



**STAFF REPORT
ACTION REQUIRED**

**College Street Study – Official Plan Amendment –
Supplementary Report**

Date:	May 17, 2017
To:	City Council
From:	Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning Division
Wards:	Ward 20 – Trinity-Spadina
Reference Number:	CC17013/13 177789 SPS 00 TM

SUMMARY

This report addresses the communications that were received by the City of Toronto City Clerk's Office in response to the Item TE24.3 College Street Study Official Plan Amendment – Final Report (April 10, 2017) and College Street Study – Official Plan Amendment – Supplementary Report (April 25, 2017). It is in response to the direction from Toronto and East York Community Council that Staff report directly to City Council to respond to the communication received by the City Clerk's Office and matters raised by deputants in response to Item TE24.3.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The City Planning Division recommends that:

1. City Council receive this report for information.

Financial Impact

The recommendations in this report have no financial impact.

DISCUSSION

The following provide a response to the deputants as well as communication received by the City of Toronto City Clerk's Office in response to the Item TE24.3 College Street Study - Official Plan Amendment – Final Report (April 10, 2017) and College Street Study – Official Plan Amendment – Supplementary Report (April 25, 2017)

Letter from Michael Domovich, President, The Domus Group (TE.Supp.TE24.3.1)

Letter Summary:

In this letter, Michael Domovich requests a deferral of the consideration of this application as the Urban Design Guidelines were not available until April 27, 2017. Mr. Domovich also suggests that Character Area B is "too long" compared to the length of Character Areas E and F and should be divided into two sub-areas with higher height permissions for the portion of the area closer to Spadina Avenue. Mr. Domovich also objects to the maximum height allowed in Character Area C and instead believes the area should be a "height peak" of 90 metres. Mr. Domovich indicates he is the owner of a site at 291 College Street and 8R Oxford Street, located in Character Area B, and that, in his opinion, this site is an appropriate site for a tall building.

Staff Response:

Staff do not agree with Mr. Domovich's opinions regarding the need to divide Character Area B into two sub-areas and the need to increase height permissions for the portion of Character Area B closer to Spadina Avenue. Staff also do not agree with Mr. Domovich's desire for a "height peak" of 90 metres at College Street and Spadina Avenue. While Character Area B is located in the *Downtown* as indicated in Map 2 – Urban Structure in the Official Plan, *Downtown* is not intended to be an area occupied uniformly by tall buildings. In Section 2.2.1 – Downtown, the Official Plan states, "While we anticipate and want *Downtown* to accommodate growth, this growth will not be spread uniformly across the whole of *Downtown*". Given the proximity of this Character Area to the Kensington Market and to the low-scale historic main street on the north side of College Street in Character Area A, Staff determined through careful consideration that Character Area B is suitable for a mid-rise built form and is not appropriate for tall buildings.

Staff also do not support making the intersection of College Street and Spadina Avenue a "height peak". The existing scale and character of Spadina Avenue is generally mid-rise and is not appropriate for tall buildings. Staff are currently undertaking a built form study of Spadina Avenue, the "Spadina Study", which will further evaluate what heights are appropriate on Spadina Avenue.

Staff have not received an application for 291 College Street, however do not consider this site to be an appropriate location for a tall building.

Staff also do not consider a deferral of the item warranted. For clarity, the Urban Design Guidelines were available online at the time the supplementary report was posted on April 27, 2017. The Urban Design Guidelines were informed by the feedback that was received through the extensive community consultation process associated with this Study.

Letter from David Bronskill, Goodmans LLP, on behalf of BRL Realty Limited (TE.Supp.TE24.3.2)

Letter Summary:

The letter provided by David Bronskill expresses concern about the College Street Study in relation to a zoning by-law amendment application filed by his client for the properties at 333 College Street and 303 Augusta Avenue submitted in November, 2014. Mr. Bronskill asks that the City either exempt the property at 333 College Street or permit the intensification already recognized by City Staff on a site-specific basis.

Staff Response:

Staff appreciate the concerns of Mr. Bronskill and have been working with his client to achieve an appropriate built form for the application at 333 College Street and 303 Augusta Avenue. Staff anticipate a final report on 333 College in the fall of 2017. The application pre-dates the College Street Study and appropriate transition will be considered in the review of this application. It is expected that the application will meet the general intent of the College Street Study, although there may be minor deviations.

E-mail from Michael Domovich, President, The Domus Group (TE.Supp.TE24.3.3)

Letter Summary:

In his email, Michael Domovich requests deferral as in his opinion the Urban Design Guidelines were released too late and that the changes to the Draft Official Plan Amendment in the supplementary report, College Street Study – Supplementary Report (April 25, 2017), were not technical and should require further public notice.

Staff Response:

Staff also do not consider a deferral of the item warranted. For clarity, the Urban Design Guidelines were available online at the time the supplementary report was posted on April 27, 2017. The Urban Design Guidelines were informed by the feedback that was received through the extensive community consultation process associated with this Study.

Further, Staff consider the changes to the Draft Official Plan Amendment in the College Street Study – Supplementary Report (April 25, 2017) to be technical in nature, serving only to clarify the intent of the Plan and no further notice is required.

Letter from Roslyn Houser, Goodmans LLP, on behalf of 2041134 Ontario Limited (TE.Supp.TE24.3.4)

Letter Summary:

In the letter from Roslyn Houser, Ms. Houser indicates a concern about her client's property at the northeast corner of College Street and Spadina Avenue, in Character Area D, expresses concern over the existence of Character Area D, notably the requirement for 12 metre landscape setbacks. Ms. Houser recommends that Character Area D be exempted from the draft Official Plan Amendment and the Urban Design Guidelines and instead be addressed through the University of Toronto Secondary Plan Review process.

Staff Response:

While Character Area D will be subject to the University of Toronto Secondary Plan Review process, Character Area D fronts College Street, it is the opinion of Staff that this generous landscaped setback on the north side of College Street between Spadina Avenue and McCaul Street is an integral feature to the character of College Street and as such it is appropriate for this to be included as a recommendation from the College Street Study. Staff working on the College Street Study have been in continuous communication with City Staff working on the University of Toronto Secondary Plan review, and there is no perceived conflict with this recommendation and the anticipated direction of the University of Toronto Secondary Plan review. Should this setback requirement be modified in the University of Toronto Secondary Plan, the policies of the University of Toronto Secondary Plan would prevail.

Letter from Signe Leisk, Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP, on behalf of The Governing Council of the University of Toronto (TE.Supp.TE24.3.5)

Letter Summary and Staff Response:

In the letter from Signe Leisk, Ms. Leisk on behalf of her client, the University of Toronto, identifies a concern about the existence of Character Area D and requests the removal of the St. George Campus from the Draft Official Plan Amendment as it is Ms. Leisk's opinion that the St. George Campus is unique as it is not adjacent to a *Neighbourhood*, does not provide market residential uses, and does not provide parkland dedication. Staff do not consider a removal of Character Area D to be appropriate, as the only policies and guidelines that apply to Character Area D are in regards to the landscaped setback on the north side of College Street, which Staff consider to be integral to the character of College Street.

Ms. Leisk also identifies on behalf of her client, a concern with the identification of properties with "heritage potential" and considers "fast tracking of heritage designations outside of the *Ontario Heritage Act* process as inappropriate". In response to this concern, Staff are of the opinion that the identification of potential contributing properties through area studies, such as the College Street Study, is appropriate and staff will be moving forward with further evaluation of these properties for appropriate listing and/or designation, in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The letter also identifies as concern that OPA 368, protecting the view of Knox College, is under appeal and should not be referred to as a policy in Section 4.1.3 of the Design Guidelines. In the opinion of Staff, as OPA 368 has been adopted by City Council, this is a Council-adopted policy and no revisions to the Guidelines are required at this time. Should this policy be modified at the Ontario Municipal Board, appropriate will modifications will be made to the Guidelines.

The letter also indicates a concern about Character Area F and that the rear transition and associated massing policies are "overly restrictive" and "do not recognize the institutional uses and pre-existing massing and densities extending south along McCaul Street immediately outside the study area". Ms. Leisk requests, on behalf of her client, that 167 College Street be removed from the draft Official Plan Amendment and the Urban Design Guidelines. Planning Staff do not agree with the analysis provided by Ms. Leisk on behalf of her client, and are of the opinion that there is a difference in character between the east and west sides of College Street at McCaul Street. The properties on the west side of McCaul Street have more narrow lots than the east side of McCaul Street, with a number of house-form buildings. Further, the setbacks above the base building required in the draft OPA are consistent with what would generally be expected of development as they are consistent with the Mid-Rise Guidelines. Any development over a mid-rise built form would be subject to the Council-adopted OPA 352 for setbacks above 24 metres.

Speaker – Matthew Garnet

Deputant Summary:

Mr. Garnet identified himself as speaking on behalf of The Domus Group and indicated that he had a concern that the proposed heights as they would apply to a property at 291 College Street were not sufficient and should be increased. Mr. Garnet was not able to recommend a height that would be appropriate for this property.

Staff Response:

It is difficult for Staff to consider Mr. Garnet's recommendation when he was not able to provide a numerical value of what he considered to be an appropriate height on for the property at 291 College Street. Based on the proximity of Character Area B to the Kensington Market neighbourhood and the low-rise scale and main street character the opposite side of the College Street, Character Area A, Staff continue to consider a 30 metre height limit appropriate for 291 College Street and the broader Character Area B.

Speaker – Sue Dexter, Harbord Village Residents' Association

Deputant Summary:

Ms. Dexter spoke in support of the College Street Study, in particular expressing support for the public consultation that was undertaken as part of the Study including a walking tour. Ms. Dexter made the recommendation that walking tours be a requirement for consultation in area studies.

Staff Response:

While not a requirement, Staff generally undertake walking tours as part of the consultation process for studies. Staff will take the feedback from Ms. Dexter into consideration and will encourage future area studies to include walking tours.

COMMENTS

Based on a review of the communication provided in response to the College Street Study – Official Plan Amendment – Final Report (April 10, 2017) and College Street Study – Official Plan Amendment – Supplementary Report (April 25, 2017), Staff do not consider any modifications to be necessary to the draft Official Plan Amendment or the Urban Design Guidelines at this time.

CONTACT

Michelle Knieriem, Planner
Tel. No. 416-338-2073
E-mail: michelle.knieriem@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Jennifer Keesmaat, MES MCIP RPP
Chief Planner and Executive Director