

Expanding Housing Options in Neighbourhoods: Neighbourhood Retail and Services Study Phase Two - Supplementary Report

Date: December 16, 2024

To: City Council

From: Interim Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning

Wards: All

SUMMARY

This report provides additional information, in response to discussion at Planning and Housing Committee on December 5, 2024. The report provides clarification on specific matters related to the recommended zoning by-law amendment to permit certain small-scale retail, service and office uses on Residentially-zoned properties within *Neighbourhoods* city-wide, and to update home occupations permissions in all areas. It includes details on consultations held with Residents' Associations as well as clarification and analysis of questions raised by Councillors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. City Council receive this report for information.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The City Planning Division confirms that there are no financial implications resulting from the recommendations included in this report in the current budget year or in future years.

The Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer has reviewed this report and agrees with the information as presented in the Financial Impact Section.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of December 5, 2024, Planning and Housing Committee held a statutory public meeting and advanced, without recommendation, a staff report including zoning by-law amendments to permit certain small-scale retail, service and office uses on Residentially-zoned properties within *Neighbourhoods* city-wide, and to update home occupations permissions in all areas. The report also recommended approval of a monitoring approach.

<https://secure.toronto.ca/council/agenda-item.do?item=2024.PH17.2>

COMMENTS

Zoning by-law amendments proposed through this study would permit a range of small-scale retail, service and office uses on major streets as well as more limited permissions on streets in the interior of *Neighbourhoods*. Changes are also proposed to home occupations permissions in all areas. These amendments provide opportunities for new amenities to be incorporated into the process of incremental *Neighbourhood* change anticipated through the broader EHON project and the City's Housing Action Plan, thereby serving both existing and new residents.

Within the proposed amendments, permissions related to the interior of *Neighbourhoods* have been a focus of resident concern and Councillor questions at Planning and Housing Committee and in discussions since.

In the interior of *Neighbourhoods*, permissions would be limited to corner sites, as well as sites adjacent to existing non-residential uses, such as schools and parks and existing commercially-zoned sites. The permitted use would be a retail store with permissions for an ancillary eating establishment or take-out eating establishment, including permissions for a small patio in the front or side yard.

As noted in the Final Report, while major streets provide the greatest opportunities for retail uses, the distance between major streets create large blocks that leave many neighbourhood residents more than 500 metres walking distance from major streets sites. Furthermore, through consultations staff heard significant interest in social gathering space within *Neighbourhoods*. Two primary services were of particular interest – local convenience grocery stores and small coffee shops. Through consultations in 2023 and 2024, preferences were identified for corner sites, as well as sites adjacent to existing non-residential uses. In the public survey conducted in 2024, over 90 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the use of a retail store and an eating establishment or takeout eating establishment on these sites and 89 percent supported an outdoor patio.

Concerns, however, have been raised about the potential for these sites to become a location for bars or cannabis stores. More generally, residents' associations identified concerns that commercial uses would proliferate within the interior of *Neighborhoods*, and that individual establishments would be generators of issues such as noise, waste and traffic from outside the area particularly at night. Some note that while certain parts of the city have many homes far from existing commercial strips, others are well served

by such walkable amenities today and have concerns that additional permissions would allow this activity to extend into the neighbourhood interior unnecessarily. Concerns have also been raised about the possibility of permissions for a Retail Store facilitating the establishment of small distribution hubs for delivery services rather than as a store with on-site for local customers.

The sections below provide further information regarding the issues raised and measures currently planned for addressing these, including those embedded in the Zoning By-Law and through monitoring and by-law enforcement.

Alcohol and Cannabis

Questions were raised at Planning and Housing Committee about alcohol and cannabis licences and the proposed permissions for a retail store with an ancillary eating establishment or takeout eating establishment and associated patio within the interior of a Neighbourhood.

Liquor Licensing

The sale and service of alcohol is under provincial jurisdiction. Municipalities do not have authority in this regard. The Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario (AGCO) licences and regulates the sale and service of liquor in Ontario.

The City Clerk's Office facilitates the liquor licensing process within the City of Toronto. The project team has consulted with the Clerk's office and with Legal Services to inform an understanding of liquor licensing and the Clerk's office has in turn been in consultation with the AGCO.

The AGCO is governed by the Liquor Licence and Control Act, 2019, which establishes the licensing and regulatory regime for most aspects relating to the sale, service and delivery of liquor in Ontario. The AGCO also issues various types of endorsements that allow liquor sales licensees to sell and serve liquor under specific conditions, such as temporary extension of time and premises (in certain circumstances) and Special Occasion Permits.

Convenience and grocery stores in Ontario may sell alcohol for consumption off-site as of September 5, 2024, and require a license from the AGCO to do so. A provincial Convenience Store Licence would apply to eligible stores with up to 4,000 square feet of retail floor space. This would be applicable to retail stores permitted within the proposed zoning by-law amendments.

Councillors and residents have also raised questions about service of alcohol for consumption on-site, and the potential for a site with permission for a retail store with an ancillary eating establishment and patio to be used as a bar.

A bar, or any other business focussed service of alcohol for consumption on site, is not a defined use within the zoning by-law. The Zoning By-law's definition Eating Establishment encompasses businesses that serve food and beverages, including alcoholic beverages. To serve alcohol, an Eating Establishment must obtain a *Liquor Sales Licence* from the AGCO allowing the owner to store, sell and serve liquor. Such

an establishment would be permitted under the current proposed zoning by-law amendment. Should an eating establishment be permitted on a site, the City does not have the legal authority to prohibit the owner from applying for a liquor sales licence. The regulation of alcohol is the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario. If the property has a legal patio, the owner would have the option for the license application to include or exclude the patio.

Eating Establishments are not the only uses that can apply and obtain a liquor sales licence. As noted by the AGCO: *“The business does not have to be primarily involved with the sale and service of food or liquor, but must be located in a premises open to the public or private members (such as a social club).”* The AGCO notes a variety of examples of premises which may apply for a Liquor Sales Licence, including a bookstore. A store, for example, may host a book reading where patrons have the opportunity to purchase a drink.

The Province’s licence application process includes an opportunity for the community and/or local councillor (and ultimately City Council) to object to a liquor licence application. This can result in a public meeting organized by the AGCO or informal discussions with the applicant. Through these discussions, the business owner may voluntarily choose to modify their plans to achieve greater community support or volunteer to have conditions attached to the licence such as limiting the hours of service of alcohol, or an early closing of an outdoor licenced patio. These decisions are made on a case-by-case basis. Ultimately, if objectors and the applicant do not agree on conditions to attach to a licence, the AGCO will issue a Notice of Proposal to Review the application that can be appealed to the Licence Appeal Tribunal by the applicant. The AGCO has no authority to attach conditions to a liquor licence for a new application without the consent of the applicant, as only the Licence Appeal Tribunal can do so on an appeal. It is uncommon for the Licence Appeal Tribunal to refuse a liquor licence outright.

The only way to eliminate the possibility of alcohol sales would be to maintain the current prohibition for a Retail Store in residential zones.

Cannabis

The Province of Ontario is responsible for licensing and regulating cannabis stores through the Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario (AGCO). The retail sale of Cannabis is governed by the *Cannabis Licence Act, 2018*.

Under the Act, municipalities: “may not create a licensing system respecting the sale of cannabis nor pass a bylaw that distinguishes land or building use for cannabis from any other kinds of use.”

A property with a land use permission for a Retail Store would therefore have the potential for a cannabis retail store to be established on the site.

Provincial regulations restrict a cannabis retail store from locating within 150 metres of public and private schools. The AGCO enforces this distance buffer between cannabis

retail stores and schools proactively through their licensing and store authorization process.

The definition of schools for this purpose does not include colleges or universities. The regulations do not establish a separation distance between other cannabis retail stores.

As school sites are located in the centre and/or on the borders of many *Neighbourhoods*, there would be a number of sites in any given neighbourhood which could have retail permissions without the potential for the establishment of a cannabis retail store, due to their location within the 150-metre buffer zone.

Retail Store Definition

City Planning explored the option of a more restrictive zoning definition for a Retail Store, either through establishing a new use definition, or through adding provisions to the permission for a Retail Store use.

For example, the City of Vancouver has a defined use of *Neighbourhood Grocery Store* which does not permit alcohol sales. The definition is:

The use of premises in a residential district for the primary purpose of selling groceries and convenience goods, and may include selling and serving prepared food and beverages for consumption on or off the premises, but does not include the sale of beer, wine, spirits, or other products that are intended for human consumption, containing more than 1% alcohol by volume.

Planning staff consulted with Legal Services on whether a similar definition, or zoning provisions with similar intent, could be an effective way of allowing a retail store on a site while prohibiting a cannabis or alcohol licence. Legal Services advised that this is outside of the City's jurisdiction and would not be enforceable.

Warehouses

The city-wide Zoning By-law defines a Warehouse as “premises used for keeping or storing goods or commodities, to which the general public does not have access, and which may also be used for the distribution of the goods or commodities”. A warehouse is not currently a permitted use in residential zones, nor would permission be added through the proposed Zoning By-law Amendments.

Councillors and residents have questioned whether a Retail Store permission would allow for a warehouse use. A key distinction between a retail store and a warehouse is the ability for the public to access the location and purchase goods on site. A business which does not allow public access would not be defined as a store. Should the business allow limited public access, it would continue to be defined as a warehouse if its primary business activity remains warehousing and distributing goods or commodities. Such a business would not be considered as a retail store and would be non-compliant with zoning permissions.

A business which maintains regular opening hours for public access and on-site purchases but sells some of its goods through delivery services would be considered a retail store and would be compliant with zoning permissions.

Potential Uptake

Some have raised concerns regarding flexibility built into the by-law with respect to potential locations in the interior of *Neighbourhoods*, and the potential for proliferation of commercial uses. The proposed by-law integrates flexibility in terms of potential locations within a neighbourhood interior. For example, rather than identifying specific corners, these uses would be permitted on any corner. It is neither the goal nor the expectation of staff that these provisions lead to a retail store or cafe on every neighbourhood corner, or on many corners. Consultations including with economic development staff, business owners and academics focussed in this area noted the economic challenges of small businesses, including retail stores and eating establishments in particular. The lower densities and reduced access in the interior of a neighbourhood makes these sites more challenging still. However, as currently exists in some areas of the city, individual operators are sometimes able find opportunities for successful local businesses within the interior of a neighbourhood. There is, however, rarely more than one such establishment in a given area.

Providing flexibility in the by-law allows individuals to identify sites that are appropriate for the specific characteristics of the neighbourhood and of their organization, which provide the greatest opportunity for success. The more prescriptive the by-law, the greater the potential for removing sites that would otherwise house establishments that act as successful businesses and bring benefits to neighbourhood residents.

Addressing Adverse Impacts

Zoning By-law Provisions

In the interior of *Neighbourhoods*, the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment includes performance standards to mitigate potential nuisance issues including:

- restricting the size of ancillary eating establishments and take out eating establishments to less than 55 square metres as they could be no larger than 49 percent of the total allowable retail store size of 110 square metres;
- associated outdoor patios would be limited to 10 square metres;
- requiring food to be prepared off-site to mitigate noise and odors;
- restricting uses from being located in a semi-detached or townhouse building;
- not permitting amplified music or entertainment on patios;
- For patios, requiring a fence along the property line, and a 1-metre setback.

Small eating establishments would be required to meet Ontario Building Code (OBC) standards, such as requirements for one universal washroom and a counter/server area. In existing sites explored by staff, the patron seating area was generally less than

40 percent of the total size of the eating establishment. An establishment of 55 square metres (about 590 square feet), would therefore typically have a seating area of under 22 square metres (240 square feet). The AGCO identifies a standard of 1.11 square metres per person, equivalent to about 12 square feet. By this standard, such an establishment would, at maximum, have enough space for about 20 people, for example, five tables of four people each. A patio of 10 square metres, by this calculation would have capacity for about nine people, or about two or three tables.

The small size permissions are intended to prevent large restaurants or bars in the interior of *Neighbourhoods* that serve as destinations for the broader city, as well as mitigate potential nuisance issues such as noise.

By-law Enforcement

The *EHON: Neighbourhood Retail and Services Study Phase Two Final Report* notes that the City of Toronto enforces a number of existing by-law regulations that are intended to mitigate potential nuisances such as noise, garbage and property standards. These by-laws apply to retail, service and office uses on Residentially-zoned properties within *Neighbourhoods* city-wide. These by-laws include, but are not limited to:

- Chapter 591, Noise
- Chapter 548, Littering and Dumping
- Chapter 841, Waste Collection, Commercial Properties
- Chapter 629, Property Standards
- Chapter 742, Sidewalk Cafes, Parklets and Marketing Displays

Toronto Municipal Code, [Chapter 591, Noise](https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/municode/1184_591.pdf), (https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/municode/1184_591.pdf) (referred to as "the Noise By-law") regulates noise in Toronto. The by-law balances the city's vibrancy with the needs of residents and visitors and provides time restrictions and sound level limits for various types of noise. It works to set out clear and enforceable noise rules, time restrictions and sound level limits for various types of noise in the city. Relevant provisions under the Noise By-law that relate to eating establishments include amplified sound (for music that might be played in the business) and stationary sources (like a kitchen hood or fan).

The Noise By-law does not regulate human voices. Any location where people may gather therefore does create the potential for noise from human voices. As noted above, the proposed zoning by-law limits the size of establishments in order to avoid large gatherings.

Monitoring and Staffing

The proposed zoning by-law amendments include performance standards to mitigate potential nuisance issues including: restricting the size of ancillary eating establishments and take out eating establishments and associated outdoor patios; requiring food to be prepared offsite to mitigate noise and odours.

Consistent with all EHON studies, City staff will monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the Zoning By-law Amendments. This monitoring program will include coordination with staff from City Planning, Development Review, Municipal Licensing and Standards (MLS), Economic Development & Culture and Toronto Building. It will include an examination of service requests made to 311, monitoring the number of new businesses licensed as well as communication with Councillors' offices to track implementation and report back on potential changes. It will also include consultation with the AGCO, school boards and other stakeholders.

The City has also updated the licensing and zoning regulations for restaurants, bars and entertainment venues in Toronto to redefine, clarify and modernize the rules for businesses. This will include an activity-based licensing model, where business license holders may be required to comply with either increased or reduced City regulations based on activities or services provided. The new rules will be in effect on January 1, 2025.

Specific to business licensing and enforcement:

- The goal of MLS' by-law enforcement team is to enhance public awareness of and obtain compliance with City by-laws, including business licensing and zoning regulations.
- MLS has a team of by-law enforcement staff operating city-wide that respond to complaints related to licensing and zoning.
 - Currently, there are approximately 69 by-law enforcement officers that respond to business licensing and public spaces issues, and 30 officers on the dedicated noise enforcement team.
- MLS conducts regular inspections of licensed establishments and staff use education and may issue warnings or lay charges to gain compliance. Certain businesses may be subject to an inspection prior to the issuance of their business license.
- Weekly analysis of 311 complaint data also informs the development and implementation of proactive enforcement strategies for problematic establishments and staff may also escalate efforts further through coordinated enforcement initiatives with enforcement partners.
- At this time, staff are unable to determine what impact, if any, the zoning by-law amendments will have from an enforcement perspective. Should staff determine that additional enforcement resources are necessary, they will be requested as part of future budget submissions.
 - It should be noted that MLS' business license application and renewal fees are based on a cost recovery model for licensing and enforcement resources, in alignment with the City's User Fee Policy.

Additional Consultation with Residents' Associations

As noted in the Phase Two Final Report, staff undertook community and industry consultation from May to October 2024, following on previous rounds conducted from 2022 to 2024. Consultation included two city-wide virtual consultation meetings and four in-person drop in events, one each in Toronto/East York, Scarborough, Etobicoke/York and North York. Consultation also included stakeholder and ward-specific meetings, a

publicly accessible webpage and an online survey which received about 1100 responses.

Following the Planning and Housing Committee, staff organized two additional two-hour meetings for representatives of Residents' Associations on Thursday, December 12; to discuss the proposals, to listen to comments, concerns, feedback, and to respond to questions. Invitations were sent to a list of about 260 Residents' Associations. The afternoon meeting had 28 attendees and the evening meeting had 15. Members from the following Residents' Associations were recorded as attending, with representation from all four Community Council Districts. The associations requested that they be identified by name in this report. Some associations sent multiple members. In some cases, the attendee's association was not identified.

1. Agincourt Village Community Association
2. Avenue Road Eglinton Residents' Association (ARECA)
3. Bayview Village Association
4. Beaconsfield Village Residents' Association
5. Centennial Community and Recreation Association (CCRA)
6. Church Wellesley Neighbourhood Association
7. Cliffcrest Scarborough Village SW Residents' Association (CSVSWRA)
8. Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations in Toronto (CORRA)
9. Davenport Neighbourhood Association
10. Federation of South Toronto Residents' Associations (FOSTRA)
11. Federation of North Toronto Residents' Associations (FONTRA)
12. Garden District Residents' Association
13. Grange Community Association
14. Highland Creek Community Association
15. Humber Valley Village Residents' Association
16. Kensington Market Action Committee (KMAC)
17. Mimico Residents' Association
18. Moss Park Residents' Association
19. New Toronto-Lakeshore Village Residents' Association
20. Quantum Owners And Residents Association (Quora)
21. Republic Residents' Association (RRA)
22. South Eglinton Davisville Residents' Association (SEDRA)
23. South Armour Heights Residents' Association (SAHRA)
24. St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Residents' Association
25. West Willowdale Neighbourhood Association

The Islington Ratepayers and Residents Association were unable to attend the meeting but asked that they be identified as a concerned party.

A large majority of residents at the meetings expressed opposition to the proposed addition of commercial use permissions in neighbourhood interiors, and concerns related to the potential for alcohol service and cannabis sales. Another widespread concern was that they had not been aware of the proposal until recently. A summary of the most common feedback and concerns from residents at the two meetings is

provided below. Participants requested that detailed meeting notes and questions be included in this report. They are provided in Attachment 1:

- Most said that they were unaware of consultations and the proposal in general;
- Many were against city-wide implementation—suggested multi-year pilot projects of small areas;
- Concerns with applying a “one-size-fits-all” approach across the city;
- Would like any proposal to require site-specific applications that can be vetoed by neighbourhood residents;
- Ontario’s appeals process means any permissions granted can be amended into large-scale permissions;
- Some residents said that they intentionally chose to live in areas without amenities or mix-of-uses;
- Some residents noted that many neighbourhoods are already within walking distance of commercial amenities and stores in the interior of Neighbourhoods would be better suited to specific areas that are far from amenities;
- Commercial uses would remove housing, violating EHON objectives of creating more housing;
- Concerns about traffic impacts of small-scale retail establishments and that they pose a threat to child safety;
- Any food-related use creates noise, garbage, rodent, traffic problems;
- Provincial licensing of cannabis and alcohol sales mean any non-residential permissions create high risk of these undesirable use—even where AGCO imposes conditions, they fail to enforce them and often lift them one year later;
- City by-law enforcement is unresponsive to complaints, especially about noise—more By-law Enforcement Officers needed, but even then do not trust them to adequately enforce restrictions;
- Property assessment and tax effects of permissions for non-residential uses;
- Negative effects on property values for sites next door to local retail establishments;

In addition to the project criticisms, many participants noted their support for the overall goal of the project to support complete communities, with amenities walking distance from residents’ homes, and to support small local businesses.

The feedback and discussions from the meetings helped inform briefings with councillors and potential motions that may be drafted.

CONCLUSION

This report provides clarification and analysis of questions and concerns raised at Planning and Housing Committee as well as those identified in meetings and communications with Residents’ Associations, focussed on Zoning By-law Amendment permissions in the interior of *Neighbourhoods*. These include concerns relating to

Alcohol and Cannabis, and the potential for warehouse uses, as well as concerns about the potential general proliferation of commercial uses in *Neighbourhoods*. It also identifies tools for addressing adverse impacts embedded in the by-law and in planned monitoring programs and by-law enforcement.

CONTACT

Caroline Samuel, Director (Acting), Zoning and Secretary Treasurer,
Committee of Adjustment, City Planning Division
Tel: 416-392-0871, Email: Caroline.Samuel@toronto.ca

Michael Noble, Project Manager, Waterfront Secretariat,
City Planning Division, Tel: 416-397-4826, Email: Michael.Noble@toronto.ca

Candace Safonovs, Planner, Planning Research and Analytics
City Planning Division, Tel: 416-392-5848, Email: Candace.Safonovs@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Kyle Knoeck
Interim Chief Planner and Executive Director
City Planning Division

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Detailed Notes from December 12, 2024 Meetings with Residents Associations

Attachment 1: Detailed Notes from December 12, 2024 Meetings with Residents Associations

Questions & Comments from the 2:00pm meeting chat

- For those in areas already open to retail and services, the residents are faced with challenges from establishments that routinely violate the hours and noise guidelines...enforcement is virtually non-existent, and any fines issued are simply absorbed as a “cost of business”. What is going to prevent this from happening in neighbourhoods?
- This I assume would change tax base to include commercial property taxes???
- Is this an answer to increase housing plus our tax deficit
- When was public consultation? I don't remember that?
- Why is it that we are NOW hearing about this? This doesn't sound accurate about consultation.
- Will retail and services be limited to the major streets through neighbourhoods?
- Please consider noise bylaws to be reviewed Please note the present bylaw allows radio to be played 24/7 even if building is empty- this would be problematic with semi and row housing. THIS WILL IMPACT!
- The interior sites for 'small-scale' establishments are problematic! Each should involve consultation with the neighbours.
- How do we preserve the "heritage designated" neighbourhoods? Is there a special process?
- Light pollution should also be considered along with noise, garbage, and increased traffic into the neighbourhood
- Why would it be city wide- that a study area be launched to see if this works etc. instead of city wide creating chaos
- Beer wine and cooler sales are not prohibited next to high schools, parks etc.
- conditions are usually lifted one year later or not enforced by AGCO
- How does this affect BIAs versus neighbourhood businesses and taxation levies?!
- Would increase in policing be offered to neighbourhoods!
- I cannot stay for the full meeting. I wanted to confirm that the Grange Community Association agrees with the issues raised by the Beaconsfield residents, as articulated in their submission to the PHC.
- It is not just building- yes patterns and what is needed
- This is deflecting away your responsibility by placing the responsibility on the province. This is incredible.
- You are implementing policies that you won't be around when these business are implemented.
- You do know the C of A regularly grants variances to increase over maximums set out in the by-law.
- Not in my backyard, but apparently in a front yard is ok! Really????

- even if amplified music is not permitted, it can be very loud and unbearable for the neighbours
- What increased car traffic and children safety...More cars to neighbourhood business and kids coming back
- Noise Bylaws do not work!!!
- there are not enough by-law officers
- how much paving over of green space will be allowed?
- Who suggested this?
- Patios should only be permitted if on flanking not sides to be consistent.
- Torontonians love their neighbours- once this comes out. This would not be acceptable by the majority of the population.
- If this goes through, I suspect that many councillors will be voted out.
- Next election should have this question on the ballot
- who was consulted on the negative impacts on neighbourhoods.
- What is the application process?
- Impact on property value, I would like to comment on that.
- this project should be differ to structure it better and re-evaluate where it would be feasible
- I don't think that allowing retail in corner sites in all residential neighbourhoods makes sense or is necessary - in midtown and downtown Toronto everyone lives close enough to major streets where intensification and retail should be encouraged - just think about Bathurst from St. Clair to Bloor - this area has evolved with better and more retail uses and this should be encouraged - there is no need at all for additional new retail within interior streets in this mature type of neighbourhood
- People purchase homes in certain neighbourhoods FOR the neighbourhood feel. Not to have a business opened up next store.
- What is in place to protect the existing homeowners that do not want a business next store. And the price of the home!
- Some neighbourhoods, including Mimico, have a significant number of small single storey homes that are rapidly disappearing by being converted into larger two storey homes eliminating affordable homes. Does the city have a role to play, either itself, or in zoning pairs of these as six-plex sites to provide some diversity of uses.
- no need to go into interior streets. it destroys the value of the neighbourhood
- with business you will need more policing
- I am a living example- it is HELL
- BIAs need to be considered- they are paying a business levy
- People are online shopping-!
- Try in certain sites not city wide
- I feel you need public consultation
- Try a pilot area otherwise you will have a public riot

- bylaw changes do not require that the residential properties converted to business be replaced by housing. So it has the potential to lose housing.
- Most of the permitted uses do not require a license. to operate.
- I think that "as of right" to open a retail or service establishment on every street corner in the city is excessive.
- The city needs to protect the residents not just the business owners.
- QUESTION- if you opened a business would your property tax be taxed COMMERCIAL and RESIDENTIAL?
- Reps of residents' association should let your ward councillor know - prior to Dec 17th council, that most only became aware a few days ago. Request Councillor to defer approval. It is already there without a recommendation.
- please defer this
- My sister has a mechanics shop next to her house on a residential street! The guy is working on cars at all hours and the City is unable to stop it.
- also for people who can't afford to go anywhere else. they are forced to pay higher convenience store prices. is it expected that there will be widespread poverty across the whole city?
- convenience stores and takeout food generate a lot of littering and not just on the site. And Garbage, and rats!
- not everyone wants to live in the same kind of neighbourhood but you're not doing it on specific sites. benefits real estate speculators.
- Multi year Pilot Project only on Major streets!
- You are converting housing into a business that are valued by a DCF calculation. The more successful the business - the greater the value and upward cost on housing...
- I did not hear one positive on this project. There are no reasons, I have not heard one that justify moving forward with this project.
- but you can purchase alcohol in convenience stores and go to a park and drink it. the huge number of changes being rapidly pushed through is drastically changing the character of the whole city
- Imagine drunk patrons who then drive throughout residential, impacting child safety?????
- Assign staff to projects that homeowners actually want in their neighbourhoods.
- Just wanted to add - in the planning report you noted Major streets provide the greatest opportunities for retail uses; however, some residents live beyond 500 meters. Residential properties are within 500 meters already have the amenities, so they don't need it. And also we want to support Commercial streets. There should not be a one size fits all.
- sticking a convenience store in the middle of a neighbourhood with a low walk score doesn't make it a walkable neighbourhood.

- Please contact your councillor and share your concerns as the vote in on the 17th. I bought into Kensington Land Trust because neighbourhood needs to be saved
- how many complaints and from how many people does it take to be heard?
- my neighbourhood is being heavily developed along Sheppard Avenue. retail should be along Sheppard not into the single family homes neighbourhood
- Reducing of car use is desirable. Walkable neighborhood is a good idea. If a presumption here is that we want to reduce the overall GHG emissions - net zero - then this concept would only work if we try to reduce emissions along all major causes. Some of measures, such as this proposal - adding more construction and retail - actual may add more emissions, while also impacting parks and protected natural areas "abutting". Construction & manufacturing responsible for over 50% of global emissions
<https://oneclicklca.com/en/resources/articles/global-emissions-from-construction-and-manufacturing>
- I like the idea of starting with neighbourhoods that are not walkable.
- My other concern is properties close to commercial streets can draw customers from those streets. Which makes the property more desirable for deliverables. And it creates increased competition for business on commercial strips, many of which are struggling. We don't want more vacancies on these streets.

Oral Questions and comments from the 2:00pm meeting

- Who was consulted about negative impacts?
- Huge impact on residential assessment – any properties near any new stores (that would be allowed to sell cannabis or alcohol)
- Not all residential areas are equal – some may be okay, but others are not. What study process was done? What is the application process?
- Wishes this to be deferred. Can see some value, but also problems.
- If someone buys a house or wants to sell a house, a store will negatively impact the sales value (he is a realtor), because it will negatively affect people's quality of life from noise and odour.
- Feel that permissions won't just allow a "croissant place". Wants a process that centres property owners for each potential store.
- Can see the plus e.g. Dovercourt, Roncesvalles cafes, but concerned that it does not include restrictions
- to the extent that they are on non-major streets, is there any way to limit it to "movement corridors" carrying significant amounts of in-neighbourhood "traffic"—think this includes pedestrian traffic
- Not what they were sold with the 2023 OPA. Allowing multiple employees in a Home Occupation and corner stores
- City's grand experiments always end badly

- Eating establishments are always a problem. Liquor licence is obtained, AGCO conditions are removed after a year, AGCO never investigates or revokes licences.
- Had a client who committed suicide because of constant noise on patios near his home.
- Schools will mean lots of students and parents using the space and being loud.
- “Custom workshops” as home occupations will have issues
- Believes that stores will only survive where they existed in the 1950s before refrigeration. Believes they will fail everywhere else because of modern needs, patients in cars for doctors’ offices.
- Will result in removal of housing.
- Concerned that doctor/dentist offices will locate next door to BIA, and undermine BIA by not paying fees.
- If Patios are permitted, both will be problematic. If allowed at all, then CofA will be a path to allow much larger sizes or expanding permission. Defeated some applications before. But without right of appeal, then.
- It’s called a “neighbourhood” not a “businesshood” for a reason. People choose these communities to not be near commercial businesses.
- Regular businesses can’t compete with prices of houses. Only businesses will be ones selling liquor and cannabis.
- Permissions mean more cars will be there, and children will get hurt because of that.
- Believes there is no monitoring or control. Planners will be gone before impacts are felt. City makes a decision with “experts” and ignores consultation feedback, because people at City Hall are driving it forward. “People pushing these things are not looking to benefit neighbourhoods.
- If we are trying to enable more housing, this is the opposite and will result in housing disappearing.
- Flaws: think we should be supporting existing commercial properties throughout the areas, which currently have significant vacancies.
- Example on Willowdale is also a legal nonconforming use. Thinks site-specific permissions should be considered, but that a city-wide blanket permission is not reasonable.
- What’s in place to protect homeowners? If a new person moves in next door and has the idea of starting a business, what’s to stop that happening?
- In an area with big lots. Seeing monster homes, now with 3-5 cars in the driveway because of kids living with parents into 40s.
- Residential street, but by-law cannot protect them. A property down the street was limited to six storeys, but developers fought for years to allow ~10 storey building and that is now there.
- Humber Valley Village:
 - 33 residential streets, bordered by Royal York Road and Dundas St

- Royal York was a “minor arterial” until reclassified as “major street”, now proposed to become an “Avenue”. 33 streets would provide approx. 132 corner lots, which is many in a neighbourhood. None of her residents want a corner store that could morph into a restaurant or a patio or alcohol or cannabis.
- This is just her neighbourhood, and there are many more like hers. People choose to live in suburban communities without commercial uses.
- So widespread. Why not test it out on major streets? Wouldn't agree with that either, but is more reasonable. This proposal is not desirable.
- So, you're eliminating the whole concept of residential neighbourhoods, and wanting to make entire city a mixed use area...
- Not making it site-specific, but rather corner-specific, and there's a big difference.
- No requirement to maintain existing housing supply, so counterintuitive under umbrella of “Expanding Housing Options in Neighbourhoods”.
- Liquor licences—believes businesses can only sell alcohol where food sales are permitted, and can prevent licences by prohibiting any seating (including patio).
- Why are we allowing these, knowing that they can become bars. Beaconsfield example that got variance for coffee, and then applied for a liquor licence. At best you can hope for conditions.
- Delivery depots – we classify as warehouse. They have an example in their neighbourhood that does 1-hour online delivery, but has limited retail sales, so gets classified as a retail store. Nothing in the proposal prevents “delivery”. Proposal allows ancillary eating establishment, but how does that get enforced—does someone come in with a measuring tape?
- In consultations we did, most residents identified desire for grocery store and café, not anything more. Why have we not defined “local grocery store” to explicitly limit the potential uses to those.
- Concerned with “food prepared off-site” instead of “low-risk pre-packaged”—do they get to heat up food? Can they do delivery from there? Catering?
- Major Streets – currently are mostly residential. Cannot imagine owning a semi-detached, and then finding out a bar or other broader commercial use is opening up next door.
- Cannabis store – the provincial rules mustn't be intended to permit a cannabis store in an existing LNC store, or when only a grocery store is permitted
- Jack Diamond was proud of how central Toronto was built on super-streets, with residential neighbourhoods nested within them. Everywhere south of St. Clair has these advantages.
- His whole area is served by thriving retail. He also looked at WalkScore, and his is 88 so that he doesn't need a car and can get access to good transit and all the amenities he needs.

- Wants to encourage small retail on major street, but feels there is no need to allow corner stores/cafes/etc. and that it is counterproductive
- For areas that are car-dependent, open it up and do pilot projects. Crawl-walk-run approach because of “one-solution fits all” approach. Is shocked at this approach. Sees this as a make-work project, that will disrupt neighbourhoods and should instead be focused where there are bad walkscores.
- Thought this was about development. Thinks this is about tax – City wants to increase income because commercial taxes are higher.
- Her neighbour is yelling at her because he is the only residential owner on a mixed-use stretch. Is part of a BIA that’s just formed. She has written to her councillor telling them to vote against it.
- Kensington Market:
 - They already do all of this, and wants to warn people of challenges they’ve faced. Property values have gone up, and whenever a mom-and-pop retires, they see it converted to a restaurant with a liquor licence.
 - Close to 300 businesses, and more than 5000 residents.
 - Have been working hard with City and councillors to control nuisance issues, with limited success
 - Parks are places people gather, and ruin the enjoyment of residents living near parks because of partying. Drum circles go on until 3am, and no one will come to address complaints.
 - Loves the idea of making neighbourhoods more dense, conversions to ‘plexes and adding laneway housing, but are not supporting our existing business on major streets—many empty storefronts.
 - Thinks good intentions, and walkable shoppable neighbourhoods are great, but maybe we should start with pilot projects, especially in those that are not already walkable. Blanketing it across the entire city is insane, especially for communities that are already working well.
 - People above/beside commercial uses become more transient—people want to leave when they have kids and cannot sleep

Questions & Comments from the 6:00pm meeting chat

- Can you please speak about the considerations and any rules concerning garbage disposal and pick up, parking and deliveries, noise and snow removal? Can you also please speak about what setbacks to family homes you landed on and the rationale?
- RATS and vermin have become a huge problem throughout our city right now. What consideration, if any, has been given to the control of vermin, in this plan?
- AGCO is problematic and I will speak to it. We have dozens of issues and applications over the years

- When has limitations placed on the city by the province ever stopped the city from trundling on its own way, for instance bike lanes???
- With all due respect Toronto's regulatory framework is unsupported and cannot be relied on. Enforcement is lax. For example, police will not come for noise complaints and noise enforcement only works Mon to Thur. Will any of this change?
- There are creeks (filled in) across the old city of Toronto where rats permeate across the buildings. This will make it worse. There is a restaurant that sits on an old creek on Queen Street West which was closed due to a rat infestation.
- Housing activities (EHON, HAPA, etc.) so far were dealing with built environment, growing more density, height, footprint, etc. So far there was no consideration for how this impacts TO's natural environment-natural heritage and green spaces. No mention that city OP has laws guiding the ESA/ANSI' in relation to development and site alteration on the location of protected land but also in the adjacency (120m). Natural Heritage Impact Study is required if development or site alteration is taking place in the adjacency. Of protected natural areas. Both direct and indirect impacts are relevant. Indirect impacts in respect to the protected natural heritage: increase use, noise, lights, pets, more impervious surfaces, etc. There must be a prove of no negative impacts from the adjacent development on natural features and ecological function. The way housing initiatives were proposed so far, there is a notable absence of relevant existing environmental policies. These policies are not nice to have but MANDATORY!
- "Since early 90th, there was a growing awareness in the City of Toronto of having to protect remaining valuable natural areas. Too often in the past, we have considered green space as an afterthought, what was left over after development took its course."
- In the urban context, the planning priority is to ensure that we benefit from the natural heritage while not unduly impairing natural processes.
- The ecosystem approach requires us to look beyond a particular site to what is happening in the next bay and in the whole watershed, and to have regard for cumulative impacts.
- It is not the goals that are the concern of most residents...it is the lack of planning and lack of rules to mitigate the obvious impacts that are alarming.
- any realistic effective timeline - given that the city is effectively bankrupt right now - on what possible basis do you surmise that enforcement would be effective at all? I would suggest that expecting any level of enforcement is divorced from reality.
- Cannabis has high margin, and this is the type of business that can be afforded when homes are 1M+
- Agreed, COA is a joke! MLS enforcement is pathetic currently, only going to get worse if approved.

- "One of the really important roles for municipal government to play is to ensure that we have clarity as to where growth will go, as well as where growth won't go". Have lost our view in Toronto where growth should not go
- "One of the challenges that we have is that we are experiencing something of a vortex sucking all kinds of growth right into the heart of the city. One of the really important roles for municipal government to play is to ensure that we have clarity as to where growth will go, as well as where growth won't go.
- I recommend that you reconsider the pace (e.g., phase in, pilot, monitor) and add consideration of the local context in the planning rules and bylaws. There are areas and sites where new commercial enterprises are welcome and make sense, and there are areas where they will damage neighbourhoods irreparably.
- In our area EHON, Midnight Economy and now this is tantamount to Block Busting in the 60s, 70s
- The Ultimate irony is the City tells us to leave these zoning Commercial changes to the Marketplace while trying to convince us only the Government can resolve the Housing problems
- Proximity to schools MUST also be a consideration
- did PHC have any questions about impacts?
- The City does not have the tools to manage this. There are tons of violations that are never investigated by the city.

Oral Questions and comments from the 6:00pm meeting

- Parking, deliveries, vermin; No food prep on site to avoid food waste
- Garbage has to be enclosed
- How about waste pick-up/timing? Is it regular residential pick-up
- Vermin and rats' problem
- City doesn't have ability or personnel to enforce
- More sources for garbage
- central tenant of the Official Plan is protecting neighborhood character
- Enforcement = divorced from reality
- What suggests that we need more of these types of uses?
- Concerned about small businesses being replaced by large stores; Need a combination of uses/space
- City of neighbourhoods; Lots of differences and similarities
- Proposal does not affect anyone well; no economic benefit
- Displacing other businesses
- Economics has not been vetted; rushing it
- MLS staff does not seem to be on-board; no budget prepared for this
- Trying to apply a "one size fits all" approach
- We are not opposed to flexibility
- Have 80% of the entertainment area in the ward already

- City-wide is a problem; individual wards should be able to opt out; CofA can modify; Don't want it imposed on us
- Concerns re violence and shooting; e.g. recent gun fight on Queen St W
- Commercial garbage pick-up is at 4:00am
- Should be phased in and modified as you go
- We have not learned from our mistakes
- Davenport area is heavily dense
- Many examples of LNC uses
- Bike repair shop with liquor license; no enforcement
- Davenport from Queen to St. Clair everyone is close to commercial strips many of which are vacant
- Buildings were not built to have a noise barrier; Dance studio for kids; would still be noisy
- One size does not fit all
- Etobicoke neighbourhoods might need this
- Construction is displacing rats; City does not deal with rats
- Supportive of walkable communities
- Scarborough community would benefit from coffee shops and clinics etc.
- Need to plan for where it makes sense and where it doesn't
- Walkable is a high-level idea
- We don't protect against spill-over noise
- More thought needs to be put towards parking
- Increasing regulatory costs; pushing problems to MLS enforcement etc. – hoping for the best
- Go a little slower
- Feasibility – 15 minute city component; working from home, bike lanes and walking; not everyone wants to walk (i.e. seniors)
- Pilot it before one-size fits all
- Public consultation process is fraught
- How many residents' associations are present and how many people do they represent?
- Do not think we should compare Toronto to European cities