mitigation measures, including better transit accessibility and connectivity, City Council require the Province to provide \$250,000 to the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) to fund the procurement of a consultant to work with the TTC, City staff and the Province to prepare a feasibility study for a potential bus rapid transit route along:
  - i. Keele Street from the proposed Finch West and/or Sheppard West subway stations on the Toronto-York Spadina Subway Extension; or
  - ii. Wilson Avenue from the Wilson subway station.
- 8. City Council determine that since the applicant is ORC acting on behalf of the Province of Ontario, the City's standard requirements for indemnification, and financial security in the form of letters of credit and deposits will not be required, but that the following requirements will be imposed on the approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision for the Provincial Campus, or any related municipal infrastructure or other servicing agreements as may be required by the City:
  - i. all development, and any new municipal infrastructure and relocated municipal infrastructure, will be constructed in accordance with the City's standards;
  - ii. enhanced insurance will be provided, to the satisfaction of the City's Manager of Insurance and Risk Management; and
  - iii. future public roads to be shown as Blocks on the Draft Plan of Subdivision, and such Blocks not to be conveyed to and/or assumed by the City until such time as they are constructed, inspected and accepted and the two year maintenance period has expired.
- 9. City Council endorse the attached Urban Design Guidelines (Attachment No. 7 to the report dated April 19, 2010 from the Director, Community Planning, North York District) that will be used for reviewing the design of public streets, accessible open spaces and individual Site Plan Control applications.
- 10. City Council require the Province to provide public art contributions in accordance with the City's Percent for Public Art Program for a value not less than one percent of the gross construction cost of all buildings and structures on the lands. This is to be secured as a condition of the subdivision agreement.
- 11. City Council require the Province to develop a Public Art Master Plan for the Provincial Campus and that it be approved by the City's Toronto Public Art Commission prior to the issuance of the Site Plan Control Agreement for Block 2 (Humber River Regional Hospital).
- 12. City Council determine that the development of the lands at 1201 Wilson Avenue would not set a precedent for the 'Avenue' segment in which it is located, will not

adversely impact the adjacent Neighbourhoods and is partially supportable by available infrastructure and therefore can proceed prior to the completion of an Avenue study.

#### **Decision Advice and Other Information**

North York Community Council held a statutory public meeting on April 27, 2010, and notice was given in accordance with the Planning Act.

North York Community Council:

A. Referred the following recommendations moved by Councillor Augimeri to the Chief Planner and Executive Director for a report directly to City Council for its meeting on May 11 and 12, 2010:

"That:

- 1. North York Community Council revise and amend the Recommendations set out in the Report of the Director, Community Planning, North York District (April 19, 2010) as follows:
  - a. That Recommendation 1 be amended to state that: "City Council amend Zoning By-law 7625 of the former City of North York substantially in accordance with the draft Zoning By-law Amendment attached as Attachment No. 5 revised as follows:
    - i. Maximum Development Section 46.4 be amended to increase the gross floor area of Block 2 (HRRH) from 111,500 m2 to 172,000 m2 so that the Section reads as follows:

The Maximum gross floor area for each Block shall be as follows:

| Block | Maximum Gross Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> ) |
|-------|--|
| 1     | 0  |
| 2     | 172,000                                    |
| 3     | 49,250                                     |
| 4     | 1,965                                      |
| 5,6,7 | 70,660                                     |
| 8     | 0  |
| Total | 293,875                                    |

- Parking: Maximum Parking Permissions Section 46.10(iv) be amended to increase the maximum parking permitted on Blocks 5, 6 & 7 from 1,045 to 1,195 to accommodate Ontario Realty Corporation fleet parking requirements and that the Section reads as follows:
  - "(iv) Excluding on-street parking, the maximum number of parking spaces on the entire site shall not exceed 3,700 parking spaces as set out below:

| Block | Maximum Parking Spaces |
|-------|------------------------|
| 2     | 2,025                  |
| 3     | 350                    |
| 4     | 130                    |
| 5,6,7 | 1,195                  |
| Total | 3,700                  |

iii. Holding Provision: Section 46.12 be amended to increase the total gross floor area permitted on Block 2 from 139,500 m2 to 200,000 m2 so that the Section reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding Subsection 46.4 and subject to removing the holding symbol, the maximum permitted gross floor area on the following blocks is as follows:

| Block | Maximum Gross Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> ) |  |
|-------|--|--|
| 2     | 200,000                                    |  |
| 5,6,7 | 118,960                                    |  |

- b. That Recommendation 4 be amended to read as follows: The Province be required to fund and/or provide the identified transportation network/road improvements as outlined in the Technical Services Memorandum dated April 19, 2010 (Attachment 6), at no cost to the City of Toronto except for the following changes:
  - i. Province required to fund its proportionate share of the proposed upgrades to Keele Street/Sheppard Avenue (northbound right turn lane).

- c. That Recommendation 5 be amended to read as follows: "The Province be required to develop and implement, within 12 months of the enactment of the By-law, in conjunction with City staff and with the assistance of a TDM consultant, a TDM strategy/plan that would minimize the impact of the proposed campus trip generation and parking by implementing a strategic plan with a focus on multi-modal transportation planning, demand management program, and stakeholder outreach.
- d. That Recommendation 10 be amended to read as follows: "The Province be required to prepare a public art plan in consultation with City staff which sets the implementation protocol, installation phasing plan and includes the necessary capital facilities, operating and maintenance budget(s).
- e. Discussions continue between City staff and the Province with respect to the burial of the hydro wires both on the site and on Wilson Avenue.
- B. Referred the following recommendations moved by Councillor Moscoe to the Chief Planner and Executive Director for a report directly to City Council at its meeting on May 11 and 12, 2010:

"That:

- 1. A design review panel shall be established by the City of Toronto to review and make recommendations with respect to structures and urban features on this site.
- 2. Parking structures shall, wherever possible, be located below grade.
- 3. Where a parking structure is located above ground, it shall be subject to design control as permitted under the City of Toronto Act and shall be subject to review by the design review panel.
- 4. Any design review shall have particular regard to the aspects of structures that present themselves to the surrounding community.
- 5. To enhance the connectivity with the surrounding community, the campus shall contain at least one municipal public facility that will serve the surrounding local neighbourhood (for example, consideration might be given to moving the Downsview library onto the site).
- 6. The applicant be required to fund a study, commissioned by Transportation Services Division, to determine how revenues from parking can be used to subsidize employee public transit use.

- 7. Approval of longer term development on Blocks 5, 6 and 7 will require a review by the Province of the feasibility of establishing a GO Transit station at the intersection of the GO Bradford Union Station line and Wilson Avenue to service both this campus and the Bombardier plant.
- 8. The required park land dedication (2% of office component only) not be satisfied by the transfer of Ridge Park to the ownership of the City, but rather be satisfied by the creation of a new park at a location to be determined through discussions involving City Planning Division, Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division and the local Councillor."

#### Origin

(April 19, 2010) Report from Director, Community Planning, North York District

#### Attachment 2: May 3, 2010 Letter From Malone Givens Parsons Ltd.

May 3, 2010

MALONE GIVEN PARSONS LTD.

140 Renfrew Drive, Suite 201, Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 6B3 Tel: (905) 513-0170; Fax: (905) 513-0177 <u>www.mgp.ca</u> Jkirk@mgp.ca

Mr. Neil Cresswell, MCIP, RPP, Manager, Community Planning North York District City of Toronto 5100 Yonge Street Toronto, ON M2N 5V7

08-1776

Dear Sir:

#### Community Council Motions April 27<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting, Zoning By-law Amendment 1201 Wilson Avenue, Toronto (North York) Ontario Realty Corp. and Humber River Regional Hospital Corporation

On April 27, 2010, Community Council approved the recommendations per the staff report dated April 19, 2010. Two councillors moved additional motions which were referred to staff for a report to Council on May 11/12, 2010. On behalf of ORC and HRRH, we submit the following comments on these motions.

#### Councillor Augimeri (paraphrased)

- 1) That Recommendation #1 be amended to state that: City Council amend By-law 7625 substantially in accordance with the draft by-law attached to the report and revised as follows:
  - a. Maximum Development Section 46.4 be amended to increase the Gross Floor Area of Block 2 (HRRH) from 111,500 m2 to 172,000 m2.

A review of the chronology of the applications can assist in understanding the discussion on Gross Floor Area (GFA):

February 2009 – Applications for zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision were filed with the City. Hospital GFA was listed at 1.2 million square feet (111,500m2). The floor space number used in the applications was the Departmental Gross Square Footage (DGSF) per the Ministry of Health definition and represented the approved functional plan for the hospital at that time. The functional plan outlines employees, services, potential visitors, clinical and operating requirements and the analysis determines a DGSF.

At that time, the hospital Planning Design Compliance team had not had an opportunity to analyse and recommend the size and functional detail of the building.

Summer 2009 – HOK/HRRH completed the initial (schematic) design the hospital building in order to begin Stage One - Planning and Design Compliance, as part of the two stage Infrastructure Ontario process for Design Build Finance and Maintain (DBFM) projects.

October 2009 – HRRH applied for Stage One site plan approval for the hospital building. The application noted a GFA of 1.7 million square feet (158,000m2). The design included items such as mechanical spaces, corridors between departments, elevators, lobbies, and retail spaces that are not part of the Departmental Gross Square Footage. While these areas are necessary, they do not drive activity in the hospital; they are in response to the activity which takes place in the departmental areas.

April 2010 – Further design revisions increased the overall GFA to 1.85 million square feet (172,000m2). There is no change to the Ministry approved Departmental Gross Square Footage. After meeting with staff during preparation of the recommendation report, we identified a discrepancy between DGSF and the zoning by-law definition of Gross Floor Area (GFA).

The activity level is not affected by the floor area, whether expressed in DGSF or GFA. The proposed DGSF is 1.2 million square feet (111,500m2) and the proposed GFA is 1.85 million square feet (172,000m2).

| Factor                   | HRRH Definition (DGSF)<br>(111,500 m2) | City Bylaw Definition (GFA)<br>(172,000 m2) |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Number of Employees      | 4,500                                  | 4,500                                       |
| Number of Hospital Beds  | 656                                    | 656   |
| Number of Parking Spaces | 2,025                                  | 2,025                                       |

Cole Engineering, who prepared both the Transportation Analysis and Servicing Analysis for the campus, did not use floor area to analyse the project and to derive their conclusions and recommendations, which are accepted by staff. The variable used in determining trip generation for all site users was future employee and visitor populations. This clarification for the correct square footage does not change the recommendations because the level of activity does not change. The critical element (activity) remains constant. Urbantrans (the TDM consultant brought on by the City) recommendations are also rooted in and build upon the work completed by Cole Engineering.

Attached to this letter are comments from Cole Engineering outlining the continued validity of their recommendations, based on the above factors and their work with Urbantrans in support of the change in GFA.

Throughout the approvals process, there have been many meetings with city staff from several departments. The plan has been rigorously reviewed and discussed. Site plan issues such as transportation, massing, setbacks, height and landscaping have been canvassed. At no point has the GFA of the building arisen as a concern.

City staff has worked with the applicants and consultants for almost 2 years to progress a supportable and achievable plan for the campus. The proposed hospital building of 172,000m2 GFA is the same building that has been the focus of discussion for many months. The variables affecting transportation and servicing have remained constant throughout, despite the change in GFA. The hospital building which staff supports is the same building which Council is now being asked to support. We support this motion strongly and ask staff to concur.

> b. Parking: Maximum Parking Requirement Section 46.10 (iv) be amended to increase the maximum parking on Blocks 5, 6 and 7 from 1,045 to 1,195 to accommodate fleet parking requirements.

The current parking space count on the campus is over 2000 spaces. The parking analysis prepared by Cole Engineering concluded that a parking supply of 1,345 spaces for the ORC/Provincial office uses is appropriate. City staff recommended 1,045 (maximum). ORC is committed to a TDM program to be developed for the site with the intention of reducing vehicle usage over time. In the short term, there will be a decrease from over 2,000 parking spaces to the prescribed maximum. With over 2,000 employees already on-site, and 150 fleet vehicles (which further reduces available supply to employees), and a campus that will be under construction for the next 5 years, it will be extremely difficult to achieve a reduction to 1,045 spaces. We support this motion to increase the maximum parking to 1,195 spaces to accommodate fleet vehicles and ask staff to concur.

c. Holding Provision Section 46.12 be amended to increase total Gross Floor Area permitted on Block 2 from 139,000 to 200,000m2.

See point #1 above, this is the equal adjustment for the GFA subject to a Hold provision.

- 2) Recommendation 4 be amended as follows: The Province be required to fund and/or provide the identified transportation network/road improvements as outlined in the Technical Services memorandum dated April 19, 2010 at no cost to the City, except for the following changes:
  - a. Province is required to fund its proportionate share of the proposed upgrades to Keele Street/Sheppard Ave. (northbound right turn lane)

The transportation analysis prepared by Cole Engineering shows that site traffic constitutes only 10% of AM peak (right turn) movements and 20% of PM peak (right turn) movements at this intersection. Other planned developments in the area are certain to contribute to the requirement for intersection upgrades. We propose to pay our 'fair share' of the proposed right turn lane at Keele St./Sheppard Ave. The details can be secured through the draft plan of subdivision process. We support this motion and ask staff to concur.

3) Recommendation #5 be amended to change '6 months' to '12 months' for the development and implementation of a TDM plan/strategy.

We support this motion which provides additional time for the implementation of the TDM strategy. HRRH has already begun development of a comprehensive TDM strategy to bring together three off-site locations and ORC has already begun information sessions with Ontario Public Service (OPS) staff. All efforts will be combined under one Campus TDM Coordinator to develop the campus-wide strategy with OPS Ministries, Forensics and HRRH employees. Meantime, HRRH has joined Smart Commute and will begin a TDM promotion campaign shortly, as part of the TDM strategy for the move to the new location at the Provincial Campus.

> 4) Recommendation #10 be amended as follows: The Province be required to prepare a public art plan in consultation with City staff which sets the implementation protocol, installation phasing plan, and includes the necessary capital facilities, operating and maintenance budgets.

We noted at the Public Meeting that the requirement for 1% of construction costs for public art as recommended by City policy is not sustainable in this public project. These are large scale, government projects on fixed budgets, which in the case of the hospital can only be funded through donor contributions from the local community. The total based on the 1% ratio could be more than \$15 million, which was not part of the approved budget. ORC and HRRH are committed to working with staff to come up with an appropriate public art plan for implementation on the campus. We support this motion.

5) Discussions continue between City staff and the Province with respect to the burial of hydro wires both on the site and on Wilson Avenue.

ORC will continue discussions with City staff on this issue.

#### Councillor Moscoe (paraphrased)

A. A design review panel shall be established by the City of Toronto to review and make recommendations with respect to structures and urban features on the site.

We understand that this project is already subject to the City of Toronto Design Review Policy and consequently believe that a separate Design Review Panel is not necessary. Urban Design Guidelines for the entire campus are before Council for endorsement. The Forensics Building is already well advanced in its design and Notice of Approval Conditions has been issued by the City. The hospital building has been through an iterative process and we believe the plan is now supported by staff. As with the Forensnics project, the final design of the hospital project will be the subject of a competitive process through a request for proposal process. City planners have been invited to participate as subject matter experts in the design evaluation process, providing advice and guidance to the Hospital as the design options are progressed. It is our opinion that the time and effort to put together a specific Design Review Panel for this site will have limited benefit and would only serve to delay progress on the projects in hand. We do not support this motion.

B. Parking structures shall, wherever possible, be located below grade.

Parking for the Forensics building and the loading area are located mostly below grade. The long term master plan for the ORC lands are for new office buildings with at least partially buried parking areas and one parking structure. The only near term proposed parking structures are on the HRRH site with both structures fronting Street A. The west parking garage on the hospital property has currently been designed to take advantage of the natural grade of this site, resulting in two of the four levels being located below street level. Hospitals try to avoid underground parking construction is not funded by the Ministry of Health and therefore hospitals must use other revenue sources or donor dollars to pay for the construction costs, diverting funds from equipment and technology that directly benefit patient care.

The amount of parking on site has been minimized. Retail is proposed at grade on some parking structures to further reduce impact. This is all outlined in the Urban Design Guidelines before Council. It is our opinion that this motion is not necessary and therefore do not support it.

C. Where a parking structure is located above ground, it shall be subject to design control as permitted under the City of Toronto Act and shall be subject to review by the design review panel.

See point (A) above.

D. Any design review shall have particular regard to the aspects of structures that present themselves to the surrounding community.

See point (A) above.

E. To enhance the connectivity with the surrounding community, the campus shall contain at least one municipal public facility that will serve the surrounding local neighbourhood (for example consideration might be given to moving the Downsview library onto the site).

The campus is proposed to hold a major public facility (the hospital) on the site and several Provincial buildings. It will be connected to the surrounding community through a network of public streets and publicly accessible paths and will become an activity 'hub'. We do not understand the need for a 'municipal' public facility on the site. The hospital is a public facility, directly serving the community. The Provincial offices and Coroner's court also have public functions which directly serve the community. We do not support this motion.

F. The applicant be required to fund a study commissioned by Transportation Services Division to determine how revenues from parking can be used to subsidize employee public transit use.

ORC and HRRH oppose any measure which would dictate how parking revenues should be used. Parking revenue in the case of a hospital is used to offset the cost of equipment and technology that directly benefit patient care. The applicants are committed to implementing and funding a TDM program and parking space limitations will require a comprehensive plan. Consideration of matters such as subsidizing employee transit use will be reviewed in that context to derive a complete TDM program. We do not support this motion.

G. Approval of longer term development on Blocks 5, 6 and 7 will require a review by the Province of the feasibility of establishing a GO Transit station at the intersection of the GO Bradford – Union Station Line and Wilson Ave. to service both the campus and the Bombardier plant.

ORC has had discussions about locating a GO Bus station on the site. There is already a bus station at the Keele Street entrance to the site. Locating GO rail here is not likely to be feasible, however, ORC will discuss this with GO Transit. We oppose any link between a GO facility and the potential for future development. We do not support this motion.

H. The required parkland dedication (2% of the office component) not be satisfied by the transfer of Ridge Park to the ownership of the City, but rather be satisfied by the creation of a new park at a location to be determined through discussion involving the City Planning Division, Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division and the local Councillor.

A portion of Ridge Park is proposed as the parkland dedication for the campus. The Urban Design Guidelines outline a network of public and semi-public spaces throughout the campus for passive recreation. These include open spaces, gardens, public plazas and the like. A formal park space is not required within the development. We do not support this motion.

By copy of this letter to the Clerks Department, we ask that this letter be provided to all City Councillors in advance of the May 11/12, 2010 Council meeting.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours truly, MALONE GIVEN PARSONS LTD.

Jim Kirk, MCIP, RPP Partner

cc: Clerks Department, North York



Our Ref: L08-117-01

Experience Enhancing Excellence

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. 140 Renfrew Drive, Suite 201 Markham, ON L3R 6B3

Attention: Mr. Jim Kirk

Dear Mr. Kirk:

Highway 401 / Keele Street Provincial Campus Gross Floor Area Re:

Cole Engineering Group has undertaken a Transportation Analysis for the Highway 401/Keele Street Provincial Campus with initial input in February 2009. A report entitled Addendum to Transportation Assessment Highway 401/Keele Street Provincial Campus for the Ontario Realty Corporation October 2009 and subsequent analysis on December 23, 2009 was submitted to Toronto Staff for review.

In our assessment, we undertook trip generation for Block 2 - the Humber River Regional Hospital (HRRH), Block 3 - the Forensic Science and Coroner's Court (FSCC), and Block 6 (ORC) - existing and future Ontario Government offices. The variable used in determining trip generation for all site users was the future employee / visitor populations. We understand that there is no change in the population. As such, any change in Gross Floor Area (GFA) by any of the site users will not result in a change to the Transportation Assessment. On this basis, the findings and conclusions provided in the Addendum to Transportation Assessment Highway 401/Keele Street Provincial Campus for the Ontario Realty Corporation October 2009 remain valid, and will continue to be valid, regardless of the proposed GFA of the facility.

The 401/Keele Provincial Campus TDM Strategic Plan was prepared by UrbanTrans North America to develop a transportation demand management plan for the Provincial Campus. The analysis undertaken by UrbanTrans also used future employee / visitor populations to the campus as the variable and, as such, does not require any revised analysis.

Yours truly,

COLE ENGINEERING GROUP LTD.

ofessional Engineer

Ontario imited

Kim Nystrom

**Cens** 

Name: KIM JUHANI NYSTROM Richard Pernicky, C.E.T., MITE Number: 100047180

 
Number:
100047180
Project Manager

Principal
Category:
Transportation:
Description

Planning of Itansportation face
Sociate
This licence is subject to the limitations as detailed on the certificate;

RP:dps
This licence is subject to the limitations as
C::
Mr. Nick Pileggi,
Matematication Projects/Data (Matematication Projects/Data (Matematication Projects/Data) (Matematication) (Mate S/2008 Projects/Land Day Proje GA Letter 04 30 10.doc

Cole Engineering Group Ltd. 100 Renfrew Dr., Suite 100, Markham, ON L3R 9R6 F: 905.940.2064 T: 905.840.6161



Experience Enhancing Excellence

April 29, 2010 Our Ref: L09-131-1

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. 140 Renfrew Drive Suite 201 Markham, ON L3R 6B3

Attention: Nick Pileggi, Senior Planner Senior Project Manager

Dear Nick:

Re: ORC Provincial Campus 1201 Wilson Avenue Pt. Lot 10, Conc 4, WYS, North York Functional Servicing Report - Sanitary Sewer Analysis

The Provincial Campus Hwy 401/Keele Street - Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, dated January 2010 was prepared in support of the Plan of Subdivision. This report addresses the sanitary sewerage strategy for the proposed re-development in accordance to the requirements of Toronto Water theoretical dry weather sanitary flow spreadsheet analysis calculation for the campus.

The sanitary sewer flow calculation is based upon the current City of Toronto average sanitary flow rate of 250 l/person/day for non-residential – commercial and office uses. An equivalent population using the above referred 250 l/person/day sanitary flow rate and 0.30 l/s/ha infiltration rate, will result in a corresponding peak flow + infiltration. An increase to the Block 2 (HRRH) gross floor area (GFA) will not affect the peak flow + infiltration calculation, since our analysis is based upon population and not area of building.

We trust this is the information you require and if you have any questions or require additional information regarding the above, please don't hesitate to contact this office. Thank you.

Yours truly,

COLE ENGINEERING GROUP LTD

Seymore Gan, B.A., C.E.T. Project Manager SJG:sg

5:12008 Projects/Land Dev Projects U.09-131 ORC Provincial Campus/Corresp/Letters/N Pileggi 4 29 10.doc



Cole Engineering Group Ltd. 100 Renfrew Dr., Suite 100, Markham, ON L3R 9R6 F: 905.940.2064 T: 805.940.6161