

## Teddington Park Residents Association Inc.

153 Golfdale Road | Toronto, ON | M4N 2C1 | 416.484.9513 | tpra@rogers.com

September 15, 2015

Planning and Growth Management Committee  
Toronto City Hall, 100 Queen Street West  
Toronto, ON M5V 2N2

Attention: Ms. Nancy Martins, Committee Secretariat  
pgmc@toronto.ca

### **Dear Chair Shiner and Members of Planning and Growth Management Committee**

**PG6.6 Mid-Rise Buildings Performance Standards – Monitoring Update**  
**Planning and Growth Management Committee Meeting No. 6 – September 16, 2015**

---

Teddington Park Residents Association Inc. (TPRA) is writing to request the staff report dated August 28, 2015 and the attached recommendations for agenda item PG6.6 be deferred for at least 2 months, to be returned to Planning and Growth Management Committee no sooner than November 16, 2015.

The reasons for this request are:

#### **Failed Due Process:**

TPRA did not receive Notice. TPRA has had a long interest in the Avenues and Mid-Rise Building Study and has been involved since 2010.

TPRA wrote to Council to request to be included in the consultations concerning the extension of the monitoring period of the Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards. And at that point, TPRA asked to be informed in November 2013.

Again in May 2014, TPRA asked why our group was not included in the consultations as directed by Council and again asked for Notice.

Despite having participated in one meeting reiterating our concerns raised as early as 2010, TPRA still did not receive Notice of this 28 page report and 15 pages of recommendations that also include other attachments requesting Planning and Growth Management Committee to approve the proposed changes for ALL the Performance Standards, and update the guidelines to be stylistically formatted into the City of Toronto urban design guideline template.

Failed Notice should not be shrugged off. TPRA once again is asking that Notice be sent to all interested parties and to residents/ratepayers that may be impacted by the changes proposed in this report and its recommendations to allow for adequate time to review and consider and be given the opportunity to provide Council with meaningful representation on public record.

## **Report Completeness & Adequacy:**

TPRA attaches the recommendations. The request is extensive and goes beyond what was directed from Council and the changes called “minor” are not. The consultant’s study focused on the design of mid-rise buildings on the *Avenues* and did not emphasize the importance of neighbourhood stability.

A substantive concern involves Performance Standards 5A-D, originally known as Enhancement Zones (EZ), translated to Neighbourhood Transition Areas (NTAs) for the Eglinton Connects Planning Study, and now appears to be called Rear Transition. Is this the “stylistic” changes this report calls for and does the report provide adequate justification, clarity and certainty? The recommendations are pre-mature.

The monitoring period was to test the Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards for their effectiveness. What was the goals of effectiveness? Why the emphasis on the visual only? How does this play out against infrastructure needs and costs. Is the growth paying for growth? How is the City managing its growth and growth targets? What is the cost to date to provide this design guideline template? And will it serve the local contextual nuances? TPRA believes the report is insufficient and the financial implications have not been adequately considered.

TPRA respectfully requests that the deferral request also consider:

- (i) with a singular focus the effectiveness of the Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards including impacts / rationale as directed by Council;
- (ii) providing a cost update of the Study
- (iii) providing a cost/benefit analysis of the recommendations, and
- (iv) outlining further procedural processes for amendments to the OP and / or Zoning.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

*Eileen Denny*

Eileen Denny, President  
Teddington Park Residents Association Inc.

cc. TPRA Board Secretary  
CORRA Executive

## Attachment 1: Chart of Comments and Recommended Actions

General Comments	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<p><b>Clarity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need for clarity about the role of the Performance Standards as a tool to implement the Official Plan, and how to deal with exceptions. There is also a need to understand how the Performance Standards are to be used in their entirety, not selectively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Performance Standards will be reorganized to follow more directly the organization of Built Form Policies in the Official Plan, and add introductory text for clarification as contained in Staff Report.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Flexibility</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opinions were expressed that the Performance Standards should be ranked in order of priority, and that they should be used on a site specific basis with greater flexibility given to variances that breach the Performance Standards, but not their intent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Performance Standards are flexible, their importance varies by site. The measure of the effectiveness of the guideline is whether it achieves the goals and principles in the Official Plan.</li> <li>See additional criteria added to Performance Standards #4B: Pedestrian Perception Stepback, #8A: Side Property Line: Continuous Street Walls and #10: At-Grade Uses: Residential.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Consistency</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns were expressed regarding the consistency of Staff development reviews between Districts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Standards should be revised and reformatted according to this report for use as part of a city-wide Urban Design Handbook for Building Typologies (Tall, Mid , Low)</li> <li>A new requirement is recommended in the submission packages showing how new development applications compare to the building envelope created by the Performance Standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Definitions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need to clarify the upper and lower thresholds for the Performance Standards, as well as the language of the definitions (ie, 4-11 storeys versus 20-36 metres in height)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Official Plan Built Form policies in section 3.1.2, and include new statements for what defines a mid-rise building.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Applicability of Performance Standards</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was confusion about whether the Performance Standards applied to all <i>Mixed Use</i> sites, including those that are not on <i>Avenues</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend that the Performance Standards should apply to sites that meet all three of these criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In areas with existing land use designations for <i>Mixed Use Areas, Employment, Institutional</i> or some <i>Apartment Neighbourhoods</i> where existing built form context supports mid-rise development AND</li> <li>Front onto Major Streets on Map 3 of the Official Plan AND</li> <li>Have planned right-of-ways 20 metres or wider.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

General Comments	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
		<p>As well, they may apply in some Secondary Plan Areas where the Plan may not be up to date or where they are specifically referenced through comprehensive studies.</p> <p>Furthermore, until additional work can be done, it is recommended that the Mid-rise Building Performance Standards NOT apply to the following sites and conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portions of extra-deep and irregular lots that are beyond the Ideal Minimum Lots Depths as defined in Table 7 from the Study.</li> <li>• <i>Apartment Neighbourhoods</i> where local context and character does not support a repeatable street wall buildings such as tower in the park areas</li> <li>• Base or podium conditions to Tall Buildings.</li> <li>• Secondary Plan Areas unless they are specifically referenced.</li> </ul> <p>As well, introductory text should provide guidance about the appropriate density range for mid-rise buildings.</p>
<p><b>Rental Replacement</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asked to consider providing greater leniency in the size requirements for replacement units as the current requirements were difficult to achieve for mid-rises.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis from a 2012 report titled Potential for Rental Housing Replacement in Mid-Rise Redevelopment Along the <i>Avenues</i>, indicated that modifications to the City's existing rental replacement policies are not warranted or necessary.</li> <li>• Link to the report: <a href="https://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/sipa/files/pdf/120802_mid_rise_rental_replacement_study.pdf">https://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/sipa/files/pdf/120802_mid_rise_rental_replacement_study.pdf</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>Parking Standards</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be reduced as demand is low, particularly in areas close to public transit. Shared Toronto Parking Authority facilities should be encouraged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend that Toronto Parking Authority partnerships be encouraged through site plan review process.</li> </ul>

General Comments	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<b>S.37</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributions should be calculated from the base line of the mid-rise guidelines not on the out-of-date zoning bylaw.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action at this time.</li> </ul>
<b>Amenity Space</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indoor and outdoor amenity space requirements should be lessened or a cash-in-lieu system should be put in place for smaller buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend that private balconies that meet the Performance Standard #12 be encouraged for all units.</li> </ul>
<b>Avenue Studies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avenue studies with more area specific zoning and policies should be encouraged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official Plan policies regarding Avenue and segment studies are under review.</li> </ul>
<b>Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approvals process is lengthy, especially when OMB hearings are held.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action.</li> </ul>
<b>Order of Performance Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In terms of ease of use and consistency, the Performance Standards should follow the order and organization of the Official Plan Built Form policies and the Tall Buildings Guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new guidelines will be stylistically reformatted into the City of Toronto urban design guidelines template, and reordered to follow the Official Plan policies for consistency and clarity.</li> </ul>
<b>Deep Lots &amp; Irregularly Shaped Buildings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For developments on extra deep lots (deeper than 60 metres) the front and rear angular planes can provide consistent impacts, including sunlight to streets, overlook, shadow and transition, but they rise above the recommended height for mid-rise. More guidelines are needed for these extra deep lots.</li> <li>For irregularly shaped building configurations (often resembling 'T', 'U' and 'E' formations), more guidelines are needed on appropriate separation distances between wings and appropriate sideyard property line setbacks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further study and additional guidelines are recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Ontario Municipal Board Hearings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Standards are helpful in early stages of Ontario Municipal Board hearings, but have had less success when relied upon too heavily because they're viewed as guidelines and not law.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include critical Performance Standards such as height, transition and sunlight into Official Plan Built Form policies.</li> </ul>

General Comments	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<b>Heritage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Concern that the 'Character Areas' do not adequately address the local context of all <i>Avenues</i>.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Further Study is recommended to determine if a more nuanced approach to the <i>Avenues</i> element is appropriate to address heritage policies and the 'Character Areas' on the <i>Avenues</i>.</li></ul>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<p><b>#1: Maximum Allowable Height</b></p> <p>The Maximum allowable height of buildings on the Avenues will be no taller than the width of the Avenue ROW, up to a max mid-rise height of 11 storeys (36m)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum height should be 80% of right-of-way width as to not overwhelm some areas with development.</li> <li>• Maximum height should be more flexible and depend on the context of the surrounding area.</li> <li>• This Standard should be a policy in order to give it more teeth.</li> <li>• Should the 1:1 maximum height allowance also apply to non <i>Avenues</i> and Arterial roads that exceed 36m right-of-way (such as Steeles Ave.)?</li> <li>• Consider designating appropriate locations for 'tall building light' (higher scale) buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include principle of a 'ratio of 1:1 between <i>total building height</i> and planned right of way' in the Official Plan's Built Form Policies</li> <li>• Clarify that the definition of <i>total building height</i> is measured as the distance between the elevation of the established grade and the elevation of the highest point on the building (excluding only the mechanical penthouses).</li> <li>• Consider (lower) 0.8:1 ratio (or 16 metre height limit) in Character Areas with 20m right-of-ways.</li> <li>• Consider if any height exceptions may apply.</li> <li>• Clarify that the Performance Standards were not intended to apply to right-of-ways wider than 36m.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#2: Minimum Building Height</b></p> <p>All new buildings on the Avenues must achieve a min. height of 10.5m (up to 3 storeys at the street frontage).</p>	<p>No concerns were expressed.</p> <p>This Performance Standard has been incorporated into amalgamated City-wide Zoning By-Law No. 569-2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further action.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#3: Minimum Ground Floor Height</b></p> <p>The min floor to floor height of the ground floor should be 4.5m to facilitate retail uses at grade.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of positive feedback suggesting we keep the minimum 4.5m floor-to-floor height of the ground floor requirement.</li> <li>• The 4.5m minimum requirement is desirable in a main street condition, but may not be in predominantly residential parts of the <i>Avenues</i>.</li> <li>• Many older streets have shorter ground floors, setting a 4.5 ground floor beside 3m ground floors creates inconsistent cornice lines, making the new buildings seem out of place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend creating criteria for exceptions to this Performance Standard based on retail character of the surrounding area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Correction:</b> Amend Retail Priority Map to include the south side of Bloor Street West that was inadvertently left out in 2010 map due to misinterpretation of the area covered by the Swansea Secondary Plan.</p>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<p><b>#4A: Front Façade: Angular Plane</b></p> <p>The building envelope should allow for a min of 5-hours of sunlight onto the Avenue sidewalks from March 21<sup>st</sup> – Sept 21<sup>st</sup>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 5hrs of sunlight should be increased to 7hrs for areas outside of downtown core.</li> <li>• Angular plane starting at 80% of right-of-way width does not work because it creates high facades in character areas with predominantly low-rise buildings.</li> <li>• This Performance Standard should not be incorporated into comprehensive zoning bylaw because it allows for no flexibility or variation to a street block.</li> <li>• Consider significant exceptions to the angular plane for architectural expression, particularly at corners.</li> <li>• More criteria for the selection of base height other than sunlight requirements and pedestrian perception are needed.</li> <li>• Many developments tend to just stepback at 80% level; there should be more direction for stepbacks at lower levels.</li> <li>• More clarity is needed on what constitutes 5 hours of sunlight and in which places.</li> <li>• 64% of on-line survey respondents believe the Performance Standard achieves the intent of creating great streets with an attractive and comfortable public realm.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include 5 hours of sunlight on adjacent/fronting main streets in Official Plan Built Form Policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Correction:</b> First sentence on page 47 of the <i>Avenues &amp; Mid-Rise Buildings Study</i> to read "This Performance Standard results in a building envelope that allows 5 hours of sunlight access on the opposite sidewalk on east/west <i>Avenues</i>, and combined on both sides of the street for north/south <i>Avenues</i>, as well as..."</p> <p><b>Correction:</b> The diagram on page 47 should more closely match that on page 39, as the diagram on page 47 fails to show the correct upper floor stepbacks and sidewalks</p> <p><b>Correction:</b> Lastly, the diagram on page 47 shows scaled buildings, and it should also show scaled sidewalks (wider on ROWs over 30m).</p>
<p><b>#4B: Pedestrian Perception Stepback</b></p> <p>"Pedestrian Perception" stepbacks may be required to mitigate the perception of height and create comfortable pedestrian conditions for buildings taller than 23 metres.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian perception stepback should be increased for buildings taller than 23m.</li> <li>• Staff have difficulty achieving a 1.5m stepback, recommend switching to 3m as in Tall Buildings Guidelines.</li> <li>• Need to provide more criteria for the selection of a height for the stepbacks other than sunlight requirements and pedestrian perception; existing and planned context of surrounding buildings should be an important criterion in the selection of base height.</li> <li>• Despite this Performance Standard, new buildings in Character Areas have not followed established datum lines;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give clarity to the height of the 1.5 metre stepback according to right-of-way widths (with criteria for exceptions), i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Buildings on 20m right-of-way should have a 1.5m stepback at a height of : 10.5 metres.</li> <li>- Buildings on 27m right-of-way should have a 1.5m stepback at a height of: 13.5 metres.</li> <li>- Buildings on 30m right-of-way should have a 1.5m stepback at a height of: 13.5 metres.</li> <li>- Buildings on 36m right-of-way should have a 1.5m stepback at a height of: 16.5 metres.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consider renaming this to 'Front Façade: Street Wall Stepbacks'</li> </ul>



2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
	<p>need more consistent datum lines in Character Areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend adding this Performance Standard to local Zoning By-Laws where appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#4C: Front Façade: Alignment</b> The front street wall of mid-rise buildings should be built to the front property lines or applicable setback lines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement that 75% of a building's frontage should be built to the setback line is incompatible with certain typologies which may be desirable in residential portions of the <i>Avenues</i> (i.e. courtyard-style buildings that open to the street).</li> <li>Building to front property line is a requirement that is biased to downtown developments; setbacks should be determined based on context, size of streets and landscape objectives.</li> <li>Additional setbacks are often needed to accommodate trees on sidewalks as there are often underground utility constraints that inhibit curbside planting.</li> <li>Need to add wording to ensure sunken pits with below grade residential units are not allowed on mid-rise buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend that criteria be developed for locations where set-backs will be required to achieve a public realm wider than the traditional downtown main street, including areas outside of downtown where a wider sidewalk zone between curb and building face is appropriate.</li> <li>Clarify that this does not necessarily apply to <i>Apartment Neighbourhoods</i> where landscape setbacks are required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#5A-D: Rear Transition</b> The transition between a deep/shallow Avenue property and areas designated Neighbourhoods, Parks and Open Spaces Areas, Natural Areas, Employment Areas and Apartment Neighbourhoods to the rear should be created through setbacks and other provisions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On <i>Avenues</i> with higher order transit (i.e. Eglinton Ave., Bloor St.), consider using the 60 degree angular planes as is already allowed on St. Clair Ave.</li> <li>Angular planes limit heights on shallow lots. Consider permitting properties in the rear to be part of mid-rise development.</li> <li>Elevators and stairs are usually located at the back of buildings, but rear angular planes are pushing them closer to the front of buildings, which is limiting the depth of the retail units at the front of the building.</li> <li>Developers have been accused of using different starting points for the 7.5m setback line depending on what suits them. Suggest more clarity on where the starting point for the 7.5m setback is.</li> <li>This Performance Standard is misleading because it is superseded by the Provincially-mandated separation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rename Performance Standard #5A: 'Rear Transition to neighbourhoods: Deep Properties' to 'Rear Transition to Neighbourhoods: Ideal Properties'</li> <li>Clarify that the 45 degree angular plane is intended to be applied from the ideal lot depth, and not from the property line as described under Performance Standard #5A in the Study. Lots that are extra deep (beyond the Ideal Lot Depth) need additional criteria, transition, study and should be subject to site specific considerations at the time of application.</li> <li>Clarify alternative ways of making a transition in scale with transition homes or low scale apartments on sites which can be serviced without a public lane.</li> <li>Clarify how angular planes make the shape of a cone in areas where lots are of different depths.</li> <li>Recommend adding an additional Performance Standard for extra deep and irregularly shaped lots.</li> </ul>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions										
	<p>distance around <i>Employment</i> uses (which is typically at least 20m)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating a use and scale matrix for all potential scales of adjacent buildings would be helpful.</li> <li>• As many mid-rise buildings do not achieve public lanes, guidelines for mid-rises without lanes would be helpful.</li> <li>• Need to strengthen this Performance Standard as there is a concern that 7.5m setback and angular plane are not being met on enough developments.</li> <li>• Include requirements for tree planting to minimize privacy concerns and create transition.</li> <li>• 63% of survey respondents believed the Performance Standard achieves the intent of reducing the impact of a building on adjacent neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Define alternative ways of making a transition in scale with transition homes on sites which can be serviced in other ways than a public lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include rear transition in the Official Plan's Built Form Policies.</li> <li>• Table 6 from the Performance Standard 5A (below) should be re-labelled to be the Definition of an <i>Ideal Lot</i>:</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="1236 321 2039 586"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1236 321 1635 371">ROW Width</th> <th data-bbox="1635 321 2039 371">Ideal Lot Depth</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1236 371 1635 423">20m</td> <td data-bbox="1635 371 2039 423">32.6m</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1236 423 1635 475">27m</td> <td data-bbox="1635 423 2039 475">41m</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1236 475 1635 527">30.5m</td> <td data-bbox="1635 475 2039 527">44.6m</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1236 527 1635 586">36m</td> <td data-bbox="1635 527 2039 586">51.8m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Correction:</b> The two diagrams on page 55 in the <i>Avenues</i> and <i>Mid-Rise Building Study</i> should reference each other, but instead show two different buildings.</p>	ROW Width	Ideal Lot Depth	20m	32.6m	27m	41m	30.5m	44.6m	36m	51.8m
ROW Width	Ideal Lot Depth											
20m	32.6m											
27m	41m											
30.5m	44.6m											
36m	51.8m											
<p><b>#6: Corner Sites: Heights &amp; Angular Planes</b> On corner sites, the front angular plane and heights that apply to the Avenue frontage will also apply to the secondary street frontage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition in scale required down to local street width, similar to the new Tall Building Guidelines.</li> <li>• A larger sidewalk width is recommended at corner sites</li> <li>• Concern for side street setback and sidewalk widths</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify and cross reference Corner Sites to <b>Performance Standard #8E: Side Property Line Side Street Setbacks</b> to ensure appropriate transition at corners.</li> <li>• Add section on angular planes when the corner site goes deep enough to face <i>Neighbourhood</i> lots.</li> </ul>										
<p><b>#7A: Minimum Sidewalk Zones</b> Mid-rise buildings may be required to be set back at grade to provide a min sidewalk zone</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance is needed to determine in which areas the 4.8m/6m minimum sidewalk width is likely achievable and where it is not, in order to avoid jagged setback conditions. This issue is dealt with individual Avenue studies, but it would be useful to develop a broad approach.</li> <li>• Wider sidewalks are needed on 36m right-of-ways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify that ‘sawtooth’ or uneven setbacks are anticipated in some areas as a temporary condition.</li> <li>• Recommend additional co-ordination with City-wide Complete Streets initiative and District Staff to determine where additional front yard setbacks for landscaping and pedestrians movement may be desired beyond the sidewalk</li> </ul>										

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As mentioned in #4C, sometimes underground utilities are located along the curb which limits the trees' location to the middle of the sidewalk or at the base of the building.</li> </ul>	<p>and boulevard widths of 4.8 and 6 metres.</p>
<p><b>#7B: Streetscapes</b> Avenue streetscapes should provide the highest level of urban design treatment to create beautiful pedestrian environments and great places to shop, work and live.</p>	<p>No concerns expressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend removing this Performance Standard (defer to City wide Streetscape Manual), and complete streets guidelines.</li> <li>Encourage continuous weather protection of streetscapes and set minimum depth for canopies and other forms of pedestrian protection.</li> <li>More direction will be given to the integration of metres and utilities into the building and streetscape.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#8A: Side Property Line: Continuous Street Walls</b> Mid-rise buildings should be built to the side property lines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complaints that this Performance Standard does not allow planting on the edges. Feedback suggests we have exceptions to allow for tree planting along the edges of buildings if the property is close to designated Natural Areas (i.e. High Park).</li> <li>First three floors should be continuous with street wall, but the rest should have upper storey setback and windows</li> <li>Development industry has raised issues with this Standard saying that building to property line poses maintenance issues.</li> <li>More clarity needed regarding what the appropriate separation distances between front facing mid-rise buildings should be.</li> <li>Confusion on whether continuous street walls should be recommended in Official Plan designated <i>Apartment Neighbourhood</i> areas and in mid-rise districts on local streets.</li> <li>A more nuanced approach to 'zero sideyard' buildings could assist in providing greater building articulation, more light into end units and improved appearances of the side of the building from the street in some areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend creating criteria for exceptions when continuous street walls are not needed (i.e. adjacencies to natural areas, parks, heritage buildings, <i>Apartment Neighbourhoods</i> etc).</li> <li>Clarify that the continuous street wall only applies to first 10.5 metres in height, up to a maximum of 6 storeys (see Performance Standard #8C).</li> </ul>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<p><b>#8B: Side Property Line: Limiting Blank Walls</b></p> <p>Blank sidewalls should be designed as an architecturally finished surface and large expanses of blank sidewalls should be avoided.</p>	<p>No concerns expressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#8C: Stepbacks at Upper Storeys</b></p> <p>There should be breaks at upper storeys between new and existing mid-rise buildings that provide sky-views and increased sunlight access to the sidewalk. This can be achieved through side stepbacks at the upper storeys.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More diagrams and explanation needed to explain setback requirements and the difference between 'principle and 'secondary' windows for both existing and new buildings (5.5m to the property line for side/secondary windows, and 7.5. to the property line for primary windows)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify that this is for buildings between 6 storeys and up to 11 storeys in order to avoid massive continuous 36 metre high slab-type buildings.</li> <li>Add diagrams to better illustrate this Performance Standard</li> </ul>
<p><b>#8D: Side Property Line: Existing Side Windows</b></p> <p>Existing buildings with side wall windows should not be negatively impacted by new developments.</p>	<p>No concerns expressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broaden this to deal with existing and future window to the side property lines.</li> <li>Strengthen this Performance Standard to deal with appropriate separation distances between wings and appropriate sideyard property line setbacks in irregularly shaped lots. Minimum setback 5.5 metres for windows.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#8E: Side Property Line: Side Street Setbacks</b></p> <p>Buildings should be setback along the side streets to provide transition to adjacent residential properties with front yard setbacks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to consider depth of parcel and contextual front yard setbacks for better transition on side streets; should look at both the proposed site plan and side elevation in the local context.</li> <li>There is no rationale for the 15% of side street lot frontage and setbacks range given in this Performance Standard. Suggest 25m max depth, then setback on the side streets to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to cross reference with Performance Standard #6.</li> <li>Clarify that the setbacks for 15% of the side frontage is a minimum, more may be appropriate elsewhere</li> <li>Clarify on deep corner sites where the midrise is across the local street from a midrise whose height is set by a much wider street.</li> </ul>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
	match context.	
<p><b>#9: Building Width: Maximum Width</b> Where mid-rise building frontages are more than 60m in width, building facades should be articulated or 'broken up' to ensure that facades are not overly long.</p>	No concerns expressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#10: At-Grade Uses: Residential</b> Where retail at grade is not required, and residential uses are permitted, the design of ground floors should provide adequate public/private transition, through setbacks and other methods, and allow for future conversion to retail uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement of 4.5m setback beyond the sidewalk negatively impacts the design of the buildings on shallow properties. These areas should be flexible so the space can move from residential to retail over time.</li> <li>Standard is bias to major streets. Should align with adjacent building setbacks.</li> <li>Developers sometimes change ground floor use from retail to residential after the zoning is approved, creating residential units with only a 3m setback. Direction needed on how to deal with less than 3m residential setbacks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend including criteria for exceptions outside of downtown or where existing character has landscaped setbacks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Correction:</b> Text of Residential Standard B in the <i>Avenues</i> and <i>Mid-Rise Buildings Study</i> does not match corresponding diagram. Text should match diagram at 3.3m (top right paragraph on page 79, last sentence).</p>
<p><b>#11: Setbacks for Civic Spaces</b> In special circumstances where civic or public spaces are desired, additional setbacks may be encouraged.</p>	No concerns expressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a reference to the Eglinton Connects Planning Study Recommendation #9 which gives further clarity to transit-related plazas.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#12: Balconies &amp; Projections</b> Balconies and other projecting building elements should not negatively impact the public realm or prevent adherence to other Performance Standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider allowing railings to slightly project into angular plane.</li> <li>Balconies are very popular with residents and contribute to eyes on the streets; the restriction on balconies on the second and third floor should be removed (at least on non-major streets).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify that recessed balconies on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors are permitted and encouraged.</li> <li>Recommend that very minor exceptions to the angular planes be permitted only for balcony railings provided that the minimum of 5 hours of sunlight is achieved and wide planters are installed at rear.</li> </ul>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balconies and projections (including railings) should not encroach into setbacks and rear yard setbacks</li> <li>Further guidelines on balconies needed including how balconies can be designed with landscape to avoid overlook and privacy concerns.</li> <li>All units should have balconies – it's more family oriented/owner occupied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add diagrams and details to illustrate how the design of balcony railings (such as wide planters) can help reduce overlook.</li> </ul> <p><b>Correction:</b> Diagrams in <i>Avenues</i> and Mid-Rise Building Study need to be amended to remove balconies that are encroaching into front setbacks (pg 81).</p>
<p><b>#13: Roofs &amp; Roofscapes</b> Mechanical penthouses may exceed the max height limit by up to 5 metres but may not penetrate any angular planes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers are exceeding the 1:1 maximum allowable height by wrapping mechanical penthouse with amenity space or residential space.</li> <li>Wrapping the mechanical penthouse with living and/or amenity space should be permitted, provided that there is no negative shadow impact and compliance with angular plane</li> <li>The maximum size of penthouses should be limited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the definition of <i>total building height</i> which measures the building from the established grade to the elevation of the highest point on the building (excluding only mechanical penthouses).</li> <li>If amenity is provided on the rooftop it must be screened with planters and/or setback to avoid overlook, and landscaped to promote comfortable use and shelter from wind and sun.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#14: Exterior Building Materials</b> Building should utilize high-quality materials selected for their permanence, durability and energy efficiency.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Standard needs more 'teeth' to be helpful, perhaps by outlining types of high quality materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should clarify that this Performance Standard was not intended to preclude innovation, however the basic massing of the building should be repeatable.</li> </ul>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<p><b>#15: Façade Design &amp; Articulation</b></p> <p>Mid-rise buildings will be designed to support the public and commercial function of the Avenue through well articulated and appropriately scaled facades.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Standard needs more 'teeth' to be helpful. Refer to old Urban Design handbook.</li> <li>• This is more than just articulation, it's about harmony and 'fit': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Responding to expressions in existing built form and context, e.g. cornice lines</li> <li>○ Breaking up long facades</li> <li>○ Providing both horizontal and vertical rhythm</li> <li>○ Materials and proportion</li> <li>○ Accentuating entrances, corners, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Reference to the additional details contained in the Eglinton Connects Planning Study Urban Design Guidelines for: building articulation and retail frontages.</li> <li>• Rename this Performance Standard to 'Retail Frontages and Articulation' and elaborate to give more general direction for retail frontages including insets and canopies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#16A, B &amp; #17: Vehicular Access &amp; Loading</b></p> <p>16A: Whenever possible, vehicular access should be provided via local streets and rear lanes, not the Avenue.</p> <p>16B: Mid-block sites without rear lane access, a front driveway may be permitted, provided established criteria are met.</p> <p>17: Loading, servicing and other vehicular related functions should not detract from the uses or attractiveness of the pedestrian realm.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide diagrams for loading and servicing on small sites, underground servicing courts, integration of ramps within the building envelope, and double sided lobby</li> <li>• Consider more flexible arrangements for loading and waste handling in particular the need for Type G spaces. Perhaps considering vehicle loading within (or partially within) the municipal lane, and other innovative designs and operations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional actions recommended at this time, however reference will be made to the extension of new public laneways in 'Feeling Congested' and the Eglinton Connects study.</li> <li>• Recommend Staff continue to compile compliance alternatives to access and loading, in particular on large sites and on sites which are not linear mixed use lots like <i>Avenues</i>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#18: Design Quality</b></p> <p>Mid-rise buildings will reflect design excellence and green building innovation utilizing high-quality materials that acknowledge the public role of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should reference other panels, not just the City's Design Review Panel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend that this Performance Standard is no longer necessary and should be removed.</li> </ul>

2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
the Avenues.		
<p><b>#19A-G: Heritage &amp; Character Areas</b></p> <p>19A: All mid-rise buildings on Avenues should respect and be sensitively integrated with heritage buildings and in the context of HCDs</p> <p>19B: The character and values of HCDs must be respected to ensure that the district is not diminished by incremental or sweeping change.</p> <p>19C: Development adjacent to heritage properties should be sensitive to, and not negatively impact, heritage properties.</p> <p>19D: New mid-rise buildings in Character Areas that have a fine grain, main street fabric should be designed to reflect a similar rhythm of entrances and multiple retail units.</p> <p>19E: Buildings in a Character Area should maintain a consistent cornice line for the first stepback by establishing a 'datum line' or an average of the existing cornice line.</p> <p>19F: Additions to existing buildings is an alternative to redevelopment projects on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fine grain fabric should be extended to more mid-rise developments, not just Character Areas.</li> <li>• Bloor West Village and Bedford Park should be added to Character Area map.</li> <li>• This Standard needs more 'teeth', especially at the OMB.</li> <li>• There have been multiple interpretations applied to the Character Areas. Further direction is needed.</li> <li>• 19G should not be unique to Character Area, but should be applicable where appropriate.</li> <li>• Consider adjacency to Natural Areas/Parks (perhaps by increasing setbacks).</li> <li>• Smaller retail units in some character retail areas.</li> <li>• Implement bigger setbacks from parks, ravines and natural areas</li> <li>• More guidance for older parts of the City that have predominantly 20m right-of-way widths.</li> <li>• Require greater clarity about the intention for these Performance Standards, and the criteria used to identify the areas.</li> <li>• Need more clarity regarding vertical additions (i.e. encourage vertical additions rather than demolition in Character Areas).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify that Performance Standard 19D-G should apply everywhere, not just in Character Areas.</li> <li>• Consider further work to restrict total building height to 16 metres or 80% of the 20 metre right-of-ways for specified Character Areas:</li> </ul> <p><b>Correction:</b> Bloor West Village, defined as the stretch of Bloor St. between Jane St. and Clendenan Ave., should be included in the Character Area map.</p> <p><b>Correction:</b> The Ledburn/Bedford Park Character Area should be extended east to run along Yonge St. between Lawrence Ave. E and Snowden Ave. in order to capture the full extent of the Bedford Park neighbourhood.</p>



2010 Performance Standard	Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff	Recommended Actions
<p>Avenues, and should be encouraged in areas with an existing urban fabric.</p> <p>19G: Additional 'context sensitive' design and massing guidelines should be considered for development in Character Areas.</p>		