# TORONTO STAFF REPORT ACTION REQUIRED

# 395, 387R and 413 Leslie Street - Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw Amendment Applications - Refusal Report

Date:	May 25, 2016
То:	Toronto and East York Community Council
From:	Director, Community Planning, Toronto and East York District
Wards:	Ward 30 – Toronto-Danforth
Reference Number:	15 213190 STE 30 OZ

# SUMMARY

Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment applications have been submitted for 395, 387R and 413 Leslie Street, to permit sixteen (16) 4-storey townhouse units. The site is located in the interior of a low-rise residential block at the northeast corner of Gerrard Street East and Leslie Street. The existing detached dwellings at 395 and 387R Leslie Street will be demolished. A total of 16 on-site parking spaces plus two visitor parking spaces are proposed.

The application is not appropriate for the site. The proposal does not conform to the Official Plan; is not consistent with Council-approved guidelines; does not fit within the existing or

planned context for the neighbourhood; and creates adverse impacts on adjacent land uses. The development would result in overdevelopment of the site. This report recommends refusal of the application to amend the Official Plan and the Zoning Bylaws.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

#### The City Planning Division recommends that:

- 1. City Council refuse the applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment at 395, 387R and 413 Leslie Street for the following reasons:
  - a. the proposal does not conform to the Official Plan;
  - b. the proposal is not consistent with Council-approved guidelines; and
  - c. the proposal creates adverse impacts on adjacent land uses.
- 2. City Council authorize the City Solicitor together with City Planning and other appropriate staff to appear before the OMB in support of City Council's decision to refuse the application, in the event that the application is appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board.

#### **Financial Impact**

The recommendations in this report have no financial impact.

#### **Pre-Application Consultation**

A pre-application consultation meeting was held with the applicant July 30, 2014. The applicant proposed 19 townhouse units with frontage onto a private driveway. Staff raised concerns related to matters such as access, height, massing, setbacks, servicing, solid waste collection, impact on surrounding land uses, and appropriateness of the proposed development. Staff also advised that the proposal would require an Official Plan Amendment.

## **DECISION HISTORY**

The site was the subject of a site plan control application to construct 12 townhouse units and maintain two existing detached dwellings in 1996. The application was withdrawn.

## **ISSUE BACKGROUND**

#### Proposal

The initial proposal filed with the application consisted of eighteen (18) 4-storey townhouse units with a total gross floor area (GFA) of  $3,480 \text{ m}^2$  and a density of 1.46 times the lot area. A total of 20 vehicle parking spaces were proposed with access via a private laneway from Leslie Street. The development would require the removal of two existing detached dwellings and an associated detached garage.

There is a significant and pronounced change in elevation and a top-of-bank feature at the north end of the property. The site is approximately 9 meters higher than the properties on Hastings Avenue. The units at the north end of the site would be stepped down to match the grade on Hastings Avenue.

The proposed access is a private driveway from Leslie Street with existing public laneways and private easements to provide vehicular access to the townhouse units.

The City issued Notice of Complete Application on August 26, 2015. Despite satisfying statutory complete application requirements, staff required additional information to assess the proposed development and advised the applicant accordingly on October 22, 2015. The applicant was advised to demonstrate viable solutions for issues related to: public/private access, waste removal, fire access, site servicing, and groundwater. Additional information requested included: a revised plan of survey clarifying ownership, context plan showing adjacent land uses, existing and proposed grades, proposed retaining walls, section drawings, sun/shadow study, and a hydrogeological study.

The applicant submitted revised plans on November 4, 2016 but fell short of providing all necessary information. Community Planning issued staff comments on November 16, 2015 advising that clarification and additional information was required.

The applicant submitted revised plans on January 7, 2016 but did not providing all necessary information. City staff met with the applicant on February 3, 2016 and reiterated the need for clarification and additional information as indicated in Planning staff comments.

The applicant submitted revised drawings showing a sixteen (16) unit townhouse development on February 25, 2016. The revised plans did not provide all of the information requested by staff. The applicant submitted the most recent drawings on March 17, 2016 providing most of the information requested.

For detailed information refer to Application Data Sheet, Attachment 5.

#### Site and Surrounding Area

The property is located in the interior of the residential block at the northeast corner of Gerrard Street East and Leslie Street. The property has a 7.6 metre frontage on Leslie Street and public laneways flank the south, east, and northwest sides of the site. The 2,460 m<sup>2</sup> site is uneven with a significant and pronounced change in elevation and a top-of-bank feature at the north end of the site. The site has two existing detached dwellings and an associated detached garage. There are three public laneways that are adjacent to the site but none of the laneways are connected.

Land uses and form of development surrounding the property include the following:

North:	The north end of the site abuts the rear yard of dwellings fronting on Harriet Street.						
East:	The easterly side of the site abuts a public laneway and the rear of dwellings fronting on Hastings Avenue.						
West:	The westerly side of the site abuts the rear yards of dwellings fronting on Leslie Street.						
South:	The southerly side of the site abuts the rear yards of dwellings fronting on Gerrard Street East.						

## **Provincial Policy Statement and Provincial Plans**

Section 2 of the *Planning Act* sets out matters of provincial interest, which City Council shall have regard to in carrying out its responsibilities. Matters of provincial interest include: the orderly development of safe and healthy communities; the adequate provision of a full range of housing, and the appropriate location of growth and development, to name a few.

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2014, provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. These policies support the goal of enhancing the quality of life for all Ontarians. Key policy objectives include: building strong healthy communities by accommodating a range and mix of uses; providing an appropriate range of housing types and affordability to meet projected requirements of current and future residents; wise use and management of resources; and protecting public health and safety. The PPS recognizes that local context and character is important. Policies are outcome-oriented, and some policies provide flexibility in their implementation provided that provincial interests are upheld. City Council's planning decisions are required to be consistent with the PPS.

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe provides a framework for managing growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe including: directions for where and how to grow; the provision of infrastructure to support growth; protecting natural systems; and cultivating a culture of conservation. City Council's planning decisions are required to conform, or not conflict, with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

## **Official Plan**

The City's Official Plan sets out a broad strategy for managing future growth by identifying an urban structure of areas where development is appropriate and areas where little physical change is expected to occur. The Plan outlines how growth is to be directed towards areas with supporting infrastructure and provide a transition in scale and density that protects stable neighbourhood areas from the effects of nearby development. The Official Plan directs growth to the *Downtown*, the *Centres*, *Avenues*, and *Employment Districts*.

The site is designated *Neighbourhoods* on Map 21, Land Use Plan of the City of Toronto Official Plan (Attachment 4). Unlike the designated growth areas, *Neighbourhoods* are stable areas, where significant growth is not encouraged and new development is to respect and reinforce the general physical patterns of the neighbourhood.

## **Healthy Neighbourhoods Policies**

Chapter 2 of the Official Plan entitled *Shaping the City* contains principles for steering growth and change to some parts of the city, while protecting our neighbourhoods and green spaces from development pressures. *Neighbourhoods* are seen as being stable but not static. Section 2.3.1 recognizes that *Neighbourhoods* will not stay frozen and that some physical change will occur over time as enhancements, additions and infill housing occur on individual sites over time.

Policy 1 of Section 2.3.1 of the Official Plan states that development within *Neighbourhoods* will respect and reinforce the existing physical character of buildings, streetscapes and open space patterns in these areas. The objective is to ensure that new development in *Neighbourhoods* respects the existing physical character of the areas, reinforcing the stability of the neighbourhood.

## **Public Realm and Built Form Policies**

Section 3.1.1 of the Official Plan includes policies on the public realm. The policies encourage development that improves the public realm (streets, sidewalks, and open spaces) for pedestrians. Policy 15 of Section 3.1.1 states that new streets should be public streets. Private streets, where they are appropriate, should be designed to integrate into the public realm and meet the design objectives for new street.

Section 3.1.2 of the Official Plan speaks to built form. The policies stress that new development will be located and organized to fit with its existing and/or planned context. The Policies of Section 3.1.2 provide guidance pertaining to the massing of new buildings to frame adjacent streets in a way that respects the existing and/or planned street proportion, incorporating exterior design elements, their form, scale, proportion, pattern and materials, and their sustainable design, to influence the character, scale and appearance of the development, creating appropriate transitions in scale to neighbouring existing and/or planned buildings for the purpose of achieving the objectives of the Official Plan, providing for adequate light and privacy, and adequately limiting any resulting shadowing of neighbouring streets and properties.

Further, Section 3.1.2 requires new development to be massed to define the edges of streets at good proportion and provide amenity for adjacent streets to make these areas attractive, interesting, comfortable and functional for pedestrians. This can be achieved by the provision of adequate amenity and landscaped open space, coordinated landscape improvements in setbacks to create attractive transitions from the private to public realms and landscaped open space within the development itself, among others. The intention is to enable new developments to 'fit' within the context of the immediate neighbourhood, while also improving the character of the surrounding area.

#### **Neighbourhoods** Policies

*Neighbourhoods* are considered to be physically stable areas made up of residential uses in lower scale buildings such as detached houses, semi-detached houses, duplexes, triplexes, townhouses and walk-up apartments that are no higher than 4-storeys. The Official Plan requires development within *Neighbourhoods* to generally "fit" the existing physical character. While *Neighbourhoods* are intended to be physically stable, they are not intended to be static.

Chapter 4 of the Official Plan further defines development in established *Neighbourhoods*. Section 4.1.5 of the Official Plan provides development criteria for *Neighbourhoods*, to respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood. No changes will be made through rezoning, minor variance, consent or other public action that are out of keeping with the physical character of the neighbourhood.

Section 4.1.9 of the Official Plan provides criteria to evaluate infill development on properties that vary from the local pattern in terms of lot size, configuration and/or orientation. Development will:

- a) have heights, massing and scale appropriate for the site and compatible with that permitted by the zoning for adjacent and nearby residential properties;
- b) provide adequate privacy, sunlight and sky views for residents of new and existing buildings by ensuring adequate distance and separation between building walls and landscaping, planting and fencing to enhance privacy where needed;
- c) front onto existing or newly created public streets wherever possible, with no gates limiting public access; and
- d) locate and screen service areas and garbage storage to minimize the impact on existing and new streets and residences.

In December of 2015 City Council approved Official Plan Amendment 320 to revise the Healthy Neighbourhoods, *Neighbourhoods* and *Apartment Neighbourhoods* policies of the Plan. The intent of these changes is to clarify, strengthen and refine the policies within these sections to support the Plan's goals to protect and enhance existing neighbourhoods.

The subject application was made in August 2015 and therefore pre-dates Official Plan Amendment 320. Furthermore, ministerial approval is required before Official Plan Amendment 320 comes into force and effect. Although still under consideration by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the amendments represent City Council's most current thinking on these policies and as such have relevance to the proposed application. New development will both respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood by recognizing prevailing building and lot patterns.

## Amendments to the Plan

Section 5.3.1 of the Official Plan states that it is a statutory document and amendments to the Plan that are not consistent with its general intent will be discouraged and that Council will be satisfied that any development permitted under a Plan amendment will be compatible with its physical context and will not affect nearby *Neighbourhoods* or *Apartment Neighbourhoods* in a manner contrary to the neighbourhood protection policies in the Plan.

The Toronto Official Plan is available on the City's website at: www.toronto.ca/planning/official \_plan/introduction.htm

## Zoning

## Former City of Toronto Zoning By-law No. 438-86

The site is zoned R2 Z0.6 in the former City of Toronto Zoning By-law No. 438-86. The R2 zone is a residential zone permitting a detached house, row house, semi-detached house, and triplex. The maximum density is 0.6 times the lot area and the maximum height is 10 metres.

## City of Toronto Zoning By-law 569-2013

The site is zoned R (d0.6) (x741) in the new City of Toronto Zoning By-law No. 569-2013. The R zone is a residential zone permitting a dwelling unit in a residential building. The maximum density is 0.6 times the lot area and the maximum height is 10 metres. The exception grandfathers previous Zoning By-laws for specific property addresses.

# Site Plan Control

The site is subject to Site Plan Control. A site plan control application has not been submitted.

## **Design Guidelines for Infill Townhouse**

The Design Guidelines for Infill Townhouse (Townhouse Guidelines), adopted by Council in February of 2003, include criteria to ensure that low-rise infill townhouse developments are compatible within existing residential neighbourhoods where they are permitted. The Townhouse Guidelines assist in identifying the most appropriate site layout and setbacks for townhouse developments on a site where they are permitted. They establish principals and criteria for the review of development applications.

The Townhouse Guidelines are under review. On November 16, 2015 the Planning and Growth Management Committee directed the Chief Planner to consult on revisions to the Townhouse Guidelines. This work is in progress.

## **Development Infrastructure Policy and Standards**

The Development Infrastructure Policy and Standards (DIPS), adopted by Council in April of 2005, provides guidance to determine where a private street (mews) may be considered and establishes design standards for such a street. Compliance with DIPS is necessary to ensure future residents of a proposed development have appropriate access to City services and infrastructure.

#### **Reasons for the Application**

An amendment to the Official Plan is required because the proposed 16-unit townhouse development in the interior of a residential block does not comply with the Official Plan.

The proposal requires a Zoning By-law amendment to permit sixteen (16) townhouse units fronting onto a private driveway, a building height of approximately 12.9 metres, a density of 1.41 times the lot area, and other zoning standards.

## **Community Consultation**

A Community Consultation meeting to discuss the proposal was held on April 7, 2016 at Riverdale United Church. The meeting was attended by the Ward Councillor, City Planning staff, the applicant and approximately 70 members of the public. Written correspondence was also received from a number of residents who were unable to attend the Community Consultation meeting.

Issues raised by area residents, which have been considered in the review of the application, are generally related to the following matters:

Impact on the stability of the community/neighbourhood character. Much of the discussion focused on the appropriateness of the proposed development in the interior of an existing residential block.

Traffic impacts on the existing neighbourhood. Residents expressed concern regarding resident, visitor, and service vehicle traffic to and from the proposed development.

On-street parking. Residents expressed concern regarding an increase to on-street parking generated by visitors to the development.

Building height. Residents expressed concern with the height of the development. Many felt that the proposed development is too tall, particularly in relation to the properties on Hastings Avenue.

Development density. Residents expressed concern with the density of the development. The requested density of 1.41 is more than double what existing zoning permissions allow.

Building setbacks. Residents expressed concern with the proposed setbacks of the development. Of particular note was an 82 centimeter rear yard setback.

Overlook. Concern was expressed regarding overlook and privacy issues.

Sun/Shadow. Concern was expressed regarding shadow impact on the rear yards of the residents on Hastings Avenue.

Slope stability. Concern was expressed regarding the stability of the top-of-bank feature which extends to the rear yards of the dwellings on Hastings Avenue.

Ground Water. Concern was expressed regarding the high water table in the area, particularly for the dwellings on Hastings Avenue. Some residents have experienced flooding and are concerned that the proposed develop will exacerbate the ground water problem.

Tree canopy. Concern was expressed regarding the loss of the existing tree canopy.

Natural Environment. Concern was expressed regarding the impact on the natural environment.

Other issues raised at the meeting include: the impact of retaining walls, site access, noise and impact of on-site construction, solid waste management, snow storage, availability of application data, lack of on-site maintenance, the builder's experience with this type of construction, potential wind tunnel, and property values.

## **Agency Circulation**

The application was circulated to all appropriate agencies and City divisions. Responses received have been used to assist in evaluating the application.

#### COMMENTS

#### **Provincial Policy Statement and Provincial Plans**

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2014 and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) are high-level and broad reaching documents. The City is a development area and infill is encouraged under these policies. However, both the PPS and the Growth Plan state that planning authorities are responsible for identifying appropriate locations for growth. Intensification and redevelopment is to be provided in areas that take into account the existing building stock or area, and availability of infrastructure and public service facilities that meet projected needs.

Within this framework, the PPS recognizes that the Official Plan is the most important vehicle for implementing PPS requirements and that comprehensive, integrated and long term planning is best achieved through municipal official plans. The City's Official Plan meets the requirements of the PPS.

In this case, the City's Official Plan designates the subject lands as *Neighbourhoods*. While some change is generally anticipated over time, the key policy of the Plan is to ensure that new development will respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood. It is not appropriate to permit development that significantly deviates from the existing character of

the neighbourhood. As was previously indicated, this is an area characterized by one to threestorey grade related dwellings with generous front and rear yards, fronting on a public street.

The proposal does not conform to the development criteria and infill development criteria in *Neighbourhoods* and is not consistent with the way in which the Official Plan implements the PPS. Thus, the proposal is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2014.

The Growth Plan provides a framework for managing growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe including: directions for where and how to grow; the provision of infrastructure to support growth; and protecting natural systems and cultivating a culture of conservation. The Growth Plan strives, among other things, to direct growth to areas of urban intensification. It requires municipalities to set clear targets for population and employment growth.

The Growth Plan also directs growth to *urban growth centres*, *intensification corridors*, *major transit station areas*, *brownfield sites* and *greyfields* to provide as a key focus for transit and infrastructure investments to support future growth. This is not an area where the scale of intensification and built form proposed, is anticipated or appropriate. The proposal is not consistent with the way in which the Official Plan implements the Growth Plan. Based on this, the proposal does not conform to, and conflicts with, the Growth Plan.

## **Official Plan**

The Official Plan identifies a land use structure of areas where intensification is appropriate and directs growth to certain areas of the City. The areas which can best accommodate growth are shown on Map 2, Urban Structure of the Official Plan. The growth areas are identified as the *Downtown*, *Centres*, *Avenues* and *Employment Districts*. The proposed development is not in one of those areas.

The subject site is located in a *Neighbourhoods* designation where growth is not anticipated. Physical changes to established *Neighbourhoods* must be sensitive, gradual and generally fit the existing physical character.

The application contemplates a 16-unit, 4-storey townhouse development in a neighbourhood characterized by one to three storey single, semi, and townhouse dwellings. Access to the site is by way of a private driveway towards an internal site. Given the existing and planned context and the location of this site in the interior of a residential block, the proposed development is inappropriate. The proposed 16-unit townhouse development in the interior of an existing residential block does not meet the general intent of the Official Plan, is not compatible with its physical context, and will affect nearby *Neighbourhoods*. Furthermore, the proposed development is not in keeping with the physical character of the neighbourhood, which in this case is low-rise residential dwellings with generous yards fronting onto a public street.

The intent of zoning by-law provisions is to ensure a consistent lot pattern and provide for adequate separation between dwellings; maximum building height; sufficient private open amenity; consistency in the streetscape; and to prevent overlook and shadowing impacts. This proposal would create 16 dwelling units that do not conform to the existing urban fabric with respect to height, open space, lot pattern, and the public realm. The proposal would also

introduce dwelling units behind dwelling units separated by a combined private driveway, public laneway, and easement in the interior of an existing residential block. The requested changes to the zoning by-law standards would permit a development that does not comply with the general intent of the Official Plan.

## **Building Height**

The character of existing dwellings in the surrounding neighbourhood is generally reflective of the zoning by-law standard of 10 metres. The proposed development cannot be assessed without considering the height of surrounding buildings, and existing and proposed grades relative to adjacent properties.

The proposed townhouse units are approximately 4-storeys in height, which is permitted in the Official Plan. There is an existing 4-storey dwelling in the same residential block, but adjacent structures are mostly detached, semi-detached and townhouse units up to 3-storeys in height. Although the *Neighbourhoods* designation permits walk-up structures up to 4-storeys in height, the local context reflects the lower permitted height of the zoning by-law.

The height of the development will be approximately 12.9 metres high. The request to increase the permitted height from 10.0 to 12.9 metres, will have a negative impact on the amenity of adjacent residential properties due to issues related to massing, overlook, and privacy.

Because the entire site is at a higher elevation, the associated impacts of overlook, shadow, and loss of privacy are exacerbated. The subject site has a top-of-bank feature and a significant grade difference to adjacent properties on Hastings Avenue. The development proposes to address the top-of-bank feature by stepping the townhouse units at the north end resulting in a 19.31 metre building as viewed from the laneway off Hastings Avenue. The increase in height permission on top of a substantially elevated grade is then intensified by an insufficient rear yard condition. At the nearest point the proposed rear yard setback is 82 centimeters.

## Density

The application proposes a density of 1.41 times the lot area. Adjacent lots are generally uniform with an as-of-right density of 0.6 times the lot area. The proposed density is substantially higher than what exists in the surrounding neighbourhood. Redevelopment of this intensity would constitute overdevelopment of the site and set an undesirable precedent for the surrounding neighbourhood.

## Access to the Blocks and Parking

The proposed development contemplates a 6 metre wide T-shaped vehicular access from Leslie Street. The access does not meet City standards for a private driveway (or mews) as prescribed in DIPS. The combined private driveway, public laneway, and easement provide access to integral garages located in front of the townhouse units. A total of 16 resident and two visitor parking spaces will be provided.

Because the proposed development does not comply with DIPS, the City is unable to confirm access to services for future residents including: fire access, solid waste pick-up, turn-around for servicing vehicles, appropriate pedestrian walkways, and landscape opportunities. The character of the existing neighbourhood consists of dwelling units with individual front yard driveways leading to a garage. The development proposes a new pattern of private driveway, public laneway, and access easements not found elsewhere in the neighbourhood. This combination access and block structure enables a more intense land use structure of smaller lots and higher densities which would significantly alter the physical character of the existing neighbourhood.

## **Design Guidelines for Infill Townhouses**

The Design Guidelines for Infill Townhouses (Townhouse Guidelines) apply wherever townhouses are considered to be an appropriate form. The intent of the Townhouse Guidelines is to provide guidance for high quality design. The proposed 16-unit townhouse development does not meet the design standards as identified in the design guidelines.

The proposal is for 16 townhouse units fronting onto a combined private driveway, public laneway, and private easement. The Townhouse Guidelines specify that public streets are preferred. In the event private streets are provided they should be extended and integrated into the existing public street. The public street frontage for the site is 7.62 meters. 16 townhouse units is too dense given the limited public street frontage.

The Townhouse Guidelines indicate that new streets should be laid out allowing for infill townhouses that have front entrances on existing or newly created public streets, and that avoid back-to-front facing relationships (such as front doors facing rear yards or service areas). Each of the 16 units fronting onto the proposed private driveway would be facing the rear of the dwellings on Leslie Street which is not appropriate and is not consistent with the design guidelines.

The design guidelines recommend that new development will align setbacks with adjacent buildings to frame the street. The cumulative effect of uniform setbacks creates a streetwall that reinforces the character of the existing neighbourhood. Setbacks consistent with the neighbouring properties also provide space for landscaping.

The proposed development contemplates a private driveway to an internal site abutting the rear yards of dwellings in a residential block. The proposed 16-unit townhouse development is effectively back-lot housing.

The Townhouse Guidelines recommend a minimum unit width for townhouses with at-grade garages. The purpose of this design standard is to prevent a congested and poorly designed urban environment. As previously noted the development contemplates integrated garages with driveway access to the townhouse units from the front. The unit widths are between 4.6 and 5.0 metres which is less than the prescribed 6.0 metres. The proposed unit widths would result in minimal front yard landscaping, insufficient space for waste storage bins, insufficient space for utility location, and a first floor elevation of either pedestrian or vehicular access.

## **Unresolved Technical Issues**

The proposed development does not comply with the City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments (Revised May 2012), Development Infrastructure and Policy Standards (DIPS), and other technical standards. The following is a summary of outstanding technical issues related to the proposed 16-unit townhouse development.

Staff are concerned with the quality, quantity, and method of groundwater discharge and management. Given the significant change in elevation and top-of-bank feature on the site staff are concerned that the proposed development will tax City infrastructure and/or negatively impact adjacent land users. At the time of writing this report the applicant did not submit a hydrogeological report. Municipal servicing issues are also unresolved.

The City has minimum design standards for fire routes to ensure fire fighting equipment is able to access the site and be used appropriately. The width, turning radius, and grading of the proposed fire access route is insufficient and does not meet the City's design standards.

The City will not collect solid waste from the proposed development as it is currently designed because it does not comply with the City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments (Revised May 2012). Private waste collection will place an unnecessary burden on the future residents of the development, in perpetuity.

The proposed development does not meet with DIPS. Because the proposed development does not comply with DIPS staff are unable to verify appropriate access to City Services.

#### Site Plan

As previously noted a site plan control application has not been submitted at the time of writing this report. This report recommends that in the event the application is appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board, and in the event the Ontario Municipal Board approves the application, the City Solicitor be directed to request the Ontario Municipal Board withhold the final order pending issuance of the Notice of Approval Conditions for the site plan control application.

#### CONCLUSION

The proposed development is not consistent with the general intent of the Official Plan. The proposed density, setbacks, open space patterns, and building height do not reinforce or respect the physical character of the existing neighbourhood and would destabilize the area. The 16-unit townhouse development does not meet the infill development criteria as outlined in the *Neighbourhoods* designation. Furthermore, the proposed development does not meet Council approved design guidelines and has unresolved technical deficiencies related to ground water management, fire access, solid waste management, and DIPS. The proposed 16-unit townhouse development is not appropriate.

Staff recommend that the application to amend the Official Plan and Zoning by-laws be refused. In the event this application is appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board, it is recommended that City Council authorize the City Solicitor and appropriate staff to attend any Ontario Municipal Board hearing in opposition to the proposal for the reasons set out in this report.

#### CONTACT

Derrick Wong, Planner Tel. No. (416) 392-0776 E-mail: dwong3@toronto.ca

#### SIGNATURE

Gregg Lintern, MCIP, RPP Director, Community Planning Toronto and East York District

(P:\2016\Cluster B\pln\TEYCC\15692637090.doc) - cavc

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Site Plan Attachment 2: Elevations Attachment 3: Zoning Attachment 4: Official Plan Attachment 5: Application Data Sheet



#### Attachment 1: Site Plan

# Site Plan Applicant's Submitted Drawing Not to Scale 04/25/2016

395, 387R, 413 Leslie Street

File # 15 213190 STE 30 OZ





File # 15 213190 STE 30 0Z

Elevations Applicant's Submitted Drawing Not to Scale 10/02/2015





Applicant's Submitted Drawing

Not to Scale 10/02/2015

File # 15 213190 STE 30 0Z



**Attachment 3: Official Plan** 

#### **Attachment 4: Zoning**



Not to Scale Extracted: 10/02/2015

## Attachment 5 - APPLICATION DATA SHEET

Application Type	Official Rezonin	Plan Amendment &	Appli	cation Number:	nber: 15 213		90 STE 30 OZ			
Details		g Rezoning, Complex	Appli	Application Date:		August 26, 2015				
Municipal Address:	395, 387	395, 387R, and 413 LESLIE STREET								
Location Description:	PLAN 6	PLAN 676 PT LOT 11 **GRID S3009								
Project Description:	The proposed development consists of eighteen (16) 4-storey townhouses comprising a total of 3,480 square metres on the subject site and a density of approximately 1.41 FSI. Each unit will contain three bedrooms and contain one parking space in an integral garage. Access will be provided by a conbitnation private driveway, public lanes, and private easement.									
Applicant:	Agent:		Architect:			Owner:				
Walker Nott Dragecevic c/ Andrew Ferancik	0				Les	lie Me	ws Inc.			
PLANNING CONTROL	5									
Official Plan Designation:	Neighbo	Neighbourhoods Site Specific Provis								
Zoning:	R (d0.6)	(x741)	Historical Status:							
Height Limit (m):	10		Site Plan	te Plan Control Area:		5				
PROJECT INFORMATION										
Site Area (sq. m):		2460	Height:	Storeys:	4					
Frontage (m):		7.6		Metres: 1		12.9				
Depth (m):		66								
Total Ground Floor Area (	sq. m):	n/a				Total				
Total Residential GFA (sq.	m):	3480		Parking Spaces:		18				
Total Non-Residential GFA	A (sq. m):	0		Loading Dock	<u>s</u> s	1				
Total GFA (sq. m):		3480								
Lot Coverage Ratio (%):		49								
Floor Space Index:		1.41								
DWELLING UNITS FLOOR AREA BREAKDOWN (upon project completion)										
Tenure Type:	Condom	iinium			Above Grade		<b>Below Grade</b>			
Rooms:	0	Residential (	Residential GFA (sq. m):		3480		0			
Bachelor:	0	Retail GFA	Retail GFA (sq. m):		0		0			
1 Bedroom:	0	Office GFA	Office GFA (sq. m):		0		0			
2 Bedroom:	0	Industrial G	Industrial GFA (sq. m):		0		0			
3 + Bedroom: 16		16 Institutional/Other G		FA (sq. m): 0		0				
Total Units:	16									
CONTACT: PLAN	NER NAME	: Derrick Wor	ng, Planner							