

## **ATTACHMENT 8: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

February 24, 2016 Planning and Growth Management Committee

Item PG10.9 Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards: Presentation and Consultation

The following is a summary of comments and questions raised:

- the variety of site conditions encountered along different *Avenues* or in different areas need to be considered and accounted for within the guidelines
- some of the conditions created can be quite severe especially along the street or next to low-rise residential
- guidelines are too often ignored or exceptions expected because they are "just guidelines"
- more articulation of the streetwall is needed
- patterns of projecting windows and recessed doors are effective
- the standards need to be tied to other departments
- other Departments are not opposing developments despite the impacts on existing infrastructure
- more of the guidelines need to be in the Official Plan
- clarify where and how *Avenues* are determined
- clarify staff's opinion on wrapping mechanical penthouses
- lower the thresholds to capture section 37 community benefits from mid-rise development
- understand that mid-rise is important to encourage intensification across the city, but every part of the city is different, it is hard to have a guideline for the entire city
- good development makes good communities
- more measures are needed to mitigate the impacts on the neighbouring community
- we should strive for buildings that are not too imposing on the street; mitigate loss of sunlight; respect local character; achieve appropriate setbacks behind and in front
- heights should be set lower and work up to a height that is not opposed only when certain parameters are met
- we should look to our own precedents and contexts; the roads, character and ambience of European cities are different
- encourage development along arterial corridors, but mitigate local concerns
- mid-rise on major roads not designated as *Avenues* 80% of the ROW
- come forward with a predetermined height, then allow additional height that meets certain measures
- reinforce the concerns respecting mechanical penthouses
- clarify the relationship of the guidelines to Secondary Plan Areas
- support the proposed changes in the Monitoring report, which will give more tools to the review of mid-rise developments
- development in areas with character need to be more realistic with neighbours
- good buildings, in the right place, that respect the existing character are needed
- these tighter guidelines with more tools will help