

PG21.1.323

From: Jan Hykamp <JHYKAMP@bell.net>
To: <pgmc@toronto.ca>
CC: <WILLADVOCATE@aol.com>, <eileen.denny@rogers.com>
Date: 11:39 am 3/28/2013
Subject: Item PG21.1
Attachments: 201303.05.CORRA.Postiion.Harmonized By-law.doc

To: Frances Pritchard, Committee Administrator
Planning and Growth Management

Re: Statutory Public Meeting for Proposed New City-wide Zoning By-law
Support by position submitted by CORRA

The Greater Beach Neighbourhood Association is an umbrella group of the major resident associations in the greater Beach area (ward 32). We are in endorsing the attached position submitted by the Coalition of Resident and Ratepayer Associations (CORRA).

Kindly distribute our support to the Committee members.

Thank you.

Jan Hykamp
President, GBNA
416-698-0350

www.gbna-toronto.com

POSITION HARMONIZED BY-LAW
of
The Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations in Toronto
(CORRA)

5 March, 2013

To: Frances Pritchard
Committee Administrator
Planning and Growth Management Committee
City of Toronto
10th Floor, West Tower
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario.M5H 2N2

From: William H. Roberts, B.A. LL.B.
Chair
63 SouthKingsway
Toronto, Ontario
M6S 3T4

Re: New City Wide Zoning By-law – PG21.1

1. CORRA is cautiously optimistic with the Proposed New City-wide Zoning By-law. It is an improvement over the previous one introduced in 2010; however how the proposed By-law is being applied in specific neighbourhoods is a matter undergoing specific review by our member associations and groups and other interested parties.
2. Some of our groups have found omissions of provisions in the (x) category that should apply to their area. Other groups have found provisions in the (x) that have introduced requirements that did not previously apply and appear to be different or for a different area.
3. Certain provisions in the general by-law introduce concepts which are not appropriate for the character of a given area.
4. Many of our member groups are still working through the proposed by-law and the related maps and need additional time to review the implications.
5. CORRA would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the administrative chapters of the proposed By-law for overall readability, clarity and consistency in the use of terms being applied. We recognize that this version is vastly improved over the previous 2010 version.

2013 MAR 28 P 4: 18
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
SECRETARIAT SECTION

6. It is CORRA's position that the proposed zoning by-law not be deferred, **provided** CORRA and our member groups have an opportunity to meet with staff to attempt to clarify or resolve the impacts of the general by-law and the specific restrictions and or permissions set out in the (x)s on their areas.
7. We request that staff be directed to meet with CORRA and other affected ratepayer and resident groups to see if the issues can be resolved prior to the first reading of the by-law, and would ask that sufficient time be given before the first reading to allow this to occur. Based on prior experiences we trust that a principled discussion will result in critical revisions being incorporated as appropriate into the general or specific provisions of the by-law.
8. CORRA reserves its right to object should those issues not be resolved.

Kindly find attached a list of issues which is not intended to be exhaustive but is attached simply to highlight some of the points of concern but does not cover all the issues many of which were provided in writing though not in the same format to staff on the 27th of February, 2013.

William H. Roberts, B.A., LL.B.
Chair

CORRA Attachment

This schedule of issues is done only to show some of the points of concern and is not meant to be exhaustive. There are also issues related to the definitions and changes in the wording of various provisions from the earlier June version that are problematic.

1. **Exemption for Mechanicals in Roof/Attic**

The proposed by-law contains a proposal for 20 sq. m. in the attic to be exempted from FSI and the Storey requirements of the By-law. See 10.20.40 .40 (2) and 10.20.40 (8). Effectively you can have a 200 sq. ft. box regardless of the size of the building.

Presently there is an exemption of 10 sq. m. within an attic for FSI calculation. For houses in the 100 sq. m. range this should be more than enough.

Issue: A builder can label an area in the attic for mechanical purposes for the building permit and then go to the Committee of Adjustment for a variance to convert the mechanical space into habitable space.

Possible Solution. This loophole which is not related to the size of smaller homes. A maximum of 20 Sq. m. may make sense for homes in excess of 200 sq. m. but not for smaller homes. For most smaller homes the 10 sq. m. is sufficient.

2. **Building above the second floor on Existing walls**

The former City of Toronto By-law 438-86 allowed for vertical additions to built above the first floor in line with existing walls even if the first floor walls were closer to the lot lines than permitted. The provision was limited to a second floor addition only and was designed to encourage second floor additions to bungalows rather than rear additions.

Issue: Regulation 10.5.40.71 (3) allows for additions on existing walls but with no limit as to the number of floors. This will prove problematic in many areas of the former City of Toronto where the side walls are very close to the side lot line and there is a permission for flat roofs.

Possible Solution. Limit the addition to second floors only as was the case in 438-86.

3. **Cladding**

10.5.40.60(4) allows cladding to be placed on the original exterior surface of the main wall.

Issue: The original provision in 438-86 only permitted cladding for houses predating October 17, 1988. The new provision has no similar limit. A builder could get a variance

Attachment. Page 2

for an existing wall of a relatively new building and then add the cladding on the basis that the wall is an original wall even though it may only been recently completed.

Possible Solution. Reintroduce an appropriate date for the original wall. Alternatively introduce as elsewhere in this by-law a requirement that the original wall and any additions must be at least 5 years old.

Exemption of second parking space

Regulation 10.5.40.40 (3) C) adds an additional exemption for lots with frontages greater than 12m for a second parking space from fsi.

Issue: The former City of Toronto by-laws only exempted the first space regardless of the frontage of the lot. There are many lots in Forest Hill, North Toronto, Swansea and the Beach that have lots with frontages equal to or greater than 12m.

Possible Solution. At a minimum this permission should not apply to lots in the City of Toronto.