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In 2010, Council approved 36 Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards

- Council also requested City staff monitor the Standards
Mid-Rise Monitoring: What’s New?

- **August 28, 2015**
  Monitoring Report

- **October 27, 2015**
  Supplementary Report

- **March 11, 2016**
  Monitoring Report

- **February 24, 2016**
  PG10.9 Mid-Rise Presentation & Consultation
## Mid-Rise Monitoring: What’s New?

**March 11, 2016 Monitoring Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 1:</th>
<th>REVISED “Addendum”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments 2 to 6:</td>
<td>no changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 7:</td>
<td>issues summary in Oct. 27 Supplementary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 8:</td>
<td>NEW summary of Feb. 24 Councillor consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1: Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards Addendum

The following chart is a revised version of the "Chart of Comments and Recommended Actions" included as Attachment 1 in the August 28, 2015 Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards Monitoring report. This revised chart incorporates the recommendations of the October 27, 2015 Supplementary Report, as well as Councillor input from the February 24, 2016 Planning and Growth Management Committee meeting item PG10.9 Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards — Presentation and Consultation, and the deputations and previous motions of Committee and Council on the Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards Monitoring.

Underlined text is used to identify each addition or revision to the chart.

The Addendum is intended to be used by City staff together with the 2010 approved Mid-Rise Buildings Performance Standards where the Performance Standards are deemed applicable to the review of mid-rise developments or preparation of area studies and policies involving mid-rise buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff/Council</th>
<th>Recommended Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>• The Performance Standards will be reviewed 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>• 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. See additional criteria added to Performance Standards #4B: Pedestrian Perceptions: #8A: Side Property Line: Continuous Street Walls and #10: At-Grade Uses: Residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>• Concerns were expressed regarding the consistency of Staff development reviews between Districts.</td>
<td>• Performance Standards should be reviewed and reformatted according to this report for use as part of a city-wide Urban Design Handbook for Building Typologies (Tall, Mid, Low). A new requirement is recommended in the submission packages showing how new development applications compare to the building envelope created by the Performance Standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards Addendum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Feedback from Public/Stakeholders/Staff/Council</th>
<th>Recommended Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>• There is a need to clarify the upper and lower thresholds for the Performance Standards, as well as the language of the definitions, i.e. 4-11 storeys vs. 20-38 metres in height.</td>
<td>• Review Official Plan Built Form policies in section 3.1.2, and include new statements for what defines a midrise building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                                                | • There was confusion about whether the Performance Standards applied to all Mixed Use sites, including those that are not on avenues. | • Recommend that the Performance Standards should apply to sites that meet all three of these criteria:  
  - In areas with existing land use designations for Mixed Use Areas, Employment Areas, Institutional Areas or some Apartment Neighborhoods where existing built form context supports midrise development; AND  
  - Front onto Major Streets or Map 3 of the Official Plan; AND  
  - Their plans height of over 20 storeys consider.  
  Clarify that the Performance Standards may be a useful planning tool where a Secondary Plan supports midrise buildings, but does not regulate built form and does not fully address midrise building design, or where a Secondary Plan is not developed. It is not, however, the intent that the Performance Standards be used on a site-by-site basis to challenge Council approved Area-specific Plans, studies, by-laws or guidelines, particularly with respect to building heights or matters of transition. |
|                                                                                | • There were objections raised to the Performance Standards being applied to Mixed Use Areas, Employment Areas, Institutional Areas or some Apartment Neighborhoods beyond avenues and in areas with Secondary Plans where the plan is not up to date. | • Until additional work can be done, it is recommended that the Midrise Building Performance Standards NOT apply to the following sites and conditions:  
  - Portions of extra-deep and irregular lots that are beyond the Ideal Minimum Lots Depths as defined in Table 7 from the Study;  
  - Apartment Neighborhoods where local context and character does not support a repeatable street wall buildings such as towers in the park areas; OR  
  - Base on plan conditions to Tall Buildings.  
  Introductory text should provide guidance about the appropriate density range for midrise buildings. |
KEY CHANGES in the ADDENDUM
KEY CHANGES in the ADDENDUM:

Applicability of Performance Standards

• Clarification about use in Secondary Plan Areas

• Removal of “not up-to-date” provision
KEY CHANGES in the ADDENDUM:

General Comments:
New Recommended Actions for

• Role of Guidelines
• Context
• Infrastructure
• Consultation

Official Plan Review Public Consultation
– Urban Design Matters –
KEY CHANGES in the ADDENDUM:

Performance Standard #1
Maximum Allowable Height

• Distinction between definition of mid-rise vs. permitted heights

• 1:1 not “as-of-right” (0.8:1 ratio)

• Multiple factors determine height (context, site geometry)
KEY CHANGES in the ADDENDUM:
Performance Standard #4B
Pedestrian Perception Stepback

• Streetwall height and upper floor stepbacks to reinforce character
KEY CHANGES in the ADDENDUM:
Performance Standard #13
Roofs & Roofscapes

• Minimizing/eliminating rooftop mechanical
• Reinforcing fit within building height ratio
Summary of Report Recommendations

1) Approve “the Addendum” to be used together with the 2010 approved Performance Standards until such time as updated Mid-Rise Guidelines are considered by Council (2017)

2) Request staff to consult further on mid-rise issues and propose new Official Plan policies for mid-rise buildings
Mid-Rise Work Program

2016

• **Official Plan Review:**
  Urban Design Phase I Policy Development
  – New Draft Policies for Mid-Rise Buildings

2017

• **Mid-Rise Building Guidelines:**
  Update Project
  – City-wide Urban Design Guidelines for Mid-rise