



30 April 2018

City Clerk
Attn: Nancy Martins, Administrator Planning and Growth Management
Committee
City Hall, 10th Floor West
100 Queen Street West Toronto
ON M5H 2N2
e-mail: pgmc@toronto.ca

Dear Members of the Planning and Growth Management Committee,

RE: Objection to the Proposed City-Initiated Official Plan
Amendment to Implement the Downtown Secondary
Plan

187 King Street East and 65 George Street

City File: 17 147290 STE 28 OZ
Our File: 14.528

We are the planning consultants for York London Holdings relative to above noted application for Zoning By-law Amendment to accommodate the development of a 17-storey building at 65 George Street to the rear of a retained 4-storey heritage building at 187 King Street East (collectively referred to as the “subject site”). The subject site is located at the southeast corner of King Street East and George Street in the City of Toronto.

The application was submitted on April 21, 2017 and has since been appealed to the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal (LPAT) as a result of Council’s refusal or neglect to make a decision on the application within the prescribed 120-day timeframe. In our opinion, the proposal as described in the application package is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe which supports intensification within the Downtown Toronto urban growth centre. It also will help to implement the Big Move: Transforming Transportation in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area by providing for intensification within an anchor mobility hub.

The proposal represents appropriate infill development in the Downtown and Central Waterfront area and Regeneration Areas identified in the Toronto Official Plan.

Downtown Secondary Plan

We have reviewed the Downtown Secondary Plan which is being considered by Planning and Growth Management Committee on May 1, 2018, and would like to bring to Committee’s attention the following issues with the Secondary Plan as it pertains to the above noted application:

Section	Comment
3.3 and 9.12	<p>This section requires that all new buildings “<u>will ... include</u> indoor and outdoor amenities”, regardless of the size of building. It is our opinion that this policy is too prescriptive and does not provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate smaller buildings where provision of on site shared amenities may not be feasible or appropriate.</p> <p>In the case of the proposal, no common amenities are provided given that the building only contains 16 units all of which are, in our experience, much larger than the average dwelling unit size generally proposed in the Downtown, which effectively provides for private amenity space in the form of greater than average interior space, as well as private balconies.</p>
6.8	<p>The policy to require the replacement of all non-residential gross floor area, or a minimum 25 percent of non-residential gross floor area as a percentage of total gross floor area, does not provide sufficient flexibility or account for situations where it may not be feasible or appropriate to provide full replacement of non-residential space. In our opinion this policy will further hinder the provision of new housing options in the Downtown.</p>
6.25 and 6.26	<p>The policies in this section are highly incongruous with the explanatory text in the preamble which describes “Mixed Use Areas 2 – Intermediate” as providing for a transitional scale between the tall buildings in Mixed Use Areas 1, and mid-rise scale buildings in Mixed Use Areas 3, in that the policies provide for only “some tall buildings” while also containing policy language more similar to that found in the Neighbourhoods designation policies which are not intended to be growth areas.</p> <p>Insofar as the policies propose to limit the scale and mass of buildings to what is “prevailing”, in our opinion these policies will not foster a “transitional” scale given that the “prevailing” heights in many of these areas, including the King-Parliament Neighbourhood, are generally low to mid rise in scale. A “transitional” scale, as articulated in the explanatory text, would include buildings that are greater than mid-rise (i.e. tall buildings), but not as tall as the buildings in the “Mixed Use Areas 1” areas. This policy, in its current form, may in our opinion significantly hinder the potential for intensification of these areas which is not consistent with Provincial policy.</p>

9.4.1	<p>This policy requires setbacks for development but does not specify whether these are front, side or rear setbacks. Furthermore, it requires that these setbacks be publicly-accessible.</p> <p>In our opinion this policy is vague and if interpreted to require side yard setbacks will create highly onerous or unachievable requirements especially for small sites, which in many cases would not be appropriate as they would create gaps in the streetscape. We strongly recommend that this section be reworded for clarity.</p>
9.26-9.28	<p>These policies, taken together, will in our opinion create significant implementation challenges for smaller sites which may be appropriate (or may currently having as of right zoning in place for) taller building forms. We strongly recommend that the policies be reworded to provide for more flexibility for smaller sites.</p>

We also have concerns with the process leading up to the release of this current draft which has not provided an opportunity for meaningful consultation and an understanding of how these policies will be applied. We recommend that the Secondary Plan include a transitional protocol for projects in the pipeline and accordingly recommend that consideration of the Secondary Plan be deferred for additional consultation with stakeholders.

We are hopeful that the above comments will be considered by Committee and Council in its consideration of these policies given the significant impact they will have on the development prospects of the subject site, and more generally, on the most important residential and employment growth area in the City, Province, and arguably the Country.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

WND associates
planning + urban design



Andrew Ferancik, MCIP, RPP
Principal