# **DA** TORONTO

STAFF REPORT Committee of Adjustment Application

Date: September 29, 2020 To: Chair and Committee Members of the Committee of Adjustment, Etobicoke York District From: Neil Cresswell, Director, Community Planning, Etobicoke York District Ward: 3 (Etobicoke - Lakeshore) File No: A0252/20EYK Address: 0 Skeens Lane Application to be heard: October 6, 2020

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning Staff recommend:

- 1. The Minor Variance application be deferred until such time an Official Plan Amendment application is submitted.
- 2. Should the Committee of Adjustment decide not to grant a deferral, staff recommend the application be refused.

### APPLICATION

To permit 9 visitor parking spaces at 0 Skeens Land to serve the adjacent property municipally known as 3418 Lakeshore Blvd West.

### REQUESTED VARIANCE(S) TO THE ZONING BY-LAW:

### 1. Section 330-9.A.

A parking space shall be provided on the same lot as the said building. The proposed 9 visitor parking spaces will be used as supplemental parking for the adjacent condominium located at 3418 Lake Shore Blvd West.

### COMMENTS

### Official Plan

The subject property is designated *Neighbourhoods* in the Official Plan on Map 15, Land Use Plan. *Neighbourhoods* are considered physically stable areas made up of residential uses in lower scale buildings such as detached houses, semi-detached houses, duplexes, triplexes and townhouses, as well as interspersed walk-up apartments that are no higher than four storeys. Parks, low scale local institutions, home occupations, cultural and recreational facilities and small-scale retail, service and office uses are also provided for in *Neighbourhoods*.

Policy 4.1.3 of the Official Plan states that new retail, service, and office uses that are incidental to and support *Neighbourhoods* and that are compatible with the area and do not adversely impact adjacent residences may be permitted through an amendment to the Zoning By-law if they are on major streets as shown on Map 3 of the Official Plan. Skeens Lane is not identified as a major street on Map 3.

Policy 4.1.5 of the Official Plan states that development in established *Neighbourhoods* will respect and reinforce the existing physical character of each geographic neighbourhood. The policy further states that, "No changes will be made through rezoning, minor variance, consent or other public action that are out of keeping with the overall physical character of the entire *Neighbourhood*."

The lands at 3418 Lake Shore Blvd. West are designated *Mixed Use Areas* on Map 15, Land Use Plan, and *Avenues* on Map 2, Urban Structure. The *Mixed Use Areas* designation permits a broad range of commercial, residential, institutional and open space uses that reduces automobile dependency and meets the needs of the local community. The designation also includes policies and development criteria to guide development and its transition between areas of different development intensity and scale, including adjacent *Neighbourhoods*. *Avenues* are considered important corridors along major streets where reurbanization is anticipated and encouraged to create housing and job opportunities while improving the pedestrian environment, the look of the street, shopping opportunities and transit services for community residents.

The Official Plan's 2.3.1 Healthy Neighbourhoods policies recognize that established neighbourhoods can benefit from a strategy that directs growth to *Avenues* and on land designated *Mixed Use Areas* while preserving the shape and feel of the neighbourhood. At the boundary between *Neighbourhoods* and growth areas, developments in *Mixed Use Areas* have to demonstrate a transition in height, scale and intensity to ensure that the stability and general amenity of the adjacent *Neighbourhood* is not adversely affected. To protect neighbourhoods and limit impacts, Policy 2.3.1.3 provides that developments in *Mixed Use Areas* will, among other matters:

- be compatible with adjacent Neighbourhoods;
- locate and screen service areas and surface parking so as to minimize impacts on adjacent land in *Neighbourhood*s; and
- attenuate resulting traffic and parking impacts on adjacent neighbourhood streets so as not to significantly diminish the residential amenity of those *Neighbourhoods*.

The *Neighbourhoods* policies do not provide for uses accessory to the *Mixed Use Areas*, such as parking spaces, to be accommodated on abutting *Neighbourhoods* designated lands. As a result, the proposal requires the submission of a related Official Plan Amendment application.

### <u>Zoning</u>

The subject property is zoned Residential Townhouse (RT) under the City-wide Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 and also subject to Zoning By-law 1997-76. Zoning By-law 1997-76 is a site specific by-law for the townhouses located off Skeens Lane. The objective of the Zoning By-law is to establish specific standards as to how land is to be developed.

### Application Description

The subject property is located north of Lake Shore Blvd West and west of Twenty Ninth Street. The application before Committee proposes to permit 9 visitor parking spaces that are related to the approved development of a 5-storey mixed-use building at 3418 Lake Shore Blvd West. Five of these spaces are proposed to be located on the north side of Skeens Lane, which is adjacent to the approved 5-storey building. Currently, this space is a layby. The additional 4 spaces are located on a landscaped open space on the east side of Skeens Lane (the lane runs parallel to Lakeshore Boulevard West and then continues northbound through the townhouse development to service the residential area).

See Attachment 1 - Site Plan.

### **Decision History**

The current Applicant submitted a Site Plan Application on February 17, 2016, for a 5storey building on the property at 3418 Lake Shore Blvd West. That Site Plan Application resulted in the need for a Minor Variance application, which was refused by Committee of Adjustment on April 12, 2018. Both applications were appealed by the applicant to LPAT on May 7, 2018. A settlement of the LPAT appeals was reached between the Applicant and the City. As part of the settlement, the Applicant sought a reduction of the required residential and commercial parking spaces required for the development. The settlement was approved by the LPAT in its written decision and order dated January 8, 2019. As a condition of approving the minor variances related to the reduced parking spaces requested by the applicant, the applicant agreed to enter into a Payment-In-Lieu of Parking Agreement with the City, to the satisfaction of City Solicitor. Additionally, as stated in the LPAT Order, the applicant's Planner supported the reduction in parking for the proposal. She opined that the reduction in parking proposed does not offend the general purpose and intent of the Zoning By-law, as the subject lands front on a pedestrian Avenue and are near 24-hour transit services with proper access to on-street and overnight parking.

Therefore, as a result of the settlement hearing, the development at 3418 Lakeshore Blvd West was provided relief from the parent Zoning By-law to permit a reduction in parking. The LPAT's decision outlined the reduction as follows:

- Permit reduction of parking required for residential dwellings from 30 parking spaces to 24 parking spaces; and
- Permit reduction of parking required for commercial uses from 3 parking spaces to 0 parking spaces.

See Attachment 2 - LPAT Order.

### Application Review

The subject property, and location of the proposed spaces, is designated *Neighbourhoods* in the Official Plan. The proposed parking intended to serve the approved 5-storey building at 3418 Lake Shore Blvd West, which is designated *Mixed Use Areas* in the Official Plan.

An Official Plan Amendment application is necessary to consider the proposed parking use in the *Neighbourhoods* designation that is intended to serve a new development in a *Mixed Use Areas*.

Planning staff note during the Site Plan and Minor Variance Application processes for 3418 Lake Shore Blvd West, City staff in Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis (SIPA) and Legal Services consistently advised that an Official Plan Amendment application would be required in order to consider providing parking spaces on 0 Skeens Lane.

The Planning Staff Report, dated April 5, 2018, submitted to Committee of Adjustment, regarding Minor Variance application (A0142/17EYK) had also clearly stated that in order to consider any potential parking spaces on 0 Skeens Lane an Official Plan amendment would be required either to redesignate the lands as *Mixed Use Area* or to introduce a Site and Area Specific policy to allow the uses associated with the *Mixed Use Areas* development within the *Neighbourhoods* designation.

Staff continue to be of the opinion that an Official Plan Amendment application is necessary to contemplate the proposed parking in a *Neighbourhood* to support the Official Plan goal of protecting and enhancing existing neighbourhoods while encouraging growth in targeted areas. These concerns have been again communicated to the applicant. They have been advised by City staff that a Minor Variance application is not the appropriate process to move forward the current proposal, and that without an accompanying Official Plan Amendment application the current Minor Variance application remains premature. As such, Planning Staff are of the opinion that there are significant issues that require resolution prior to the consideration of a Committee of Adjustment application for Minor Variance. Therefore, the application is deemed premature and staff recommend:

- 1. The Minor Variance application be deferred until such time an Official Plan Amendment application is submitted.
- 2. Should the Committee of Adjustment decide not to grant a deferral, staff recommend the application be refused.

### CONTACT

Laleh Farhadi, Assistant Planner, Community Planning, Etobicoke York District, 416-394-8214, Laleh.Farhadi@toronto.ca

### SIGNATURE

Signed by Angela Stea, Manager, Community Planning, on behalf of Neil Cresswell, MCIP, RPP Director, Community Planning, Etobicoke York District

### ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Site Plan Attachment 2 - LPAT Order, January 8, 2019



TIAL CON	DOMINIUM		
9		OBC REFERENCE	=
0		REFERENCES ARE TO DIVISION B U NOTED [A] FOR DIVISION A OR [C] FOR	/
		PART 3 - 1.1.2. [A]	
TION		PART 11 - 11.1	1.1.2. [A] & 9/10.1.3.
RATION	CHANGE OF USE	TO 11.4	
AL		3.1.2.1 (1)	9.10.2.
NE	EW 738.7 SQ.M. TOTAL 738.7 SQ.M.	1.4.1.2. [A]	1.4.1.2. [A]
NE	EW 2326.8 SQ.M. TOTAL 2326.8 SQ.M.	1.4.1.2. [A]	1.4.1.2. [A]
В	ELOW GRADE	1.4.1.2. [A] & 3.2.1.1.	1.4.1.2. [A] & 9.10.4.
		3.2, 2.10. & 3.2.5.	9.10.20.
AL		3.2.2.20 TO 3.2.2.83	9.10.2.
RE BUILD	ING	3.2.2.20 TO 3.2.2.83	9.10.8.2.
CTED CO	OMPARTMENTS	3.2.1.5.	
	DOR AREAS	3.2.2.17.	
MENT		INDEX	INDEX
REQUIRE			
<u> </u>		3.2.9.	N/A
$\rightarrow$		3.2.4.	9.10.18.
		3.2.5.7.	N/A
		3.2.6.	N/A
BUSTIBLE XION-COMBUSTIBLE DOTH		3.2.2.20 TO 3.2.2.83.	9.10.6.
BUSTIBLE		L	
⊑ /		3.2.1.1.(3) - 3.2.1.1.(8)	9.10.4.1.
PERSON	N 🛛 DESIGN OF BUILDING	3.1.17.	9.9.1.3.
pl. DNS PER	SLEEPING ROOM X 42 SLEEPING ROOMS)		
	NO (EXPLAIN) AS PER OBC 9.5.2.1.(2)	3.8.	9.5.2.
	NO NO	3.3.1.2. & 3.3.1.19.	9.10.1.3.(4)
3	LISTED DESIGN NO. OR DESCRIPTION (SG-2)	3.2.2.20 TO 3.2.2.83. & 3.2.1.4.	9.10.8. 9.10.9.
			3.3.4.2.
	LISTED DESIGN NO. OR		
	DESCRIPTION (SG-2)		k
R WALLS	i	3.2.3.	9.10.14.

LOT AREA		SQ.M.		SQ.FT.	
GROSS LOT AREA (includes north parcel) ROAD WIDENING (1.6M) NET LOT AREA		el) 1,047.82 51.89 995.93		11,278.64 558.54 10,720.10	4
LANDSCAPED AREA		85.17		916.76	6
PAVED AREA		154.47		1,662.7	
BUILDING COVERAGE	711.53		7,658.8	4	
GROSS FLOOR AF	SQ.M.		SQ.FT.		
GROUND FLOOR		247.92		2,668.59	E 20
COMMERCIAL RESIDENTIAL		146.35			5.30 3.29
SECOND FLOOR THIRD FLOOR	608.92 608.92		6,554.36 6,554.36		
FOURTH FLOOR		608.92		6,554.36	
FIFTH FLOOR		608.92			
TOTAL		2,683.60	2	8,886.03	
F.S.I. FSI = -	2,683.60 995.93 (1	) NET LOT AREA)	2.69		
F.S.I. FSI = -	2,683.60	= 2	2.56		
	1,047.82	2 (GROSS LOT A	REA)		
DENSITY UPH = -		<u>30</u> .0995 = 3	801.50		
ZONE PROPOSED			RESIDE	NTIAL	
		REQUIRED		PROVID	ED
LOT FRONTAGE				-	
SETBACKS PROPOS	ED				
FRONT YARD REAR YARD				0 0	
SOUTH SIDE YARD (IN		0			
SOUTH SIDE TARD (IN	1.)			0	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN				0 0	
,		REQUIRED	PR		
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN	T.)	REQUIRED	PR	0 ROVIDED	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC	T.)	REQUIRED	PR	0	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD	T.)	REQUIRED	PR	0 ROVIDED	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE		REQUIRED	PR	0 ROVIDED	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD			PR	0 ROVIDED 0	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE			PR	0 ROVIDED 0	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93			PR	0 ROVIDED 0 71.44 %	
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY	T.) CTION	N/A	1BR+D	0 ROVIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR	7
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR	T.) CTION	N/A		0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M	7777
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY	T.) CTION	N/A	1BR+D 2	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5	7
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR THIRD FLOOR	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - -	N/A 1BR @ 54M2 - -	1BR+D 2 2	0 COVIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 5	7 8
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR THIRD FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1	N/A 1BR @ 54M2 - 1	1BR+D 2 2 3	0 COVIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3	1
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FUNTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR	T.) CTION ) HT 1BR @ 53M2 - 1 1 2	N/A           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2	1BR+D 2 2 3 3 3 10	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3	7 8 8 30
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FIRD FLOOR FIRTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PER LOCAL PLANNING APPEALS TO	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - 1 1 2 G SPACES	N/A           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           :         REQUIF	1BR+D 2 2 3 3 3 10	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3 16	7 8 8 30
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FIRD FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PER LOCAL PLANING APPEALS TR RATIO	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUNAL JAN. 8, 2019	N/A           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           REQUIF	1BR+D 2 2 3 3 3 10 RED	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3 16	7 8 8 30
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FIRD FLOOR FIRTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PER LOCAL PLANNING APPEALS TO	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUNAL JAN. 8, 2019	N/A           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           REQUIF	1BR+D           2           3           3           10	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3 16	7 8 8 30
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FINT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR FIFTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PER LOCAL PLANING APPEALS TR RATIO RESIDENTIAL = 1.0/U 8	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUAKL JAK 8, 2019 . 2.5PS/93 S	N/A           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           REQUIR           M	1BR+D           2           3           3           10	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3 16	7 8 8 30
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIG UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FUNTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PER LOCAL PLANING APPEALS TR RATIO RESIDENTIAL = 1.0/U & VISITORS COMMERCIAL = 3.5/100	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUNAL JAN. 8, 2019 2.5PS/93 S DM2 SROUND PS	IBR @ 54M2           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           -           1           1           2           -           -           1           1           2           -           -           0           0	1BR+D           2           3           3           10	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3 16 PROVI	7 8 8 30 DED
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIG UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FUNTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PER LOCAL PLANNING APPEALS TR RATIO RESIDENTIAL = 1.0/U & VISITORS COMMERCIAL = 3.5/100	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUNAL JAN. 8, 2019 2.5PS/93 S DM2 SROUND PS	IBR @ 54M2           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           -           1           1           2           -           -           1           1           2           -           -           0           0	1BR+D           2           3           3           10	0 COVIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 16 PROVI 0 13	7 8 8 30 DED
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIG UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR RESIDENTIAL = 1.0/U & VISITORS COMMERCIAL = 3.5/100 RESIDENTIAL UNDERG	T.) CTION CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUINL JAIL 8, 2019 2, 2, 5PS/93 S DM2 SROUND PS 0 FLOOR PS	IBR @ 54M2           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           -           1           1           2           -           -           1           1           2           -           -           0           0	1BR+D           2           3           3           10	0 COVIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 16 PROVI 0 13 11	7 8 8 30 DED
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIG UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PER LOCAL PLANNING APPEALS TR RATIO RESIDENTIAL = 1.0/U 8 VISITORS COMMERCIAL = 3.5/100 RESIDENTIAL UNDERG RESIDENTIAL UNDERG	T.) CTION CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUINL JAIL 8, 2019 2, 2.5PS/93 S 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	IBR @ 54M2           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           ·           REQUI           ·	1BR+D 22 23 3 3 3 10 RED	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3 16 PROVI 0 13 11 24	7 8 8 30 DED
NORTH SIDE YARD (IN BALCONY PROJEC SOUTH SIDE YARD LOT COVERAGE (GRD. FL. 711.53/995.93 MAX. BLDG. HEIGI UNIT SUMMARY SECOND FLOOR FURTH FLOOR FURTH FLOOR FURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FOURTH FLOOR FORTH FLOOR TOTAL PROPOSED PARKIN (AS PRE LOCAL PLANNING APPEALS TR RATIO RESIDENTIAL = 1.0/U & VISITORS COMMERCIAL = 3.5/100 RESIDENTIAL UNDERCO RESIDENTIAL UNDERCO RESIDENTIAL UNDERCO RESIDENTIAL UNDERCO RESIDENTIAL UNDERCO RESIDENTIAL UNDERCO RESIDENTIAL GROUND TOTAL SITE LEVEL PS (NORT	T.) CTION HT 1BR @ 53M2 - - 1 1 2 G SPACES BUNAL JAN. 8, 2019 - - 2.5PS/93 S DM2 SROUND PS D FLOOR	IBR @ 54M2           1BR @ 54M2           -           1           1           2           ·           REQUI           ·	1BR+D           2           3           3           10           RED	0 20VIDED 0 71.44 % 21 M 2BR 5 5 3 3 3 16 PROVI 0 13 11 24 9	7 8 8 30 DED

# **M** Toronto

### Toronto Green Standard Version 2.0 Statistics Template

For Mid to High-Rise Residential and All Non-Residential Development City Planning Division The Toronto Green Standard StatisticsTemplate is submitted with Site Plan Control Applications and stand alone Zoning Bylaw Amendment applications. Complete the lable and copy it directly onto the Site Plan submitted as part of the application. Refer to the full Toronto Green Standard for Mid to High-Rise Residential and All Non-Residential Development (Version 2.0) for the complete set of standards and detailed specifications: www.toronto.ca/greendevelopment For Zoning Bylaw Amendment applications: complete General Project Description and Section 1. For Site Plan Control applications: complete General Project Description, Section 1 and Section 2.

General Project Description			Proposed
Total Gross Floor Area			
Breakdown of project components (m <sup>2</sup> ):			
Residential			
Retail			
Commercial			N/A
Industrial			
Institutional/other			N/A
Total number residential units (residential only)			30
Section 1: For Stand Alone Zoning Bylaw Amendment Applications and Site Pla	n Control A	nnlications	
Automobile Infrastructure	Required	Proposed	Proposed (%
Number of parking spaces	35	25	71%
Number of parking spaces with physical provision for future EV charging (residential)	0	0	
Number of parking spaces dedicated for priority parking: LEV, car pooling, car sharing (institutional/commercial)	0	0	
Cycling Infrastructure	Required	Proposed	Proposed (%
Number of long-term bicycle parking spaces (residential)	23	19	82%
Number of long-term bicycle parking spaces (all other uses)	N/A	N/A	
Number of long-term bicycle parking (residential and all other uses) located on:			
a) first storey of building		17	
<li>b) second storey of building</li>		0	
<ul> <li>c) first level below-ground (also indicate % of net area of level occupied by bicycle parking)</li> </ul>		2	
		N/A	
<ul> <li>d) second level below-ground (also indicate % of net area of level occupied by bicycle parking)</li> </ul>		N/A	
parking)		0	
parking) e) other levels below-ground (also indicate % of net area of level occupied by bicycle parking)		0 N/A	
parking) e) other levels below-ground (also indicate % of net area of level occupied by bicycle parking) Number of short-term bicycle parking spaces (residential only)		-	
parking) e) other levels below-ground (also indicate % of net area of level occupied by bicycle parking) Number of short-term bicycle parking spaces (residential only) Number of short-term bicycle parking spaces (all other uses)		N/A	
parking) e) other levels below-ground (also indicate % of net area of level occupied by bicycle parking) Number of short-term bicycle parking spaces ( <i>residential only</i> ) Number of short-term bicycle parking spaces ( <i>all other uses</i> ) Number of male shower and change facilities ( <i>non-residential only</i> )	Required	N/A N/A	Proposed (%

#### Section 2: For Site Plan Control Applications Cycling Infrastructure Number of short-term bicycle parking spaces (residential and all other uses) at-grade or on first level Required Proposed Proposed (% 0 0 Urban Heat Island Reduction: At Grade Required Proposed Proposed (%) Total non-roof hardscape area (m<sup>2</sup>) 186.7 Total non-roof hardscape area treated for Urban Heat Island (minimum 50%) (m<sup>2</sup> and %) 104.4 Area of non-roof hardscape treated with: (indicate m<sup>2</sup> and %) a) high-albedo surface material 99.0 b) open-grid pavement 0 c) shade from tree canopy 5.4 d) shade from structures covered by solar panels 0 Percentage of required car parking spaces under cover (minimum 50%)/non-residential only Urban Heat Island Reduction: Roof Required Proposed Proposed (%) Available Roof Space (m<sup>2</sup>) 514.72 Available Roof Space provided as Green Roof (m<sup>2</sup> and %) Available Roof Space provided as Cool Roof (m<sup>2</sup> and %) Required Proposed (%) Water Efficiency 78.4 100 Total landscaped site area (m<sup>2</sup>) Landscaped site area planted with drought-tolerant plants (minimum 50%) (m<sup>2</sup> and %) Urban Forest : Increase Tree Canopy Required Proposed Proposed (%) Total site area (m<sup>2</sup>) 987.6 Total number of trees planted (site area x 40% + 66) 3 Number of surface parking spaces (if applicable) Number of shade trees located in surface parking area interior (minimum 1 tree for 5 parking spaces) 0.4 Required Proposed (%) Natural Heritage: Site Total number of species planted Total number of native species planted and % of total species planted (minimum 50%) Required Proposed Proposed (%) Bird Friendly Glazing Total area of glazing of all elevations within 12m above grade (including glass balcony railings) Total area of treated glazing (minimum 85% of total area of glazing within 12m above grade) 858.24 729.50 858.24 (m<sup>2</sup> and %) Percentage of glazing within 12m above grade treated with: a) Low reflectance opaque materials \_\_\_\_ b) Visual markers \_\_\_\_\_ c) Shading storage and Collection of Recycling and Organic Waste Required Proposed (%)

10 10

Waste storage area for bulky items and other (minimum 10m<sup>2</sup>) (residential only)

#### THESE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE SCALED: ALL DIMENSIONS MUST BE VERIFIED BY CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORK. ANY DISCREPANCIES MUST BE REPORTED DIRECTLY TO SRN ARCHITECTS INC.

NO:	DATE:	ISSUE FOR:
8	11/10/17	ISSUED FOR CLIENT REVIEW
9	11/15/18	ISSUED FOR ZONING REVIEW
10	11/20/18	ISSUED FOR OMB
11	06/02/19	ISSUED TO CLIENT
12	12/04/19	ISSUED FOR SPA
13	05/13/20	ISSUED FOR CLIENT REVIEW
14	05/21/20	ISSUED FOR CLIENT REVIEW
15	06/22/2020	ISSUED FOR CLIENT REVIEW

### ADDITIONAL NOTES:



KEY PLAN

### NOTE:

BUILDING PERMIT ISSUANCE SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE BUILDING PERMIT DRAWINGS NOT BEING IN CONTRAVENTION WITH THESE APPROVED PLANS AND DRAWINGS INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE EXTERIOR DESIGN OF THE BUILDING MATERIALS.

BE ADVISED THAT SHOULD ANY PARTY, INCLUDING THE APPLICANT OR ANY SUBSEQUENT OWNER, APPLY FOR MORE THAN ONE CONDOMINIUM CORPORATION ENCOMPASSING ANY OR ALL OF THIS DEVELOPMENT OR MAKE AN APPLICATION THAT RESULTS IN LAND DIVISION, STAFF MAY REQUIRE LEGAL ASSURANCES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO EASEMENTS, WITH RESPECT TO THE APPROVED SERVICES. SUCH ASSURANCES WILL BE DETERMINED AT THE TIME OF CONDOMINIUM APPROVAL.

SITE PLAN APPLICATION NUMBER: 16 117628 WET 06 SA

NO:	DATE:	REVISION COMMENT:



### Local Planning Appeal Tribunal

Tribunal d'appel de l'aménagement local



**ISSUE DATE:** January 08, 2019

CASE NO(S).: MM180029

The Ontario Municipal Board (the "OMB") is continued under the name Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (the "Tribunal"), and any reference to the Ontario Municipal Board or Board in any publication of the Tribunal is deemed to be a reference to the Tribunal.

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 114(15) of the *City of Toronto Act*, 2006, S.O. 2006, c. 11, Sched. A

Subject: Referred by: Property Address/Description:

Municipality: OMB Case No.: OMB File No.: Site Plan Gerard Borean 3418 Lakeshore Boulevard West and "0" Skeens Lane City of Toronto MM180029 MM180029

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 45(12) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Applicant and Appellant: Subject:	Eden Oak (Lakeshore) Inc. Minor Variance
Variance from By-law No.:	1997-77
Property Address/Description:	3418 Lakeshore Boulevard West and
	"0" Skeens Lane
Municipality:	City of Toronto
Municipal File No.:	A0142/17EYK
OMB Case No.:	MM180029
OMB File No.:	PL180643

Heard:

November 21, 2018 in Toronto, Ontario

### **APPEARANCES:**

Parties	<u>Counsel</u>
City of Toronto	A. Suriano
Eden Oak (Lakeshore) Inc.	G. Borean and H.T. Arnold

## DECISION DELIVERED BY C.J. BRYSON AND INTERIM ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL

### BACKGROUND

[1] Eden Oak (Lakeshore) Inc. ("Applicant" and "Appellant") applied to the City of Toronto ("City") Committee of Adjustment ("CoA") for variances and to the City itself for site plan approval for a proposed five storey, 32-unit apartment building development at 3418 Lakeshore Boulevard West and "0" Skeens Lane ("Subject Lands"). The CoA refused the variance application and the City failed to decide upon the site plan application. The Applicant appealed the variance refusal to the Tribunal pursuant to s. 45(12) of the *Planning Act* ("PA") and the failure to decide upon its site plan application pursuant to s. 41(12) of the PA and s. 114(15) of the *City of Toronto Act* ("COTA").

[2] Initially, the Applicant requested variances to the applicable Etobicoke Zoning By-law No. 1997-77 ("ZB") to allow for eight undersized dwelling units from the required minimum 60 square metres ("sq m") to four units of 53 sq m and four units of 54 sq m; a slight increase in floor space index ("FSI") from the permitted 3.0 to 3.13, and; a reduction in required residential parking spaces from 32 to 29.

[3] At the hearing, the Parties proposed a settlement upon a revised proposal, inclusive of a reduced number of dwelling units, an addition of commercial space at ground level, and reduced variance requests as listed in Exhibit 3. The newly requested variances call for an allowance of four undersized units, two at 53 sq m and two at 54 sq m, and a reduction in parking from the now required 30 to 24 residential spaces and

from the required three to zero commercial spaces. The FSI variance is no longer required. The Parties also proposed two conditions for variance approval as listed in Exhibit 4. The conditions require that the development include 135.22 sq m of commercial gross floor area on the ground floor as depicted in Exhibit 2, and that prior to final Tribunal approval of the variances the City and Applicant enter into a payment in-lieu-of parking agreement to the satisfaction of City Solicitor.

[4] The Parties also requested that the Tribunal bi-furcate the site plan appeal in matter MM180029 from this variance appeal in matter PL180643 and adjourn it *sine die*. The Parties are optimistic that the site plan will be resolved in the near future, upon the revised development plans. At the hearing, they sought the Tribunal to set a status update telephone conference call ("TCC") for the site plan appeal and that this Member remain seized due to the relation of the variance evidence heard at this hearing to that matter.

[5] Nancy Frieday, a planner for the Applicant, was qualified on consent to provide expert opinion evidence in the area of land use planning in support of the proposed settlement of the variance appeal.

[6] Tim Dobson sought but was denied party status in the variance appeal. Mr. Dobson submitted he owned a property nearby but not adjacent to the Subject Lands and that he had general concerns regarding the inclusion of commercial space in the development and the reduced parking leading to overflow to on-street parking in the area. He further raised concerns regarding the potential building façade. The Tribunal was not satisfied that Mr. Dobson raised direct concerns regarding the proposed development and variances sufficient to garner party status. Further, the Tribunal found that some of Mr. Dobson's concerns pertained to site plan and not variance concerns. Mr. Dobson was not an adjacent property owner and did not indicate to the Tribunal any intent to bring forward evidence of any direct impact of the variances upon him or his property interests. Mr. Dobson was granted participant status without objection.

3

### PROPERTY

[7] The Subject Lands front upon the recognized City Avenue of Lakeshore Boulevard West, back onto Skeens Lane, have several commercial properties directly to the west and 29<sup>th</sup> Street directly to the east. Further to the north of Skeens Lane is a pair of semi-detached dwellings with integrated parking and then townhouses. Further to the south from the commercial properties along the south side of Lakeshore Boulevard West are single detached dwellings.

[8] Ms. Frieday testified that the Subject Lands on the north side of Lakeshore Boulevard West are currently vacant, approximately 0.1 hectare ("h"), rectangular and flat. They have a frontage of 32.6 metres ("m") on Lakeshore Boulevard West and a depth of 24.8 m along 29<sup>th</sup> Street. They are immediately east of 29<sup>th</sup> Street, between Kipling Avenue and Brown's Line. She further informed the Tribunal that the Subject Lands were previously used by the City of Etobicoke for a municipal parking lot, which was acquired by the Applicant in 1997.

[9] The Subject Lands are designated in a Mixed Use and Avenue Area under the City Official Plan ("OP") and within the area affected by Site and Area Specific Policy 21 ("SASP 21") which applies to the whole of Lakeshore Boulevard per an Avenue study undertaken by the City in 2004 and related OP amendments. The Subject Lands are zoned C1-AV under the ZB and zoning amendment By-law No. 1055-2004.

### PARTICIPANT EVIDENCE

[10] Mr. Dobson owns property to the west of the subject Lands along Lakeshore Boulevard West. It is a commercial property with residential units above and parking behind. There are three commercial businesses between his property and the Subject Lands. Mr. Dobson provided no evidence of insufficient on-site parking for his property uses or of potential impact on his property uses resulting from the variances. He only stated that some unnamed commercial operators on the south side of Lakeshore Boulevard West have experienced on-street parking supply issues. [11] Mr. Dobson also suggested the proposed development should incorporate another underground level of residential parking, to provide for more than one space per unit, beyond the requirements of the ZB and inclusive of commercial parking spaces. He took no issue with the proposed undersized dwelling units.

[12] In cross-examination by Mr. Arnold, Mr. Dobson conceded that the condition for cash-in-lieu of parking would be utilized by the City for parking in the area, that the former City of Etobicoke sold its municipal parking lot to the Applicant for lack of demand, that less parking is required for one-bedroom units which constitute 40% of the proposed development, that some buyers will not have a car and all buyers will have knowledge of the parking limitation upon purchase, and that the units will be more affordable without individual parking spaces.

### PLANNING EVIDENCE

[13] Ms. Frieday testified regarding the proposed variances. She correctly outlined the applicable four tests for variance approval as found in s. 45(1) of PA: do the variances maintain the general purpose and intent of the OP; do they maintain the general purpose and intent of the ZB; are they minor in nature, and; are they desirable for appropriate development of the land.

[14] Ms. Frieday outlined that Chapter 4 OP policies regarding Mixed Use designations, Chapter 2 OP policies regarding Avenues and Chapter 3 OP policies regarding Urban Design apply to the Subject Lands. Further, SASP 21 applies. Ms. Frieday opined that the Urban Design policies will be addressed in the site plan process and that the Mixed Use, Avenue and SASP 21 policies support the proposed variances and mixed use development. Although a single use building is permitted, the OP policies encourage mixed use through inclusion of a commercial component at grade along the Avenue and high quality use to meet the needs of the community and support a reduction in vehicle use. Ms. Frieday further opined that the reduced unit sizes and parking spaces do not offend the OP for there are no specific applicable policies regarding unit size or parking requirements.

[15] Ms. Frieday continued that the ZB per the Etobicoke Zoning Code – Chapter 330 supports the proposed variances and development. The ZB has a maximum FSI of three, which is met by the revised proposal as is the maximum permitted height of 21 m. An apartment building is a permitted use with or without the included commercial component. The ZB does require a minimum one and two bedroom unit size of 60 sq m. Ms. Frieday testified that she looked at the prior zoning by-law and found it only had a required minimum of 48 sq m for one-bedroom units and 65 sq m two-bedroom units. The 1997 ZB changed the minimum required size for all one and two-bedroom units to 60 sq m but Ms. Frieday opined the trend is now toward smaller, more affordable dwelling units. On this basis and the resulting development in the area, Ms. Frieday opined that the reduction in size for four one-bedroom units from 60 sq m to two units of 53 sq m and two units of 54 sq m does not offend the purpose and intent of the ZB.

[16] Ms. Frieday further testified that the ZB instituted the one parking space per dwelling unit requirement, in advance of the development of provincial policies regarding transit use encouragement. She noted that there is one lay-by space in front of the Subject Lands, a cash-in-lieu of parking payment required of the Applicant as a condition of the settlement, and that the Subject Lands front on a pedestrian Avenue and are near 24 hour transit service along 30<sup>th</sup> Street, one block to the east as well as other transit options along Lakeshore Boulevard West. Finally, she noted that there is on-street and overnight parking along 29<sup>th</sup> Street, directly adjacent to the Subject Lands. On this basis, Ms. Frieday opined that the reduction in parking proposed does not offend the general purpose and intent of the ZB.

[17] Ms. Frieday also opined that the proposed variances and development are minor in nature in the absence of evidence of any resulting adverse impacts upon the Subject Lands or the surrounding area landowners and community members and services. She concluded that the proposed variances are desirable for the infill development of the Subject Lands provided for needed housing and commercial space along an Avenue, while contributing to the pedestrian streetscape.

6

[18] Finally, Ms. Frieday opined that the variances and proposed development are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 ("PPS") and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 ("GGH") for they provide for infill residential development, along an Avenue well-supported by local services and transit.

### CONCLUSION

[19] The Tribunal accepts the uncontested opinion evidence of Ms. Frieday and on that basis approves of the variance appeal settlement, as outlined in Exhibits 3 and 4. Mr. Dobson did not provide any evidence that the proposed variances and resulting development did not meet the four tests or were inconsistent with the PPS and lacking conformity to the GGH. Specifically, there was no evidence provided of any adverse impact resulting from the undersized units or the reduced parking on-site of the Subject Lands.

### ORDER

[20] The Site Plan appeal in MM180029 is adjourned *sine die*.

[21] A Site Plan appeal status update TCC is scheduled for 9 a.m. on Friday,
February 8, 2019. The parties are directed to call 416-212-8012 or Toll Free
1-866-633-0848 and to enter code 1006967# when prompted.

[22] The Tribunal having been asked to consider an application which has been amended from the original application, and the Tribunal having determined as provided for in subsection 45(18.1.1) of the *Planning Act* that no further notice is required; the Tribunal orders that the variance appeal is allowed in part and the variances to By-law No. 1997-77 as found in Exhibit 3 and attached to this Decision and Order as Attachment 1, are authorized subject to the conditions set out in in Exhibit 4, a copy of which attached to this Decision and Order as Attachment 2. Further, the Tribunal orders that it will withhold issuance of its final order until such time that it is advised by the City Solicitor that condition 2 set out in Attachment 2 has been complied with.

- [23] There will be no further notice.
- [24] This Member is seized of the scheduled TCC for the Site Plan appeal.

"C.J. Bryson"

C.J. BRYSON MEMBER

If there is an attachment referred to in this document, please visit www.elto.gov.on.ca to view the attachment in PDF format.

### Local Planning Appeal Tribunal

A constituent tribunal of Environment and Land Tribunals Ontario Website: www.elto.gov.on.ca Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

### ATTACHMENT 1

### Exhibit # 3 '

### Application to be amended to request variances as follows:

### Variance 1

Permit reduction of dwelling unit sizes from 60 sq. m. to 53 sq. m. for 2 dwelling units and from 60 sq. m. to 54 sq. m. for 2 dwelling units.

### Variance 2

Permit reduction of parking required for residential dwellings from 30 parking spaces to 24 parking spaces; and,

#### Variance 3

Permit reduction of parking required for commercial uses from 3 parking spaces to 0 parking spaces.

### ATTACHMENT 2

3418 Lake Shore Boulevard West & "0" Skeens Lane LPAT Case No.: MM180029

Exhibit #:  $\frac{4}{2}$ 

### **Proposed Conditions of Minor Variance Approval**

- 1. The proposed development shall include 135.22 square metres of commercial gross floor area on the ground floor of the building in the configuration and location as generally shown on the revised architectural plans prepared for 3418 Lake Shore Boulevard West and "0" Skeens Lane by SRN Architects Inc. dated November 20, 2018, and submitted as Exhibit 2 in the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal's hearing for LPAT Case No. MM180029.
- 2. Prior to the issuance of the final order, the Owner shall enter into a Payment-In-Lieu of Parking Agreement with the City, to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.