



REPORT FOR ACTION

Minister's Approval of Official Plan Amendments 405 (Yonge-Eglinton) and 406 (Downtown) with Modifications and Staff's Preliminary Assessment of Potential Impacts of Bill 108

Date: July 12, 2019

To: City Council

From: Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning

Wards: 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15

SUMMARY

This report summarizes the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing's (the "Minister") modifications of Official Plan Amendments 405 (Yonge-Eglinton) and 406 (Downtown). This report also provides a preliminary assessment of the potential effect of the Decisions and the impact associated with Bill 108 on the Secondary Plans.

Official Plan Amendments 405 and 406 ("OPA 405" and "OPA 406")

Official Plan Amendments for the Downtown and Yonge-Eglinton areas were submitted to the Minister pursuant to Section 26 of the *Planning Act* in August 2018. On June 5, 2019, the Minister issued two Notices of Decision (the "Decisions") approving Official Plan Amendment No. 405 (Yonge-Eglinton) and Official Plan Amendment No. 406 (Downtown Plan) with modifications. The Minister's Decisions are final and not subject to appeal. Additionally, in accordance with the *Planning Act*, the two OPAs cannot be amended for a 2 year period except at the determination of Council. The Official Plan Amendments are now in full force and effect.

Each Notice of Decision made a number of modifications to the respective Secondary Plans adopted by City Council. The Minister made 194 modifications to the Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan and 224 modifications to the Downtown Plan. Many of the modifications are similar in both plans. The specificity, such as various numeric standards, that had been included in policy directions in both plans to provide certainty and predictability has been generally reduced and replaced with more policy guidance and less prescriptive terminology. Other similar changes to both OPAs included introducing new policies, such as an objective related to "transit optimization", directing transit-supportive development within the vicinity of transit stations.

Copies of both the in-force Secondary Plans which incorporate the modifications as well as redline versions which show the modifications are attached to this report as Attachments 1 through 4.

Bill 108

Bill 108, which amends 13 pieces of legislation, received Royal Assent on June 6, 2019. It has not yet been proclaimed. A number of the modifications made to both Official Plan Amendments align with provisions in Bill 108, specifically as they relate to the new community benefits charge authority and the removal of an alternative parkland dedication requirement for the development or redevelopment of land for residential purposes.

In the absence of the detailed information to be released through Bill 108's implementing regulations, it is difficult to fully assess the implications of Bill 108 on the two Secondary Plans. Detailed analysis that was previously undertaken for the two areas, as well as ongoing work related to the infrastructure implementation strategies for both areas and parkland dedication will inform ongoing discussions with the Province on the regulations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning recommends that:

1. City Council receive this report for information.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommendations in this report have no financial impact. The Minister's Decisions are expected to create numerous changes to the demand for and funding of development related infrastructure as described herein. The financial impacts associated with the Minister's Decisions, and specifically as they relate to Bill 108, are not yet known. The Province has emphasized that one of its goals in establishing the new community benefits approaches is to maintain municipal revenues related to development.

DECISION HISTORY

OPA 405 and OPA 406

City Council adopted the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA 405) at its July 23, 2018 meeting pursuant to Section 26 of the *Planning Act*. City Council's decision can be found here: <http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2018.PG31.7>

City Council adopted the Downtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA 406) at its meeting on May 22-24, 2018 meeting pursuant to Section 26 of the *Planning Act*, and the Bill was enacted at the July 24-26th, 2018 Council meeting. City Council's decision can be found here: <http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2018.PG29.4>

OPAs 405 and 406 were submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing on August 9, 2018 for Ministerial review and approval. The Minister issued its Decision approving the OPAs on June 5, 2019. The Decisions can be found here:

- Midtown - <https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/refdocs/11188.pdf>
- Downtown - <https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/refdocs/11189.pdf>

Additional information on the Midtown in Focus initiative can be found at www.toronto.ca/midtowninfocus. Additional information on TOcore: Planning Downtown, the four-year study that led to the Downtown Official Plan Amendment, and 5 associated infrastructure strategies can be found here: www.toronto.ca/tocore

Bill 108

On May 2, 2019, the provincial government released Bill 108 – the More Homes, More Choice Act for review and comment. City Council adopted the recommendations in the Proposed Bill 108 (More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019) and the Housing Supply Action Plan - Preliminary City Comments report on May 14, 2019 in advance of the commenting deadline of June 1, 2019. The comments were forwarded to the Province and posted on the Environmental Registry of Ontario. The report and Council decision can be found here:

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2019.CC7.3>.

On June 6, 2019 Bill 108 received Royal Assent. The Bill has not yet been proclaimed. Three draft regulations related to the Development Charges Act, Transition under the *Planning Act* and the new community benefits charge were released for review and comment on June 21, 2019. The deadline for comments on the 3 regulations is August 6th (Transition regulation) and August 21st (Development Charges and Community Benefits Charge).

COMMENTS

OPA 405 and 406 – Common Modifications

The Decisions from the Minister contain a number of common revisions to both Secondary Plans. Both Secondary Plans introduced clear and predictable policy frameworks to guide and shape growth in the respective Secondary Plan areas and to address context-specific issues each area was experiencing. The Secondary Plans built on policy direction in the City's Official Plan. For the most part, the impact of the Minister's modifications is the removal of the specificity, such as numeric standards, included in a number of policy directions in both Plans and the use of less prescriptive terminology. This may result in more and longer negotiations on a site-by-site basis and/or varying interpretations with respect to matters that may be appealed to the Local

Planning and Appeal Tribunal. The common policy modifications to both Secondary Plans are discussed below.

Alignment with Bill 108 provisions and its stated objective of making it easier to increase the supply of housing.

The modifications to both plans clarify that residential intensification is generally permitted throughout the Secondary Plan areas, consistent with the Province's stated goal to increase housing supply. The Decisions also:

- remove the ability for the City to have area-specific alternative parkland requirements for these two high-growth areas; and
- delete policies related to Section 37 community benefits and introduce policy language regarding the new community benefits authority, providing an indication of the types of matters that are addressed in the recently released draft regulation or will be in forthcoming regulations.

Additional detail on the impacts of Bill 108 and related modifications to both OPAs are discussed further in this report.

Emphasis on transit infrastructure and investment as a primary driver for more intense development.

The modifications insert new 'transit optimization' policies into both Secondary Plans and in a number of instances refer to ensuring 'transit-supportive' development, which is a defined term in the Growth Plan. This may result in applications for taller and more intense buildings in proximity to transit stations that will continue to be reviewed taking into consideration the local context and other policies in the two Plans, as well as with other Official Plan policies.

Removal of the requirements for new development to provide additional space for jobs and businesses.

Both Secondary Plans introduced policies to grow and protect employment in the Secondary Plan areas and included requirements to replace all office floor area and minimum requirements in certain areas to grow employment uses and limiting new residential in portions of the Downtown. The Minister's Decision enshrines the office replacement requirement in the Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan area and in the Financial and Health Sciences Districts and Bloor-Bay Office Corridor in the Downtown, and 'encourages' replacement in the King-Spadina and King-Parliament areas. The office replacement requirement had been an area of appeal associated with Official Plan Amendment 231. With the Minister's Decision, it is now in full force and effect for both Secondary Plan areas, protecting close to 60 per cent of the total office GFA in the city.

The minimum requirements to grow non-residential uses and the limitations on new residential uses have been deleted while still enabling the City to advance these requirements through other means. For instance, the Minister's Decision continues to recognize the planned function of the Yonge-Eglinton Centre as a major centre of

economic activity with office uses and other key economic sectors. Similarly, in the approved Downtown Plan, the Minister recognized that the Downtown will continue to be an economic driver with a requirement to protect and promote non-residential uses in the Downtown's major employment clusters.

Removal of the specificity that identified minimum requirements for the design of buildings and siting of development to improve the public realm.

Both Secondary Plans placed an emphasis on the public realm to ensure improvements took place in lock-step with development, but also to safeguard the liveability of both areas. Both plans had specific requirements for development to support a high-quality public realm, such as minimum setback requirements in certain areas. The modifications retain the general intent of the public realm policy direction, but replace the specificity with language that speaks to 'reasonable setbacks'. The Council endorsed Parks and Public Realm Plans, inclusive of the 2014 Midtown in Focus Parks, Open Space and Streetscape Master Plan, for the two areas will be used to assist in clarifying the public realm objectives for the two areas and what is 'reasonable' by means of specific standards either as part of site-specific applications or area initiatives.

Sunlight protection for parks and other public spaces.

Policies were included in both Secondary Plans related to sunlight protection to ensure good sunlight on parks and sidewalks during the spring and fall equinoxes. This was important given the anticipated height and density of buildings, the desire to maintain the usability and comfort of these spaces especially in the shoulder seasons and to reflect the benefits of sunlight for human health. The modified policies recognize the need for 'adequate' sunlight on parks and other public spaces and, in some instances, continue to recognize the importance of protecting access to sunlight on certain public spaces. The background analysis to develop the initial Council-adopted policies will be used as the basis for determining what the tests for 'adequate' sunlight mean in considering development applications and implementing the Secondary Plans.

Direction that the City must ensure infrastructure in tandem with development, while deleting policies that link the provision of infrastructure directly to development approval.

Both Secondary Plans were developed as integrated planning processes and were accompanied by a series of infrastructure plans, strategies and assessments. A key policy direction of OPA 405 and 406 was to link the provision of infrastructure to growth. The modifications continue to recognize the need for infrastructure to support growth, however, they place more onus on the City to ensure and/or secure the required infrastructure in tandem with growth.

In order for the City to successfully ensure infrastructure is provided in tandem with growth, a full suite of planning and financial tools will be required, inclusive of the Minister's commitment of ensuring revenue neutrality as part of the implementation of Bill 108. Additionally, these modifications may result in the need for increased use of holding provisions and other measures while further analysis is completed as part of the development of the Council-directed infrastructure implementation strategies for the two

areas. City staff are and will proactively assess the need to apply holding provisions, as permitted by the City's Official Plan, and will update the infrastructure needs associated with the additional intensification now contemplated by the Minister's Decisions.

Community facilities and replacement of existing community facilities.

The Council-adopted Plans provided direction related to securing a range of community service facilities as part of development and direction for the type of space to be secured. For the most part, the Minister's Decision retains this direction while also recognizing community service facilities as community benefits under Bill 108. The Plans also required the replacement of any existing on-site community service facilities to ensure no loss of this type of space and provided an incentive where space was being retained. The Minister's Decisions continues to incentivize the replacement of existing community service facility space, while no longer specifically stating that development is required to replace community space. Existing community service facility space, in addition to new facilities, and as identified in the respective Community and Service Facilities Strategies, will continue to be needed to support development.

Requirements for two- and three- bedroom units.

The Council adopted Plans included requirements for 2- and 3-bedroom units in buildings with more than 80 units. The Decision maintains the requirement for 10 per cent 3-bedroom, 15 per cent 2-bedroom and 15 per cent convertible units. This is a positive outcome as it enables the City to require a specific unit mix in new developments. However, the minimum size requirements of these larger units was removed.

Water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure.

The Plans included two policies related to water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure. The Decisions changed one of the policies to specifically note the "City will ensure" the maintenance and provision of infrastructure. Local servicing required for development has and will continue to be the responsibility of the developer and the City will continue to ensure this is provided as part of development. Further, and similar to the above, where infrastructure upgrades are required to support the level of intensification proposed in particular areas, the City may use holding provisions more frequently to ensure the required infrastructure is in place.

Additionally, the Decisions changed policies that identified that development will reduce the negative impacts of inflow and infiltration on the capacity of the City's sewer systems. The Decisions changed the policy in each Plan to note that new development, in some circumstances, will offer an opportunity to reduce the negative impacts of inflow and infiltration. The City will continue to not permit development that would negatively impact the capacity of the City's sewer system through inflow and infiltration associated with development, or approvals may be conditional on inflow and infiltration issues associated with a development being adequately addressed to the City's satisfaction.

Introduction of a transition provision.

By way of Ministerial modification, the Minister included a transition policy in both Secondary Plans clarifying that the Plans only apply to applications submitted after June 5, 2019. Applications submitted prior to June 5, 2019 that are not withdrawn are to be evaluated based on pre-existing plans and policies.

OPA 405 – Specific Modifications

The Council adopted OPA 405 for the Yonge-Eglinton area was a comprehensive, detailed plan that included specificity on a wide range of matters that was developed over a three year process with considerable analysis and consultation. The Minister's modifications to OPA 405 largely maintain the concepts and ideas of the Secondary Plan. It also continues to provide a much more robust policy framework for the area than previously existed. However, in many instances it removes the numeric standards and specificity and generally provides more flexibility for tall buildings in more areas.

A number of the modifications also make reference to the actual standards being included in the Zoning By-law, signalling that the Minister was of the view that the level of detail included in the Plan was more appropriate for zoning, either on a site-specific basis or as a City-initiated Zoning By-law Amendment. A summary of the modifications made by the Province to the OPA is provided below based on thematic areas in the Secondary Plan.

Character Areas (Section 1.3)

The Council adopted Plan identified 22 character areas and included vision statements for each character area, describing the form, scale and type of development anticipated in each character area. The Minister's decision retains the character area approach. However, it modifies a number of the vision statements by removing references to specific building types being permitted, such as mid-rise buildings, and removes the limitations on the number of tall buildings and building height directions that were included. It also changes other aspects of the vision statements that were intended to ensure good living and working environments. By way of example, a number of the vision statements spoke to the need for 'generous' spacing between tall buildings. This has now been replaced with 'appropriate' spacing between tall buildings.

Low-Rise Neighbourhoods (Section 2.1)

The Council adopted Plan included a policy related to the *Neighbourhood* designated lands that provided opportunities for more intensive low-rise development in some areas and spoke to development in the balance of *Neighbourhood* areas being in accordance with the Official Plan's development criteria. The decision retains this direction with revised terminology while encouraging 'compatible intensification where appropriate' in the balance of Neighbourhood areas.

The Provision of Infrastructure (Section 2.1)

The Council adopted Plan included policies that defined infrastructure (physical infrastructure, community service facilities, green infrastructure and parks) and a policy

that development will not be permitted to outpace the provision of infrastructure. The infrastructure definition largely remains the same except schools are omitted from the definition in the Decision. The infrastructure policy has been replaced with a new policy that speaks to planning for infrastructure in an integrated manner, leveraging infrastructure investment to direct growth and development and facilitating higher density development around transit. It also adds a new policy requiring the City to provide infrastructure in tandem with development. This will only be possible where the City continues to be provided with the financial and planning tools to support the provision of infrastructure.

Related to the provision of infrastructure policies, the Minister made a minor modification to the infrastructure implementation strategies policies in Section 9 of the Secondary Plan clarifying that the infrastructure implementation strategies are required to be prepared by the City. Development of these implementation strategies is in process, but delayed until all details associated with Bill 108 are released. The infrastructure assessments will also need to be updated as part of the development of the infrastructure implementation strategies to reflect the potential additional height and density permissions contemplated by the Minister's Decision.

Midtown Transit Station Areas (Section 2.4)

The Council adopted Plan provided policy directions for Yonge-Eglinton's five transit stations and readied the Plan to meet the Growth Plan requirements for delineating the area's 'major transit station areas'. It included two types of transit station areas – Nodes and Corridors – and included a 'Built-Up Zone' that largely consisted of low-rise residential areas.

The Minister's Decision retains the transit station areas and does not make any revisions to the boundaries which were generally based on a 500-metre radius. However, the Decision revises a number of the policies and adds new policies that speak to 'transit-supportive development', multi-modal access, and supporting development. The Minister introduced a new policy that directs that the highest density development will be located in close proximity to transit stations, which was already achieved with the Council-adopted Plan. The new policy also speaks to encouraging development that is integrated with a transit station.

Additionally, the Council-adopted Plan included minimum population and employment targets for each of the transit station areas that met or exceeded Growth Plan requirements. The Minister's Decision retained the targets for the Yonge-Eglinton, Davisville and Mount Pleasant Transit Station Areas, but increased the Leaside, Chaplin and Avenue targets to 200 people and jobs per hectare from 160 people and jobs per hectare.

Land Use (Section 2.5)

OPA 405 included a number of land use redesignations to Map 17 of the Official Plan for the Secondary Plan area. Some of the redesignations were to ensure viable development parcels and to ensure a consistent lot fabric. Some of the redesignations also supported the Secondary Plan's parks and open space network plan by

designating key sites as *Parks and Open Space Areas*, such as the open-cut subway trench between Chaplin Crescent and Berwick Avenue. The Minister made no changes to any of the land use designations.

The Council-adopted Secondary Plan also included a land use plan with more detailed land use designations and land use permissions for each designation shown on the plan. It also included policies to protect existing office uses and requirements in some areas for additional space for jobs (office, institutional or cultural). The Yonge-Eglinton area has not experienced any employment growth since 1991 and has lost office space. The intent of Council's minimum space requirement was to ensure that as the area further intensified, more jobs were created in proximity to transit.

The Decision makes no changes to the land use plan. It adds specific reference to residential intensification to a number of the land use permissions for each designation even though the Council-adopted Plan permitted residential uses in all areas. The most significant change is the deletion of the minimum requirement for office, institutional or cultural uses while enshrining the office replacement requirement and still recognizing the need generally for employment uses to both support transit investment and the Urban Growth Centre. The Decision provides more flexibility for where office replacement can happen which will require additional negotiation on a site-by-site basis. The Minister's Decision identifies that office replacement may be transferred to a receiving site in the Secondary Plan area, whereas the Council-adopted Plan required the replacement to be either within the character area where the office is located or within lands designated *Mixed Use Areas A or B*. Nonetheless, and as noted above, the retention of the office replacement requirement in the area is positive.

Public Realm Improvements (Section 3.1 and 3.2)

In 2015, City Council adopted Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 289 which amended the Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan. This amendment included policy directions to support improvements to streets, parks, and open spaces within a smaller geography centred around the Yonge-Eglinton intersection. The primary purpose of the amendment was the introduction of requirements for landscaped setbacks of varying widths adjacent to public streets in support of five Public Realm Moves. The OPA was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board and was subsequently brought into effect by the OMB in May 2018 save for specific sites. The Council-adopted Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan retained the OMB approved policies and included a series of new Public Realm moves with landscaped setback requirements in the Davisville area and along Bayview Avenue and portions of Mount Pleasant Road.

The Minister's Decision retains much of the area-wide public realm policies and concepts, such as the Public Realm Moves. However, improvements to the public realm secured through development may be limited with Bill 108. More detail is needed to fully understand the impacts of Bill 108 and modifications made to the Secondary Plan by the Minister. The Minister's Decision also removes numeric references for the landscaped setbacks and in all instances replaces the numeric requirement with the language 'a reasonable setback'. Given the detailed work undertaken as part of the first phase of Midtown in Focus with the Parks, Streetscape and Open Space Plan, the previous OMB approved OPA and additional analysis in the balance of the Secondary

Plan area as part of OPA 405, in staff's professional opinion, the setbacks previously established are reasonable and have been secured in many development applications in the area.

Parks and Open Spaces (Section 3.3)

The Council adopted Plan included a parks and open space network plan that identified the conceptual location of new parks and open spaces and provided clear, transparent and predictable direction for securing new parks. Excluding the potential decking of the subway trench and Davisville Yard, approximately 14 hectares of new parkland was identified to support the growth planned within the Secondary Plan area.

The Minister's Decision makes no changes to the parks and open space network plan. It does, however, stipulate that it is the City's responsibility to secure and acquire the lands identified as "Proposed Parks". The Council-adopted Plan also included policies enabling an area-specific alternative parkland requirement that was to be established by by-law. These are deleted by the Minister's Decision, as well as other changes introduced to reflect Bill 108. A new, area specific alternative parkland requirement is no longer possible given Bill 108. This is addressed in more detail in the Bill 108 section of this report.

Mobility (Section 4)

The Minister made minor modifications to the Secondary Plan's mobility section and largely the modifications relate to identifying certain matters as being provided in accordance with the legislative framework for community benefits. The Secondary Plan continues to have direction for streets, laneways, mid-block connections, cycling, transit, travel demand management and parking. Additionally, the Minister made no modifications to planned street widenings included in the OPA for Davisville and portions of Mount Pleasant Road. The street widenings will assist in ensuring complete streets and are secured as part of Site Plan Control applications.

Heritage Conservation (Section 5.2)

The Council-adopted Secondary Plan included additional policy direction related to heritage resources to supplement direction in the City's Official Plan. The Secondary Plan included a map of properties with cultural heritage potential, and included policy directions to conserve attributes of these properties in addition to those already listed or designated. Additionally, Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) were required for any development on or adjacent to properties with cultural heritage potential. Timely identification of heritage properties, prior to the submission of development applications, will put City Planning in a stronger position to conserve cultural heritage resources.

The Minister retained the map, but deleted requirements for the HIAs to be submitted for potential cultural heritage resources unless listed or designated on the City's Heritage Register at the time of application. The map continues to provide clarity for property owners to understand if their property does or does not have cultural heritage value, and to plan accordingly. The City's Official Plan policies related to complete applications will continue to apply.

Heritage Preservation Services is completing the necessary assessment of properties identified on the map that merit inclusion on the City's Heritage Register and will bring forward a staff report to Planning and Housing Committee and City Council.

Permitted Building Types and Urban Design Standards (Section 5.3)

The Council-adopted Yonge-Eglinton Plan included detailed direction for the types of buildings (low-rise, mid-rise, tall buildings and infill development on apartment building sites) permitted in different areas. It included a series of maps that identified permitted building types and building heights on a site or area basis and the Plan provided detailed urban design standards, such as stepping back building mass above certain heights and spacing requirements between buildings, for the different building types and tailored to the specific character areas. The Minister's Decision deleted the maps. The Minister's Decision retains the different categories of building types, redefines some building types (e.g. mid-rise buildings are now 5 to 12 storeys in height rather than 5 to 10) and generally retains policy related to the massing of buildings, except precise numeric standards are deleted with few exceptions.

The deletion of these maps creates an issue with respect to areas that were identified as "Special Study Areas" as the Special Study Areas were identified on the maps. The deletion of the maps, in combination with the Special Study Areas policies, means that all school properties in the Secondary Plan area would be considered Special Study Areas, whereas the Council-adopted Plan only identified certain school properties. Canada Square and the Davisville Yard continue to be identified as Special Study Areas in the approved policies and no modifications were made to the policies. A city-initiated amendment to the Secondary Plan may be advanced to address the Special Study Areas issue associated with schools, along with other minor revisions to address some inconsistencies with the modifications.

Building Heights (Section 5.4)

The Council-adopted Plan set out maximum building heights for the 22 character areas. The building height limits were included in storeys and metres on the permitted building type and height limit maps. As noted, these maps have been deleted along with policy directions that spoke to or clarified how building heights are determined. The maps have been replaced by a new policy that provides 'guidance' for building heights and height ranges for each of the character areas. Attachment 5 provides a comparison of the staff recommended height limits, the Council-adopted height limits and the new guidance introduced by the Minister's Decision. The Decision identifies that specific height limits are to be set in implementing zoning (site-specific or City-initiated) and that the height limits could be higher or lower than as set out in the guidance.

Implementation (Section 9)

The Council adopted Plan for Yonge-Eglinton included policy directions to provide predictable and transparent application of Section 37 public benefits. This has been deleted in the Minister's Decision, along with holding provision policies tailored to the area and a policy requiring transportation certification reports to be submitted as part of a complete application. The requirement for construction management plans, which was

introduced in recognition of the impacts from construction in the area, was retained with a minor revision that these are to be submitted at Site Plan Control stage only.

The City's Official Plan continues to include policies enabling the use of holding provisions which can be relied on in the area. The transportation certification report requirement was intended to assess multi-modal transportation capacity more holistically and in recognition of the Line 1 subway capacity issues. Other transportation assessment reports will continue to be required to be submitted as part of complete applications. City staff will be discussing the optimal approach for ensuring that all modes of travel are adequately accounted for in the various transportation assessments.

OPA 406 – Specific Modifications

A Long-Range Vision for Downtown

Despite Ministerial modifications that change how the plan will be implemented, this Decision has brought into force a long-range planning vision and a series of aspirational goals for Toronto's Downtown for the next 25 years. The Plan provides an overall structure for growth Downtown by defining four Mixed Use Areas, the Financial and Health Sciences Districts as well as acknowledging in policy the key moves in the Parks and Public Realm Plan. It also has put in place other important policies pertaining to Downtown's shift toward sustainable transportation, improved public space networks, support for arts and culture, and transformation towards a low-carbon and more resilient future.

Linking Infrastructure with Growth to Support Liveability.

An overall theme of the Downtown Plan was to link the provision of infrastructure to growth and the increase in residents and jobs. The policy intent was to ensure that Downtown remains strong, liveable and healthy. The Decision modified the policies as follows:

Policy 3.1 amended – "Growth will be accompanied by the community service facilities, parkland, green infrastructure and physical infrastructure required to support complete communities..." This has been amended to: "The provision of community service facilities, parkland, green infrastructure and physical infrastructure is encouraged to support complete communities..."

Policy 3.18 deleted – "The provision of infrastructure – community service facilities, parkland, green infrastructure and physical infrastructure – will be commensurate with the intensity of development and the number of residents and workers generated".

Policy 5.2 deleted – "Development will be evaluated based on the availability and provision of community service facilities, parkland, green infrastructure and physical infrastructure relative to the number of people it will generate, to provide for the achievement of complete communities."

Policy 14.3 remains in the Plan and is in-force. It states that, "Development of lands within Downtown will be reviewed to ensure the adequacy of community service

facilities, green infrastructure, physical infrastructure and parkland. Staging or phasing of development will be provided for where necessary and appropriate to coordinate City action." The City will continue to ensure that any development approval considers the availability of infrastructure to support growth.

Protecting Space for New Jobs

The Council-adopted Downtown Plan contained a number of policies to ensure there was sufficient space to accommodate long-term employment growth and support the expansion of healthcare and other institutions. The Decision has modified certain policies that prioritized non-residential land uses in the Financial District, Health Sciences District and Bay-Bloor Office Corridor, as well as in the King-Spadina and King-Parliament areas where creative industries and the culture sector are clustered. Examples include:

Policies 6.2.3 and 6.15.2 *deleted* - In the Financial District and Health Sciences District, the Council-adopted Downtown Plan contained two policies that limited residential development to existing as-of-right zoning permissions. The Decision has deleted both of these policies, which would have supplemented other policies that prioritize non-residential development in these two significant employment clusters.

Policies 6.8.2 amended - In the King-Spadina and King-Parliament Areas, a minimum of 25% of the area of new buildings was required to be for non-residential uses or the replacement of all existing non-residential gross floor area. The Decision has modified this requirement and replaced it with a policy that encourages the replacement of existing non-residential gross floor area in any redevelopment, including potential replacement of cultural spaces as a community benefit.

The Decision maintains the requirement for the replacement of non-residential uses through development in the Financial District and Health Sciences District. In addition, Policies 6.1 and 6.13 require the protection of opportunities to increase non-residential uses in these two Districts to accommodate future job growth.

Scale of Development on Main Streets

The Council-approved Downtown Plan defined Mixed Use Areas 3 as those areas with a mainstreet character where mid-rise buildings are the appropriate scale of development, generally with heights the width of the right-of-way and setbacks to provide a pedestrian scale and sunlight on sidewalks. The Decision may allow some tall buildings in Mixed Use Areas 3 based on compatibility. In addition, Council-approved policies that provided specificity in transition in scale to adjacent areas and maintenance of sunlight on sidewalks were replaced with more general policy language that requires the assessment of mid-rise development proposals through the performance standards contained in the Avenues and Mid-Rise Building Study and other urban design objectives.

Intensity of Development Adjacent to Rapid Transit Stations

The Council-adopted Downtown Plan provided that a study would be undertaken for areas within 500 metres from planned rapid transit station (Policy 6.35). The Decision has added policies to this section of the Plan that require the City to plan to accommodate higher density development around existing and planned transit stations to optimize return on public investment in transit. New policy language has also been added that development in these areas will be supported by fostering collaboration between the public and private sectors and the provision of alternative development standards.

A Walkable Downtown

The Downtown Plan required that buildings be setback to ensure a minimum of 6 metres from curb to building face in most areas of Downtown to achieve wider sidewalks for pedestrians (Policy 9.5). This policy has been deleted. The City may now secure the setback on a site-by-site basis, but public access may not be required and any easement secured may be deemed a community benefit.

Parks and Open Spaces

The Council-adopted Downtown Plan is linked to the Downtown Parks and Public Realm Plan, one of the five associated infrastructure strategies, and contains policies that identify the key conceptual initiatives for the development of an expanded, improved, connected and accessible network of parks and public spaces to support a growing Downtown. It also included policies enabling an area-specific alternative parkland requirement that was to be established by by-law. The Minister's Decision resulted in only minor modifications to the policies aligned to the Downtown Parks and Public Realm Plan. However, the Minister's Decision removes the policies pertaining to a Downtown-specific alternative parkland requirement, placing more onus on the City to secure and acquire lands for new parks using the community benefits charge. This is addressed in more detail in the Bill 108 section of the report.

Protecting Parks from Shadow

Policy 9.18 -- "Development will not cast net-new shadow as measured from March 21st to September 21st from 10:18 a.m. - 4:18 p.m. on parks and open spaces indicated on Map 41-13." The 'not cast net-new shadow' has been modified to read, 'adequately limit net-new shadow'. This modification, while removing the specificity of the policy language, continues to recognize the need for 'adequate' sunlight to ensure thermal comfort within parks and other public spaces in Downtown. Moving forward, staff will rely on the detailed solar analysis of these 44 parks and open spaces, undertaken as part of the [TOcore Building for Liveability Recommendations Report](https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/planning-studies-initiatives/tocore-planning-torontos-downtown/tocore-studies-reports/tocore-background-reports/), as the basis for determining what the tests for adequate sunlight mean in reviewing development applications and applying the policies of the plan. The report can be found here: <https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/planning-studies-initiatives/tocore-planning-torontos-downtown/tocore-studies-reports/tocore-background-reports/>

Transition between areas and buildings of differing scales

The Downtown Plan set out detailed guidance on how transition between scales of development should be expressed, in a context that is seeing an increasing number of tall buildings. The Decision has retained most of the Plan's policies on transition but replaced the more prescriptive word "will" with the more conditional phrase "may be required", which may result in less clarity and consistency in the application of the policies. For example:

Policy 9.25 amended – "Development will be required to demonstrate transition in scale...." This has been amended to "Development may be required to incorporate transition in scale to achieve built form compatibility...."

Central Waterfront Secondary Plan

The Decision has removed the areas covered by the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan from the Downtown Plan (roughly the area between Bathurst and the Don River, south of the Gardiner Expressway, plus the West Don Lands). The Financial District Policies and any policies related to identified and planned transit still apply within this area. This does not materially impact on the Secondary Plan as the policies pertaining to the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan (CWSP) remain as approved previously and given that development in the CWSP area is largely master planned.

Making It Happen

The Council-adopted Downtown Plan included a series of policies in support of plan implementation. The Minister's Decision retains a core set of policies pertaining to the adoption of supporting implementation plans, strategies and guidelines and sets out their use in the review of development proposals and in the monitoring of the provision of infrastructure to support growth. The Decision has, however, added a new policy that places more onus on the City to ensure this infrastructure — community service facilities, green infrastructure, physical infrastructure and parkland — is provided in a timely way to service growth.

The Minister's Decision removes all Council-adopted policies pertaining to the use of holding by-laws from the Downtown Plan. This has no policy implications as the City's Official Plan includes policies with respect to the use of holding provisions which can be relied on as required.

The Council-approved Downtown Plan also contained a policy that encouraged the use of Community Benefit Agreements which differed from Section 37 community benefits under the *Planning Act*. The Community Benefit Agreements were intended to achieve local, community-based social and economic benefits through development, intended to address interests of people who are not already benefiting from economic growth. The Decision has deleted this policy. It is worth noting that the City is considering a Community Benefits Framework at this council meeting which would otherwise apply, but in a manner not secured under Section 37.

Bill 108 Implications on the Secondary Plan Areas

Bill 108, the More Homes, More Choices Act, 2019, received Royal Assent on June 6, 2019. As of the date of this report the Bill has not yet been proclaimed. On June 21, 2019, the Province published the proposed content for three regulations related to the transition of matters associated with the Planning Act, the Development Charges Act, and for certain aspects of the new community benefits charge authority. The Minister is providing until August 6, 2019 for review and comment of the proposed Planning Act Transition regulation and until August 21, 2019 for review and comment on the Development Charges Act regulations and the new regulation for the community benefits charge through the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO).

City staff are reviewing the draft regulations and will be providing comments to the Province on the draft regulations. The following are matters that the province is proposing to prescribe in regulation that may affect the implementation of OPA 405 and OPA 406:

Development Charges Act

In order to migrate to the community benefits charge authority the province is proposing that the specified date for municipalities to transition to community benefits is no later than January 1, 2021 after which municipalities would generally no longer be able to collect development charges for discounted services. Upon proclamation, Bill 108 will provide for the deferral of development charges for rental housing development, non-profit housing development, institutional development, industrial development and commercial development until occupancy. The province is proposing definitions for the types of developments proposed for development charge deferrals.

The Minister is proposing that the development charge be frozen at rates in effect as of the date the site plan application is submitted, or in the absence of the site plan application, two years from the date the zoning application was submitted.

Bill 108 provides that municipalities can charge interest on development charges payable during the deferral period. It also provides the ability for municipalities to charge interest during the development charge 'freeze' period from the date the applicable application is received to the date the development charge is payable. In both cases, the interest cannot be charged at a rate above a prescribed maximum rate. At this time, the province is not proposing to prescribe a maximum interest rate in the regulation which enables municipalities to set its own interest rates during the deferral and freeze periods.

Until such time as the regulations are fully developed it is difficult to assess the full impact of the changes to the Development Charges Act. It will be critical for the Province to continue to commit to the statement that the changes will be revenue neutral.

Planning Act

Proposed changes to the transition regulation would set out rules for planning matters in-process at the time certain components of the Planning Act in Bill 108 are proclaimed. In the case of appeals to official plan amendments or zoning by-law amendments, it is proposed to expand the grounds of appeals and ability of the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal to make any land use planning decision the municipality or approval authority could have made and this would apply to appeals that have not yet been scheduled for a hearing by the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal regarding the merits of the matter before the Tribunal.

It is proposed that the reduction for decision timelines on applications for official plan amendments (120 days), zoning by-law amendments (90 days, except where concurrent with official plan amendment for some proposal) and plans of subdivision (120 days) would apply to complete applications submitted after Royal Assent. The legislative changes will impact any complete applications submitted after June 6, 2019 as such applications would already be subject to the new decision timelines notwithstanding that the legislation has not been proclaimed. It is also still unclear whether other matters that were instituted under Bill 139, such as records of decisions, are still requirements under the Bill 108.

The proposed changes to the transition regulation are not currently addressing matters related to the removal of the alternative parkland dedication provisions in the Planning Act. It will be critical that the City's existing alternative parkland dedication requirements be allowed to continue until such a time as a community benefits charge by-law is adopted to ensure revenue neutrality. This can be addressed either by requesting the Province not to proclaim the changes to Section 42 until specified date all municipalities are required to have their community benefits by-laws in place or through transitions provisions in the transition regulation.

Community Benefits Charge

An amendment to the Development Charges Act, 1997 provides for a date to be prescribed in regulation that would effectively establish a deadline as to when municipalities must transition to the community benefits authority if they wish to collect for the capital costs of community benefits from new development. Beyond the date prescribed in regulation municipalities would generally no longer be able to collect development charges for discounted services and municipalities would generally no longer be able to pass by-laws to collect funds under section 37 of the Planning Act. It is proposed that the specified date for municipalities to transition to community benefits is January 1, 2021.

Amendments to the Planning Act provide for the Minister to prescribe types of development or redevelopment in respect of which a community benefits charge cannot be imposed. The Minister is proposing that certain types of development be exempt from charges for community benefits. The City does not apply Section 37 to many of the types of development proposed. The types of development that are proposed to be exempted from charges for community benefits under the Planning Act include:

- Long-term care homes
- Retirement homes
- Universities and colleges
- Memorial homes, clubhouses or athletic grounds of the Royal Canadian Legion
- Hospices
- Non-profit housing

Bill 108 provides the authority for municipalities to charge for community benefits at their discretion to fund a range of capital infrastructure for community services needed because of new development. According to the legislation this capital infrastructure for community services could include libraries (not including collections), parkland, daycare facilities, and recreation facilities. It is currently uncertain as to whether the listed facilities that have been identified is an exhaustive list or whether additional community benefits can or will need to be secured as community benefits. The Minister's Decisions on both OPAs identifies other facilities and matters as 'community benefits' which is discussed in more detail below. Further, Bill 108 also does not include any provisions related to legal agreements being registered on title where in-kind benefits are provided and the draft regulation is not currently addressing this.

For any particular development, the community benefits charge payable could not exceed the amount determined by a formula involving the application of a prescribed percentage to the value of the development land. The value of land that is used is the value on the day before the first building permit is issued. It is proposed that a range of percentages will be prescribed to take into account varying values of land. The Minister is not providing prescribed percentages at this time but rather proposes further consultation on the proposed formula.

Bill 108 provides that community benefits charges cannot be imposed for facilities, services or matters associated with services eligible for collection under the Development Charges Act, 1997. It also enables the Province to prescribe facilities, services or matters in respect of which community benefit charges cannot be imposed. The Minister is proposing to prescribe that the following facilities, services or matters be excluded from community benefits:

- Cultural or entertainment facilities
- Tourism facilities
- Hospitals, which are not eligible Section 37 benefits today
- Landfill sites and services
- Facilities for the thermal treatment of waste
- Headquarters for the general administration of municipalities and local boards

There will be additional consultation with municipalities on the proposed formula associated with the Community Benefits Charge, including a second ERO posting.

Based on the legislation and regulations released to date and modifications made to both OPAs, it is anticipated that the primary effect of Bill 108 on the Secondary Plan areas relates to the provision of parkland and parkland improvements, community service facilities and other matters typically secured through Section 37 such as

contributions towards cultural facilities and public art. Parkland and community benefits are addressed in more detail below. More detail is required regarding the regulations to fully assess the impacts of Bill 108 and in light of the modifications to the respective Plans.

Additionally, the Downtown and Yonge-Eglinton area continues to be a focus for development activity. Bill 108's revised timelines for the review of development applications is anticipated to disproportionately affect these two areas in combination with the modifications to various policy directions that leave determining precise standards to site-specific or area-wide rezonings as this will result in more negotiation on a site by site basis. City staff are in the process of determining new process requirements for the review of development applications based on the revised timelines.

Community Benefits

The Minister's Decisions on both OPAs align with Bill 108 and specifically as it relates to the new community benefits charge. In the Downtown Plan, the modifications identify the following facilities and matters as a community benefit:

- parks and improvements to existing parks;
- community service facilities;
- cultural spaces;
- pedestrian and public realm improvements, such as widened sidewalks and walkways, other open spaces, POPS, street trees and other landscaping, street furniture, public art, landscaped open spaces, access to transit and transit shelters and cycling amenities;
- setbacks at grade to support additional public realm and pedestrian enhancements and any easements to support public access within the setbacks;
- additional links to the cycling network and bike parking spaces; and
- the replacement of ten or more dwelling rooms in the Downtown.

In the Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan, the modification's likewise identifies a number of the facilities and matters identified above that may be secured as a condition of development in accordance with the applicable legislative framework for community benefits. Additional facilities and matters in the Yonge-Eglinton area not addressed in the Downtown Plan that the Minister's Decision identifies as matters that may be secured in accordance with the applicable legislative framework for community benefits include:

- New public streets;
- Realignment of and improvements to existing streets; and
- Mid-block pedestrian connections.

Some of the matters above are traditionally hard infrastructure improvements needed to support development and/or matters that secured via Site Plan approval that are not Section 37 benefits today. Further, a number of facilities and matters that have been identified in both Secondary Plans that suggest they are considered community benefits are not reflected in draft regulation, such as public street and cycling infrastructure improvements within public streets. Further clarity is required from the Province and City

staff will be providing detailed commentary to the Province on the draft regulation. Further, some facilities and matters, such as cultural facilities, are proposed to no longer be able to be secured as a community benefit and the City no longer has a mechanism to secure matters as a legal convenience.

Parkland Dedication

A primary impact of Bill 108, and particularly as it relates to the Downtown and Yonge-Eglinton areas, is the repeal of provisions enabling an alternative parkland dedication requirement and limiting the maximum amount of parkland dedication that can be secured to 5 per cent of a site's area for residential uses. Given the lot fabric in these two high-growth areas, where the majority of sites are under 5,000 square metres, a 5 per cent dedication would, in most instances, not yield a functional or programmable park space. Further, in instances where the City opts for the actual dedication of land for park purposes in areas, the City would forego the ability to establish a community benefits charge by-law that could be used towards a variety of necessary community facilities to support growth, inclusive of parkland improvements.

As part of the final reports for both Downtown and the Yonge-Eglinton area, City staff were directed to develop area-specific parkland dedication by-laws with calibrated alternative parkland dedication requirements for both the Yonge-Eglinton and Downtown areas and tied to the intensity of development as part of the decisions of the respective final reports and parks and public realm plans. City staff were advancing this work as part of a broader city-wide initiative that was likewise updating the City's alternative parkland dedication and official plan framework for parks for the balance of the City.

Area-specific by-laws with alternative parkland requirements for these two areas are no longer able to be advanced as the policies in the two OPAs enabling the alternative requirement were deleted by the Province and Bill 108 removed provisions enabling a separate alternative rate. However, the Minister has committed to retaining the municipal revenues from development available to municipalities in the new community benefits charge authority. From a parkland and revenue neutrality perspective, the rate(s) set for the community benefits charge for both areas will need to ensure the City can acquire the necessary parkland to support growth in a timely way along with paying for other associated costs, while also ensuring the City can continue to improve existing parks and develop the new parkland. Currently, the City uses a number of tools to address this and was revising the alternative parkland requirement in recognition that the current requirement is not calibrated to support the growth the two areas are experiencing.

The work and analysis completed to date as part of the parkland dedication work will inform ongoing discussions with the Province related to the caps that will be imposed for the community benefits charge and the ability to secure in-kind facilities such as parks and community facilities. Additionally, City staff were and are continuing to advance the implementation strategy for the respective parks and public realm plans and community service strategies for the two areas. This more detailed implementation work will likewise be used to inform the caps for the community benefits charge.

Moving Forward

City staff will be advancing the various Council directions for additional, more-detailed area-specific studies that were adopted for Downtown and Midtown when the Secondary Plans were approved, including implementing some directions as part of staff's review of development applications in the area, such as the application of holding provisions. However, some of the previous Council directions are no longer able to be implemented or acted on due to Bill 108 changes, such as developing area-specific parkland dedication by-laws for the two areas.

Overall, the Minister's Decisions that modify the two Plans take a less prescriptive approach, which may pose challenges on a site-by-site basis or through City-initiated area initiatives as policy is interpreted. The goal will remain, however, to provide as much clarity as possible for landowners and stakeholders in order to implement the objectives of the Plans and facilitate positive outcomes through collaborative planning.

OPA 405 – Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan

With the Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan now in force, City staff will begin some of the more detailed follow-on work that was identified as part of the final report on the OPA and required a decision by the Province to advance. This includes the zoning review for the area's 22 character areas, and feasibility studies for the Davisville Yard and subway trench. Council directed staff to review and consider the need for holding provisions as part of the City-initiated zoning review. More detailed analysis is required as a result of the Minister's Decision on the Secondary Plan and will be undertaken as part of the development of the infrastructure implementation strategies.

Work will continue to proceed on the infrastructure implementation strategies. The Council directed interim report is anticipated to proceed to Planning and Housing Committee in Q4 2019 where an update will be provided on how City staff will advance the additional analysis needed as a result of the Minister's Decision. The Midtown multi-modal corridor study is also now proceeding as part of the Cycling Network Plan update and a series of city-wide transit initiatives.

OPA 406 – Downtown Plan

The Downtown Plan is now in-force, providing an overarching vision and structure for development within Downtown. Moving forward there are a number of ways that the City can address the specificity that is no longer part of the Downtown Secondary Plan.

Three local area studies are in progress within the geography of the Downtown Area - King Spadina, King Parliament and Bloor Yorkville. The outcome of these studies may result in updated zoning and/or more detailed, locally-specific policies.

Staff will be conducting analysis of where additional work and context-specific direction within the Downtown is needed given the modifications contained within the Decision. The result may be revisions to the zoning by-law or the introduction of Site and Area Specific Policies.

Five infrastructure strategies that were packaged with the Downtown Plan are Council-adopted and provide clear guidance on the provision of hard and soft infrastructure. Staff will be reviewing the strategies based on the revisions to the Downtown Plan to ensure alignment. These infrastructure strategies will continue to be used by staff in development review and by City Divisions when implementing projects Downtown.

CONTACT

Gregg Lintern, Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, 416-392-8772
gregg.lintern@toronto.ca

Kerri Voumvakis, Director, Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis, City Planning, 416-392-8148, kerri.voumvakis@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Gregg Lintern, MCIP, RPP
Chief Planner and Executive Director
City Planning Division

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: OPA 405 Redline - posted online
- Attachment 2: Final in-force OPA 405 - posted online
- Attachment 3: OPA 406 Redline - posted online
- Attachment 4: Final in-force OPA 406 - posted online
- Attachment 5: Yonge-Eglinton Building Heights Ranges Comparison by Character Area

Attachment 5: Yonge-Eglinton Building Heights Ranges Comparison by Character Area

Character Area		Staff Recommended	Council Adopted	Provincial Decision
A1	Eglinton Park	4 to 8 storeys	4 to 8 storeys	4 to 10 storeys
A2	Mount Pleasant Gateway	7 storeys	7 storeys	7 to 10 storeys
A3	Eglinton East	8 to 10 storeys	8 to 10 storeys	8 to 12 storeys and within 250m of Mount Pleasant LRT 15 to 20 storeys
A4	Mount Pleasant North	4 to 7 storeys	4 to 7 storeys	15 to 25 storeys on the west side with transitions down and 4 storeys on east side
B1	Erskine and Keewatin	4 to 16 storeys	4 to 16 storeys	25 to 35 storeys along Erskine and 12 to 18 storeys along Keewatin with transitions east to west
B2	Redpath Park Street Loop	8 to 40 storeys	8 to 15 storeys	35 to 50 storeys with tallest buildings on south side of Roehampton
B3	Soudan	7 to 23 storeys	7 to 15 storeys	20 to 35 storeys with heights decreasing south to north and west to east
B4	Davisville	8 to 26 storeys	8 to 15 storeys	25 to 40 storeys with heights decreasing with distance from transit station
C1	Eglinton Way	7 to 8 storeys	7 to 8 storeys	8 storeys
C2	Yonge Street North	7 to 8 storeys	7 to 8 storeys	8 storeys except south of Keewatin/St. Clements 8 to 15 storeys
C3	Yonge Street South	8 storeys	8 storeys	8 to 15 storeys

Character Area		Staff Recommended	Council Adopted	Provincial Decision
C4	Mount Pleasant South	7 to 6 storeys	7 to 6 storeys	8 storeys
C5	Bayview-Leaside	7 storeys	7 storeys	8 storeys
D1	Yonge-Eglinton Crossroads	8 to 48 storeys	8 to 35 storeys	35 to 65 storeys with peak at intersection and gradual transitions down
D2	Davisville Station	14 to 29 storeys	14 to 15 storeys	30 to 45 storeys
D3	Mount Pleasant Station	8 to 29 storeys	8 to 29 storeys	20 to 35 storeys
D4	Bayview Focus Area	6 to 23 storeys	6 to 23 storeys	20 to 35 storeys
E1	Eglinton Green line	8 to 56 storeys	8 to 20 storeys	40 to 55 storeys west of Redpath and 30 to 40 storeys east of Redpath
E2	Montgomery Square	8 to 28 storeys	8 to 28 storeys	20 to 30 storeys with heights decreasing south to north and east to west
E3	Henning	8 to 24 storeys	8 to 24 storeys	15 to 35 storeys with heights stepping down towards Edith/Orchard View
E4	Davisville Community Street	4 storeys	4 storeys	Policy 5.3.9 still only allows for low-rise
E5	Merton Street	12 to 16 storeys	12 to 15 storeys	14 to 40 storeys with heights decreasing north-south and east-west

Note: Height ranges are for new buildings and does not include Approved/Constructed buildings for the Staff Recommended or Council Adopted Plans. Refer to Maps 21-11 to 21-16 for permitted heights for specific sites. All mid-rise buildings (five to ten storeys) had the potential for an additional storey subject to meeting certain criteria, as well as an additional storey where a heritage building was being appropriately conserved on site.



Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan

MAP 21-2 Midtown Character Areas

— Secondary Plan Boundary	Apartment Neighbourhoods	Villages	Cores	Special Places	Not to Scale ↑
Apartment High Streets	B1 Erskine and Keewatin	C1 Eglinton Way	D1 Yonge-Eglinton Crossroads	E1 Eglinton Green Line	
A1 Eglinton Park	B2 Redpath Park Street Loop	C2 Yonge Street North	D2 Davisville Station	E2 Montgomery Square	
A2 Mount Pleasant Gateway	B3 Soudan	C3 Yonge Street South	D3 Mount Pleasant Station	E3 Henning	
A3 Eglinton East	B4 Davisville	C4 Mount Pleasant South	D4 Bayview Focus Area	E4 Davisville Community Street	
A4 Mount Pleasant North		C5 Bayview-Leaside		E5 Merton Street	

March 29, 2018