



## REPORT FOR ACTION

### Golden Mile Secondary Plan – Supplementary Report

Date: September 29, 2020

To: Scarborough Community Council

From: Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District

Wards: 16 – Don Valley East, 20 – Scarborough Southwest, and 21 – Scarborough Centre

**Planning Application Number:** 17 134997 EPS 00 TM

#### SUMMARY

---

At its meeting on July 17, 2020, Scarborough Community Council commenced a statutory public meeting on Official Plan Amendment No. 499 ("**OPA 499**"), including the Golden Mile Secondary Plan ("**Secondary Plan**") and associated Urban Design Guidelines for the 113-hectare Golden Mile Secondary Plan Area ("**Plan Area**") (Attachment 1: Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study Area Boundary to the Final Report dated July 25, 2020).

Scarborough Community Council at that same meeting deferred consideration of the OPA 499 and the Golden Mile Secondary Plan - Final Report dated June 25, 2020, from the Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District, and directed staff to further consult with stakeholders on the final version of OPA 499 and report back to Scarborough Community Council, scheduled for October 16, 2020.

Since the Scarborough Community Council meeting on July 17, 2020, City staff have undertaken additional consultation with stakeholders in the Plan Area regarding the recommended Secondary Plan policies. Based on the feedback received during the consultations, staff have refined, where appropriate, some of the policies of OPA 499 in an attempt to address concerns raised by stakeholders, while maintaining the long-term vision for the Plan Area as a complete, liveable, connected, responsive, and prosperous mixed-use community.

This report provides supplementary information to the Final Report considered by Scarborough Community Council on July 17, 2020, and recommends that City Council adopt the Secondary Plan and associated amendments in Official Plan Amendment OPA 499. The report identifies the policy refinements that were undertaken by staff and provides clarification on the intent of certain policies that may have been misinterpreted by stakeholders.

The Secondary Plan is accompanied by Urban Design Guidelines for the Plan Area which have also been revised to reflect the refinements to the Secondary Plan. As an implementation tool for the Secondary Plan, the Urban Design Guidelines provide more detailed guidance to assist in the development and review of public and private initiatives in the Plan Area.

OPA 499, including the Secondary Plan, has regard to matters of provincial interest under Section 2 of the *Planning Act*, is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) ("**PPS (2020)**"), and conforms to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020) ("**Growth Plan (2020)**"). OPA No. 499, including the Secondary Plan, is consistent with the general intent and purpose of, and conforms to, the City's Official Plan.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The City Planning Division recommends that:

1. Scarborough Community Council delete Recommendation 1 in the Golden Mile Secondary Plan - Final Report (June 25, 2020) from the Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District and replace it with the following:

"City Council adopt Official Plan Amendment No. 499 substantially in accordance with Attachment No. 1 to the Supplementary Report (September 21, 2020) from the Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District."

2. Scarborough Community Council delete Recommendation 5 in the Golden Mile Secondary Plan - Final Report (June 25, 2020) from the Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District and replace it with the following:

"City Council adopt the Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines substantially in accordance with Attachment No. 2 to the Supplementary Report (September 21, 2020) from the Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District and authorize the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning to make any minor, technical or stylistic amendments/modifications as required to align with the Golden Mile Secondary Plan."

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

---

At its meeting on July 17, 2020, Scarborough Community Council considered the Final Report on the Golden Mile Secondary Plan, which included background information on the anticipated financial impact of the Secondary Plan. The Financial Impact Section has not changed since the June 25, 2020 Final Report.

## **DECISION HISTORY**

---

### **Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study - Final Report**

On July 17, 2020, Scarborough Community Council deferred its decision on the Final Report for the GMSP Study and directed staff to consult with stakeholders who had submitted written submissions on the recommended Secondary Plan and Scarborough Community Council directed staff report back to the October 16, 2020, Scarborough Community Council meeting.

The Scarborough Community Council decision regarding the Final Report can be found here:

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2020.SC16.3>

For additional information on the Decision History on the Secondary Plan, please refer to the Final Report identified in the link above.

## **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN (OPA NO. 499)**

---

The revised recommended OPA No. 499 introduces the Secondary Plan and associated amendments to the Official Plan. The proposed amendments to Map 3, Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 of the Official Plan are generally consistent with the amendments proposed in the Final Report dated June 25, 2020, from the Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District. Minor mapping changes were made to the Secondary Plan to align with the associated refinements to the policies. A general description of the refinements to the Secondary Plan is explained in the following section of this report.

## **GOLDEN MILE SECONDARY PLAN: REFINEMENTS AND CLARIFICATION**

---

Since the Scarborough Community Council meeting on July 17, 2020, City staff have undertaken additional consultation with stakeholders in the Plan Area regarding the recommended Secondary Plan policies. Discussions and meetings with landowners and various stakeholders were focused in an attempt to resolve concerns with the Secondary Plan. Staff have carefully considered the additional input and where appropriate, have further refined the Secondary Plan policies and associated maps and the Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines, while maintaining the long-term vision for the Plan Area as a complete, liveable, connected, responsive, and prosperous mixed-use community.

Key refinements and clarifications are outlined below. Other minor, grammatical and stylistic changes have also been made to the policies and maps, but are not explicitly addressed in this report. Please refer to Attachment 1: Draft Official Plan Amendment No. 499, Golden Mile Secondary Plan for the revised Official Plan Amendment. The Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines have been revised to reflect the changes in the Secondary Plan. Please refer to Attachment 2: Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines.

### **GMSP Section 3 - Districts and Character Areas**

Staff received comments seeking clarification regarding Policy 3.2.2 which speaks to the type of development in the Central District. This policy has been refined to make it clearer that the Central District will function as the "main" institutional, social and cultural hub, however, it will not be the only area where community service facilities will be located as those uses are encouraged throughout the Plan Area. Map 45-16: Conceptual Community Services & Facilities Plan (Non-statutory) provides the general conceptual direction that such uses are anticipated throughout the Plan Area.

Staff received further comments on Policies 3.6 and 7.31 as they relate to the East Park Mid-rise and Tall Building Community. This Character Area is located between the Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit ("**ECLRT**") Golden Mile Stop and Birchmount Stop. The distance between the two stops is greater than those between other stops along this stretch of the ECLRT corridor. With tall buildings located closer to the two stops, there is an opportunity to create a pronounced visual break in massing along a portion of the Eglinton Avenue East frontage, while still achieving transit-supportive and transit oriented development in this area. The mid-rise character along this portion of the Eglinton Avenue East can be further expanded towards the north to East-West Street #2 along the planned East Park, by creating a full mid-rise buildings block. This mid-rise building block will frame and support both Eglinton Avenue East and the park, as well as the planned pedestrian promenade connecting these two key public realm elements.

Policy 3.6 and 7.31 have been refined to provide more clarity that an enhanced mid-rise character is intended for "a portion" of the Eglinton Avenue East frontage. While a full block of mid-rise buildings along Eglinton Avenue East in the East Park Mid-rise and Tall Building Community is identified on Map 45-13: Building Types and Heights in Character Areas, Policy 7.29 indicates that the pronounced visual break in massing along the *Avenue* and in the area can be achieved with measures "such as" providing a full block of mid-rise buildings along Eglinton Avenue East.

Comments were received on Policy 3.10 regarding the Employment Area. This Employment Character Area is located south of Eglinton Avenue East, and development is envisioned to primarily take on a mid-rise form to accommodate transit-supportive employment uses with appropriate densities, while limiting shadow impact on the north side of the street to encourage pedestrian activities along the commercial main street. Policies 3.10 and 7.35 have been revised to provide some additional flexibility by stating that tall buildings accommodating employment uses may be considered at appropriate locations, provided that all other objectives of the Secondary Plan (including density provisions) are met.

### **GMSP Section 4 - Land Use and Density**

Policy 4.6 regarding major retail uses in *Mixed Use Areas* permits the relocation of existing major retail stores and/or power centres on the same Site or Block. This would allow for various development phasing options for Sites that may include long-term leases, particularly those that may be seeking to relocate a major retail store on the same Site as an interim condition prior to the full build-out of the Site. As described in

this Supplementary Report, the interim use policies were also revised to address the potential for interim relocation of major retail stores and/or power centres.

Policy 4.15 (previously Policy 4.16) on density incentives has been refined to exempt the gross floor area of public schools from the calculation of density.

Comments were received that requested adding flexibility to Policy 4.5 with regard to adding additional exemptions for the gross floor area of certain uses in *Mixed Use Areas*. Policy 4.15 was revised to include an incentive to increase non-residential uses in excess of the minimum requirement in Policy 4.5, where such increase would be exempt from the calculation of gross floor area of the Site, up to 10 per cent of the permitted density for the Site.

The new revision to Policy 4.15 includes requirements to support the exemption of up to 10 per cent of the total gross floor area of the Site. The minimum requirement in Policy 4.5 for 10 per cent non-residential uses is not subject to Policy 4.15. Similarly, any existing office uses on the Site to be replaced are not subject of Policy 4.15. The revisions to Policy 4.15 also address comments on Section 5 of the Secondary Plan to incentivize non-residential development beyond the minimum requirement. This density incentive will also help increase the potential non-residential uses on a Site up to a total of an additional 10 per cent (total of 20 per cent non-residential uses), which addresses comments on Policy 4.5 to provide more non-residential uses in the Plan Area. Development sites are always encouraged to achieve more non-residential uses on the Site without relying solely on density exemptions.

### **GMSP Section 5 - Economic Development**

Comments were received that further policy direction should be provide to incent non-residential uses. As noted above, Policy 4.15 has been revised to incent non-residential uses to provide an exemption on new non-residential uses. The City will also work to support local businesses to establish a business association and will offer incentives (such as the Imagination, Manufacturing, Technology and Transportation (IMIT) program) to encourage the construction of office and other commercial uses that are not retail based.

### **GMSP Section 6 - Public Realm**

Staff received comments seeking clarification on how major telecommunication infrastructure will be protected. An addition to Policy 6.3 is proposed to ensure that any public street adjacent to or crossing over any of Bell Canada's major telecommunication infrastructure, such as the fibre optic cable network, would be protected. This will require mitigative and/or protective measures to ensure such major telecommunications infrastructure is protected. This policy addition focuses on major telecommunication infrastructure, and would not extend to small scale typical below grade utilities and utility easements. Such coordination, consolidation and relocation of those matters would be subject to Policy 3.1.1.13 and 3.1.2.4 of the in-force Official Plan (OPAs 479 and 480) and Policy 6.8 of this Secondary Plan.

Staff received comments seeking clarification on the policy direction to provide streetscape improvements along the entire frontage of individual Sites along Eglinton Avenue East as part of the first phase of development. The Plan requires Eglinton Avenue East to be widened from 36 metres to 43 metres to support an enhanced streetscape. As illustrated in the Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines, the sidewalk zone (from curb to building face) will be designed as a vibrant urban place along the commercial main street, with a 9.3 metres minimum width to accommodate street trees in seat wall planters in the public boulevard (from curb to street line), generous sidewalks, and marketing zones along the street frontage with commercial uses at grade. The boulevards with street trees will serve as a green seam throughout the Plan Area and reinforce the image of Eglinton Avenue East as a green street.

Building on the streetscape currently being implemented through the construction of the ECLRT, including dedicated bike lanes, sidewalks and street trees in some locations, early implementation of the enhanced streetscape in the public boulevard is of vital importance to the realization of the public realm vision for the Plan Area. The Secondary Plan requires the implementation of the enhanced streetscape along Eglinton Avenue East to be prioritized and be coordinated between adjacent sites.

Policy 6.9 b) has been refined to make the policy intent more clear from a process and implementation perspective, by indicating that wherever possible and in association with appropriate development phasing, development on Sites that have frontage on Eglinton Avenue East may be required to implement the streetscape design across the full Eglinton Avenue East street frontage in the first phase of the development.

Comments were received with regard to various policies in the parks and open spaces section of the Plan. Minimum sizes were included to provide clearer direction to landowners on the expected park sizes for each park and the expectation for each landowner who would be providing a park, in whole or in part. It was noted that it caused confusion for landowners. The following policies have been revised as follows:

- Policies 6.13 to 6.20 have been revised to remove the minimum park sizes, notwithstanding that the majority of the parks, upon full development of the Plan Area, will be approximately those identified in the Park Types and Sizes section of the Urban Design Guidelines;
- Policy 6.11 has been refined by deleting the reference to minor modifications to lands designated *Parks*. Policy 5.6.5 of the Official Plan provides sufficient guidance on how the boundaries of land use designations are addressed and already contemplates that minor adjustments may be made without amendment to the Official Plan;
- Policy 6.14 e) ii has been refined by deleting the reference to the relocated Victoria Park - Eglinton Parkette to allow more flexibility for the location; and
- Policy 6.25 has been refined to allow greater flexibility for the City to determine when and under what circumstances additional parkland is required, as well as greater flexibility regarding the method of acquiring these additional lands and at

that time, the City will evaluate the legislative tools it has to secure and acquire such additional lands, as may be required.

Staff received comments seeking clarification on the number and location of Privately Owned Publicly-accessible Spaces ("**POPS**") within the Plan Area. The Secondary Plan identifies a conceptual network of POPS to complement the public parks and open space system, creating new spaces for social gathering and outdoor activity. Maintained and operated by private landowners, POPS will be openly accessible to all members of the community. Map 45-6: Public Realm Plan illustrates potential locations of POPS at LRT stops and other intersection locations. The potential locations are conceptual in nature and can be refined through the development application review process. Additional language was also provided to recognize that the development application review will determine the exact locations, number and size of such POPS.

Similar comments were received regarding the locations for Public Art. Policy 6.31 speaks to potential public art locations shown on Map 45-6: Public Realm Plan as being conceptual. The exact locations will be further reviewed and determined through Public Art Plans secured through the development application review process.

Comments were received seeking clarification on what a Green Node is and where they should be located. A Green Node is a group of publicly-owned and publicly accessible open spaces or landscapes located at a street intersection where a park is located. Typically, it consists of a portion of the park on one corner of the intersection, and POPS or additional building setbacks with enhanced landscaping and pedestrian amenities on the other corners of the intersection. Green Nodes will function as focal points and small gathering places at the intersections, accentuating the park entries and accommodating increased active uses in these areas.

The nature of a Green Node may vary depending on the location and anticipated character. Development around a Green Node may contribute to the creation of the feature through a variety of different design measures, including POPS and/or additional setbacks with enhanced landscaping. The detailed components and design of the Green Nodes will be determined through the development application review process. The non-policy text for Green Nodes has been refined to clarify the intent of the policies.

## **GMSP Section 7 - Built Form**

Stakeholders sought clarification or enhanced policy flexibility on various policies in the Built Form section. The City's Official Plan provides general guidance on planning new neighbourhoods, while Secondary Plans establish local development policies to guide growth and change in a defined area of the City. Policy 5.2.1.3 of the Official Plan indicates that Secondary Plans will promote a desired type and form of physical development resulting in highly functional and attractive communities, and plan for an appropriate transition in scale and activity between neighbouring districts. Policy 5.2.1.4 of the Official Plan requires that City-building objectives will identify or indicate, among other things, urban design objectives, guidelines and parameters.

The Plan Area today is a large underutilized area that is intended to be transformed into a connected, accessible, diverse, complete and liveable mixed-use community. As part of the planning framework that will guide this transformation, it is important to define the built form vision as it relates to the different Character Areas and public realm elements in the Plan Area. Key character defining built form parameters and objectives are identified in the Plan, in relation to issues such as setbacks, building/base building/ground floor heights, tall building tower stepbacks/separation distances/floor plates, building type mix, and sunlight objectives.

While it's important to establish a clear built form vision to guide future development, it is equally important to ensure that the policies are flexible to accommodate specific site conditions and design considerations. Flexibility is built into many policies by identifying minimum to maximum ranges, providing exceptions, and indicating general policy intent with words such as "generally" and "approximately" (where appropriate). Some examples are outlined in the remaining parts of this section. The policies are practical and achievable, especially in the context of the many larger sites in the Plan Area, which have greater ability to accommodate a variety of building types and built form configurations.

Clear and flexible built form policies will support a varied, yet coherent built environment that can accommodate a variety of architectural and landscape expressions. They will promote design excellence, while ensuring that the public realm and built form vision for the Plan Area is achieved. With clear directions to guide the applications, the policies will also help expedite the development review process in the implementation stage.

The approach is generally consistent with other recent Secondary Plans, such as ConsumersNext Secondary Plan, Don Mills Crossing Secondary Plan, and Sherway Area Secondary Plan. The specific policies were developed through extensive consultation with the community and stakeholders, and have been refined several times to respond to issues and concerns raised. As a result of further conversations with stakeholder since the July 17th Scarborough Community Council meeting, further refinements have been made to accommodate additional flexibilities, some of which are outlined below.

Some stakeholders sought additional flexibility through policies pertaining to setbacks and projections/encroachments. The Secondary Plan's policies establish appropriate minimum setbacks to support a generous, cohesive and green public realm. These setbacks provide additional space for landscaping, help encourage active transportation with walkways, allow for active at-grade commercial uses, such as outdoor marketing and patios, and provide additional space to support privacy for street related residential uses adjacent to the public realm. Policy 7.8 and Map 45-11: Building Setbacks identify required minimum setbacks, while Policy 7.9 provide direction on how projections and encroachments can be considered. The two policies should be read together.

Policy 7.8 and Map 45-11: Building Setbacks have been refined to change minimum setback from Parks from 6 metres to 5 metres, to be consistent with other recent Secondary Plans in the City.



Policy 7.9 has been refined by referencing the Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines, by way of example on the types of projections and encroachments that can be considered, such as porches, canopies, window boxes, and minor façade projections and/or encroachments. Including these details in policy would have made design matters more restrictive, and instead the general direction referencing examples in the Urban Design Guidelines provides sufficient guidance on what may be permitted in these setback areas.

Staff also received comments seeking further clarification or flexibilities to policies pertaining to active at-grade commercial, residential, community, and institutional uses. These uses foster a human-scaled and pedestrian-oriented environment, by encouraging activities in the public realm and promoting eyes on streets, parks and open spaces. The Secondary Plan promotes active at-grade uses, with required at-grade commercial uses identified on Map 45-15: Building Edges and Active Commercial Uses at Grade. To address comments raised, several policies have been refined to provide additional clarity and/or flexibility, as follows:

- Policy 7.11 has been refined to indicate that residential lobbies are strongly discouraged along Eglinton Avenue East but may be permitted if they cannot be located at other alternative locations (such as side streets);
- Policy 7.12 c) has been refined to allow for entrances fronting onto at-grade outdoor amenity spaces located in the interior of the site that may not be clearly visible and directly accessible from the street sidewalk; and
- Policy 7.15 regarding larger retail units has been refined to add "including but not limited to, power centres, major retail stores and big box stores" for additional clarity. This Policy however does not preclude other types of larger retail units from looking to this policy for guidance on how such retail uses may be integrated into new development.

Staff also received some comments seeking clarification and flexibilities to the locations of outdoor amenity spaces in Policy 7.16. The Secondary Plan promotes at-grade outdoor amenity spaces such as courtyards, urban gardens, and plazas to provide opportunities for a variety of activities and social interactions among residents. When outdoor amenity spaces are located at grade, there are more opportunities for them to be connected with the surrounding streets, parks and open spaces, contributing to an expanded open space network on the ground level. In general, compared with rooftop amenity spaces, at-grade outdoor amenity spaces also allow for better growing conditions for trees and landscaping. However, to provide additional flexibility the policy has been refined to clarify that alternative locations for outdoor amenity spaces can also be considered, where appropriate.

Some stakeholders also sought clarification or additional flexibilities to where parking and parking structures may be located on a site. The arrangement and design of parking will have a significant impact on the public realm and the overall look and feel of the Plan Area. The Secondary Plan promotes underground parking to allow for more space for active uses above grade to animate the public realm and the Plan Area as a whole. The Secondary Plan also provides directions on the general locations and

design objectives of underground parking garages, surface parking, and above-grade parking structures. Several policies have been refined to provide additional clarity and/or flexibility, including, Policy 7.17, 7.18, 7.19, 7.20, 7.21, and 13.22.

Comments were received seeking clarification on where the City was seeking views and vistas to be protected, where possible. Policy 7.23 has been refined to include reference to the Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines, where examples are provided depicting where the City is encouraging protecting for memorable and identifiable views and vistas.

Comments were received seeking additional flexibilities to the minimum base building heights provided for in the Secondary Plan. Base building height is one of the most important attributes that define the built form characters of an area, as it is closer to the pedestrian realm with a strong impact on the perceived building scale. The Secondary Plan promotes lower to modest base buildings with generous stepbacks to help define and support the Character Areas, mitigate the visual impact of taller building components above the base buildings, and create and contribute to a spacious and pedestrian friendly environment throughout the Plan Area.

As shown on Map 45-12: Base Building Heights, three types of minimum and maximum base building heights are identified for different Character Areas and public realm elements. Base buildings will be the highest (five to six storeys in *Mixed Use Areas* and four to five storeys in *General Employment Areas*) along Eglinton Avenue East, lower (three to six storeys) along key north south side streets, and the lowest (three to four storeys) in the three transition areas and other areas.

To allow for flexibilities and variations, base building heights are identified in ranges of storeys, with no specific heights prescribed in metres.

Comments were received seeking additional flexibilities to the maximum buildings heights provided for in the Plan. Policy 7.26 and Map 45-13: Building Types and Heights in Character Areas identify four maximum tall building heights for different Character Areas: 35 storeys in the Golden Mile Commercial Gateway, 30 storeys in the Mixed Use Transit Nodes, and 30, 25 and 20 storeys in the three transition areas. The Golden Mile Commercial Gateway will have the greatest heights recognizing its historic role as the gateway to the Golden Mile and Scarborough.

The maximum heights for tall buildings were determined based on several key considerations such as the existing and planned context, impact on the public realm, as well as transportation and servicing capacities. Policy 4.12 provides flexibility to the maximum building height in keeping with the parameters established in Policy 4.11. This would allow maximum building heights on Map 45-13: Building Types and Heights in Character Areas to be evaluated on a site-specific basis to promote variation in tall building heights while providing guidance on the overall planned built form context in relation to tall building heights across the Plan Area.

Comments were received seeking additional flexibilities to the policies related to tall building design. A significant amount of tall buildings are anticipated in the Plan Area. The Demonstration Plans included in the Urban Design Guidelines illustrate over 60 tall

buildings. Together they will have a significant impact on the public realm and the overall look and feel of the Plan Area. Several key design parameters such as tower floor plate, separation distance, and tower setback are included in the Secondary Plan policies, to ensure that the buildings are designed appropriately to limit their impact and contribute to a complete, liveable, connected, responsive, and prosperous mixed-use community.

In order to ensure that tall buildings are designed appropriately while allowing for flexibilities, Policy 7.42 c) regarding tower setbacks has been refined by including the word "predominantly", to allow for flexibilities to address potential site-specific considerations. In addition, Policy 7.42 e) has been refined to indicate that separation distances of less than 30 metres may be considered at limited locations on the Site in order to achieve other built form objectives to enhance the pedestrian experience, such as greater tower setbacks, and will be no less than 25 metres.

Comments were received seeking additional flexibility to mid-rise building design and heights. As part of the built form strategy to support the public realm and built form vision for the Character Areas and the Golden Mile as a whole, the maximum building heights for mid-rise buildings are determined based on a 1:1 ratio with the existing and planned right-of-way widths of the adjacent street or streets that the building fronts onto. Along Eglinton Avenue East in particular, mid-rise buildings are planned to have a maximum height of approximately 36 metres. With a variety of right-of-way widths in the Plan Area, maximum mid-rise building heights could range from approximately six storeys to 11 storeys, allowing for a variety of mid-rise building heights. The 1:1 height/ROW ratio is a recognized urban design tool in creating mid-rise buildings that frame the streets with appropriate proportions and will help limit shadow impact on the streets. The built form relationship of mid-rise buildings relative to the adjacent right-of-way width is also recognized through the approved policies to the Official Plan in OPAs 479 and 480.

Comments were also received seeking further flexibilities to the sunlight policies. Comfortable pedestrian and cycling conditions in the public realm are of vital importance to the success of a transit supportive, complete and liveable community. The Secondary Plan provides directions on limiting shadow impacts on the public realm by including both general policies and specific sunlight objectives for key public realm elements, such as existing and new parks, as well as Eglinton Avenue East (in *Mixed Use Areas*) and East-West Street #2.

A new policy has been added (Policy 7.50) to provide minor flexibilities through zoning by-law amendments for shadow impact on existing and new parks, Eglinton Avenue East, and East-West Street #2. The intent is to allow for minor deviations from the sunlight objectives to respond to specific site considerations.

## **GMSP Section 9 - Housing**

Comments were received on the unit mix required in the Secondary Plan. Policy 9.2 is reflective of the objectives of the now Council-approved Growing Up Guidelines to ensure a range of housing is provided including units suitable for larger households and

families. The policy is consistent with the City's standard unit mix requirements for secondary plan areas.

Comments were also received on the 80-unit threshold in Policy 9.2, which is included in the Secondary Plan to help ensure that the unit mix requirements do not limit smaller developments.

### **GMSP Section 11 - Mobility**

The Secondary Plan policies identify the required transportation infrastructure to support the anticipated growth in the Golden Mile, focusing on improving access and balancing modes of transportation to ensure a range of travel choices and encourage sustainable travel behaviour.

Comments were received seeking flexibility in the implementation of the transportation infrastructure required by the Secondary Plan. The Secondary Plan recognizes the long-term development and implementation of the transportation infrastructure. Various mobility policies provide flexibility both in term of the process and implementation of the required improvements, including:

- Policy 11.2 identifies that the required transportation network improvements from the Plan will be refined, protected and implemented through the development application review process and identified capital expenditures;
- Policy 11.8 identifies that the exact location, alignment and design of streets and potential mid-block pedestrian connections will be refined through the development application review process (including the Plan of Subdivision process), an MCEA, as required, or other implementation mechanisms at the discretion of the City;
- Policy 11.16 identifies that the cycling network, alignment, and design will be refined through the development application review process (including the Plan of Subdivision process), an MCEA as required, street designs or other implementation mechanisms at the discretion of the City.

Policies 11.2, 11.8 and 11.16 all provide flexibility for refinements to the Secondary Plan by way of the development application review process or other implementation mechanisms. Policy 11.8 contemplates that the exact location, alignment and design of streets and potential mid-block pedestrian connections, will be determined through the applicable development review process and such a determination would not require an Official Plan Amendment. Also, Policy 5.6.9 of the Official Plan further contemplates that minor adjustments to these features do not require an amendment to the Official Plan. The combination of Policy 11.8 of the Secondary Plan and Policy 5.6.9 of the Official Plan provide for sufficient flexibility in implementation.

The long-term vision of the Plan Area and required infrastructure was carefully balanced to ensure that the policies provide certainty that the required transportation infrastructure is in place, while maintaining a flexible process in securing those infrastructure requirements as outlined in Policies 11.8 and 13.18. Any refinements

agreed through the development application review process or as approved by the MCEA process will not require an amendment to the Secondary Plan.

Comments were received seeking clarification on what Shared Mobility Hubs are. Policy 11.21 describes 'Shared Mobility Hubs' as single service points for bike-share, ride-share and car-share facilities at locations identified on Map 45-17: Transit and Travel Demand Management Plan. These hubs are one-stop service points that provide comfortable areas to find a share bike or scooter stations, car-share vehicles, or wait for a ride-share driver. Shared mobility solutions can encourage transit use in the Plan Area and reduce automobile ownership.

As defined in the TMP, Shared Mobility Hubs can vary in size from large scale hubs which integrate multiple mobility services in proximity to higher-order transit stops, to medium and small scale, which are identified in accessible locations central to development block where on-street car-share station or an integrated bike/scooter share and bus stops are found. The types of functions of each of the Shared Mobility Hubs will be determined through the development review process.

### **Transportation Master Plan (TMP) - Part II Order Decision**

In the Golden Mile Secondary Plan - Final Report (June 25, 2020), City Staff identified the Consultation on the Transportation Master Plan and subsequent MCEA work to be undertaken.

Since the Final Report, the Province enacted Bill 197, COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act which made changes to various pieces of legislation, including the Environmental Assessment Act.

In response to the Part II Order Request received by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, on August 31, 2020, the Ministry issued a decision. The Part II Order Request was reviewed by the Ministry and a written decision provided in Attachment 3: Transportation Master Plan, Decision on Part II Order Request to this report.

In summary, the Ministry's decision allows the City to proceed with the implementation of Phases 3 and 4 of the MCEA process, which may be undertaken in phases, to determine the precise alignment and preliminary design for certain infrastructure projects.

### **GMSP Section 12 - Servicing**

The Secondary Plan area falls under and is serviced by different sanitary systems, some of which may or may not have an impact on each other. In some cases, certain developments may discharge into one system and others into another, with or without impacts. Regarding water distribution for the Secondary Plan area, it is serviced by one system.

Comments were received regarding Section 12 and the roles and responsibilities of the City and respective landowners. The policies in Section 12 related to Core Servicing

Agreements, depending on whether certain landowners are under different sanitary and storm systems, as well the water distribution system will need to be addressed through such agreements between landowners recognizing the equitable share relative to each landowners responsibilities based on the sanitary, storm and water systems applicable to those sites.

Both the sanitary and water systems will require new municipal infrastructure, or improved and/or upgrades to existing municipal infrastructure, which will be determined through the Master Servicing Plan to service new development. Attachment 7 to the Final Report explains it “is anticipated that local system sewer improvements will be financed and completed by landowner(s) through the development process. Major servicing infrastructure and trunk sewer improvements may be implemented through the City's Capital Program, when funding is available and have been recommended for inclusion. Where a landowner wishes to expedite the construction of major/trunk sewer infrastructure for their respective private development to proceed, such construction of the identified infrastructure matters included in the Capital Plan and DC Background Study may become eligible for some DC credits when these matters are provided as part of development of lands in the Secondary Plan area. These arrangements will be typically secured in an agreement which may allow the developer to recover all or part of their costs and to establish the developer's obligations for construction.”

For example, Policy 12.4 provides for the direction that the City may also be a party to these Core Servicing Agreements and in such circumstance it may be to address the matters described above that involve the construction or major/trunk sewer infrastructure and matters related to the Development Charges Act where the City believes it to be appropriate and such matters are addressed to its satisfaction. This is also reflected in Policy 13.8 of the Secondary Plan. The City also has other tools under the Development Charges Act and Planning Act to facilitate the construction of municipal infrastructure that will also be utilized where appropriate.

### **GMSP Section 13 - Implementation, Phasing & Monitoring**

Comments were received seeking clarification on the transportation network implementation polices. Policies 13.16 to 13.18 reflect that the transportation network will develop incrementally over the next 20 plus years. As such, implementation, phasing and monitoring policies are key components to the longevity and adaptability of the Secondary Plan. Managing growth and monitoring its impact are important elements in the growth management strategy necessary to implement the Vision for the Golden Mile. Incremental growth via new development will need to be reviewed in the context of the available transportation network capacity until such time as the implementation of the transportation network is complete, including the ECLRT, north-south transit priority routes, and new and reconfigured streets as identified in the Secondary Plan.

The implementation, phasing and monitoring policies of Plan require that:

- Development applications demonstrate that there is adequate transportation infrastructure capacity within the broader Golden Mile area to accommodate the proposed level of intensification;

- The expansion of the street network into a finer grid of streets will occur incrementally with development through the direct construction and conveyance of new streets on development sites or contributions towards the acquisition of land and construction of transportation infrastructure off-site;
- Development will be sequenced to ensure appropriate infrastructure is available and a Holding ("H") provision may be placed on lands, where appropriate, for additional matters beyond those in the Official Plan; and
- Landowners are encouraged to enter into landowner agreements addressing their respective responsibilities regarding coordination, provision, financing, cost-sharing, front-ending and/or phasing of infrastructure.

The Secondary Plan recognizes the significant public investment from all levels of government in the ECLRT. However, additional transit improvements are required to provide a complete transit network and to support the anticipated growth planned for the area.

Furthermore, Map 45-18: Transportation Implementation Plan outlines the development areas and street link improvements for the implementation of the transportation network as outlined in policies 13.16 to 13.18. These policies provide flexible directions on how to implement the transportation network as development proceeds and provide the steps that would ensure sufficient transportation infrastructure is in place for development to proceed.

Comments were received regarding interim use Policies 13.23 and 13.24 (renumbered Policy 13.24 and 13.25 respectively). The purpose of Policy 13.24 is to establish a threshold of additions, renovations or expansions to the uses contemplated by Policy 13.24 without the requirement of an Interim Development Strategy. Where an application proposes a renovation, addition or expansion of greater than 10 per cent of the legally existing gross floor area, including a major retail use, then an Interim Development Strategy will be required as part of that development application. Policies 13.24 and 13.25 do not preclude such existing uses from exceeding the 10 per cent threshold, but rather require a development application to demonstrate that such an expansion beyond 10 per cent addresses the requirements in Policy 13.25.

Comments were also received regarding the relocation of existing uses and gross floor area on a Site to a new location with a free-standing building on an interim basis, to allow the redevelopment of the Site over time. As City Planning and Economic Development staff want to encourage the retention of such retail uses in mixed-use forms upon full development of the Plan Area, a new Policy 13.23 and additions to Policy 13.25 are recommended to acknowledge the possibility for the interim condition for such uses, where applicable and appropriate. Given the size and scale of such major retail and power centre uses in the Plan Area, their proposed relocation into a new free-standing building(s) will require a satisfactory Interim Development Strategy in accordance with Policy 13.25, if such relocation on an interim basis is intended as part of the redevelopment of the Site.

## COMMENTS

---

### Provincial Policy Statement and Provincial Plans

City Planning staff are of the opinion that the refined Secondary Plan and associated Official Plan Amendments have regard for the relevant matters of provincial interest under Section 2 of the *Planning Act*, are consistent with the PPS (2020), conform to and do not conflict with the Growth Plan (2020), and are consistent with the general intent and purpose of, and conform to, the City's Official Plan.

The Final Report provides the extensive analysis of the relevant Provincial and Municipal policies and guidelines, as applicable. The proposed refinements and revisions continue to be consistent with those policy documents.

The Growth Plan (2020) came into effect on August 28, 2020. This new plan amends the previous Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019. The changes to the Growth Plan do not impact the analysis on the OPA 499 or the Golden Mile Secondary Plan. These changes include changes to the growth forecasts for the City as a whole with a new planning horizon of 2051, updated Land Needs Assessment, and revisions to policies specifically related to conversion of lands within provincial significant employment zones and protected major transit station areas, as well as alignment with the PPS 2020. These matters in Amendment 1 will be addressed through the City's upcoming municipal comprehensive review. OPA 499, including the Golden Mile Secondary Plan continues to conform with the Growth Plan.

### Official Plan

On September 11, 2020, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing approved city-wide amendments to the Official Plan regarding public realm and built form. As a result, some of the Secondary Plan policies related to public realm and built form have been deleted as they are now addressed through the revised Official Plan policies and will apply to development in the Secondary Plan area in accordance with Section 5.6 of the Official Plan. The following policies that were deleted as a result of the approval of OPAs 479 and 480 are as follows:

- First paragraph of non-policy text under Section 6, Public Realm;
- First two sentences of Policy 6.1 defining the public realm;
- Policy 6.23 b) to f) related to development adjacent to parks and open spaces;
- Policy 6.29 b) and c) related to POPS design;
- Policies 7.2 and 7.3 related to shaping built form;
- Policy 7.18 f) related to sunlight on at-grade outdoor amenity spaces; and
- Policy 7.45 d) related to mid-rise development and the 1:1 relationship with the adjacent right of way.

OPA 479 regarding public realm can be found at:  
<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/bylaws/2020/law0083.pdf>



OPA 480 regarding built form can be found at:  
<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/bylaws/2020/law0084.pdf>

## **Conclusion**

The refined Secondary Plan has addressed numerous comments raised by stakeholders in the Plan Area. The refined Secondary Plan continues to provide a long-term planning framework that includes flexibility to allow development to be phased over 20+ years. Leveraging the significant public investment in the ECLRT, the Secondary Plan and related Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines advance the vision for the Golden Mile as a complete, liveable, connected, responsive, and prosperous mixed-use community that will maintain its role as an important economic driver in the east end of Toronto.

OPA 499, including the Secondary Plan policies, has regard for the relevant matters of provincial interest, is consistent with the PPS (2020), conforms to and does not conflict with the Growth Plan (2020), and is consistent with the general intent and purpose of, and conforms to, the City's Official Plan. City planning staff recommend that City Council adopt the revised OPA 499, including the Secondary Plan, included as Attachment 1 to this Supplementary Report. City planning staff also recommend City Council adopt the revised Urban Design Guidelines to align with the changes in OPA 499 found in Attachment 2 to this Supplementary Report.

## **CONTACT**

---

Emily Caldwell, Senior Planner, Community Planning, Scarborough District, Tel. No.: 416-396-4927, E-mail: [Emily.Caldwell@toronto.ca](mailto:Emily.Caldwell@toronto.ca)

## **SIGNATURE**

---

Paul Zuliani, MBA, RPP, Director,  
Community Planning, Scarborough District

## **ATTACHMENTS**

---

Attachment 1: Draft Official Plan Amendment No. 499, Golden Mile Secondary Plan  
Attachment 2: Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines  
Attachment 3: Transportation Master Plan, Decision on Part II Order Request

**Attachment 1: Draft Official Plan Amendment No. 499, Golden Mile  
Secondary Plan**

Provided separately as a PDF and posted under the Agenda Item for Scarborough  
Community Council's October 16, 2020 meeting.

## **Attachment 2: Golden Mile Urban Design Guidelines**

Provided separately as a PDF and posted under the Agenda Item for Scarborough Community Council's October 16, 2020 meeting.

### **Attachment 3: Transportation Master Plan, Part II Order Decision**

Provided separately as a PDF and posted under the Agenda Item for Scarborough Community Council's October 16, 2020 meeting.