



Wednesday, May 6, 2026

PH30.8 - Mid-Rise Housing Implementation Initiative - Proposals Report

Dear colleagues,

Summary

Planning staff are seeking authorization to conduct a public consultation on, among other things, relieving midrise buildings of Type G waste collection requirements. Midrise buildings are important, and developers report that they are challenging to make profitable under current market conditions. It is reasonable to review whether city requirements unnecessarily add to the financial obstacles of such buildings, and some developers have pointed to the Type G requirements as obstacles.

The report states that:

When Type G loading spaces are enclosed within the building, it can have significant impacts on ground floor design and limits potential layouts, particularly on smaller sites. This leads to less efficient and functional layouts and in turn, less area for residential or retail uses. Reforms to Type G requirements could potentially unlock additional space to enable a better-designed ground floor and more functional retail spaces or additional residential units. Further, providing alternative design solutions for the location of Type G loading spaces could improve the feasibility of projects through both potential cost savings and increased sellable/leasable floor area.

It is therefore reasonable to consider allowing midrise buildings to use other internal options for waste collection. For example, when approving the midrise building at 126-130 Avenue Road, Council permitted a smaller Type C space, on condition that the developer agree to use private waste disposal with smaller trucks. Private Molok systems could also work. The city could also consider directing Solid Waste to add smaller or Molok-type trucks to its fleet that are capable of serving such buildings.

However, it would be unreasonable and unacceptable to my constituents to allow midrise buildings to stage their garbage, recycling and green bin materials on the sidewalk or boulevard, where their physical bulk and stench would degrade the public realm. In my ward, the public realm is tightly constrained, and there is no space to spare. FONTRA is correct that:

Fundamentally, this approach neglects what economists call “externalities.” These “reforms” aim to curb internal costs to sellers and buyers. But that internal saving is at external expense. It costs the neighbours, and the physical environment, and the whole city, in both material and immaterial ways, like esthetics and reputation, and tourist draw

and even civic and social life. Unfortunately, it is very hard to cost out the damage done.

As the staff report acknowledges,

Relying on the public realm to accommodate waste collection can create several issues including:

- Obstructing pedestrian clearways and compromising accessibility;*
- Displacing street trees and other amenities;*
- Reduced operational efficiency due to longer and more frequent truck stops;*
- Impeding traffic and potential hazards for cyclists due to frequent truck stops;*
- and,*
- Introducing sanitation concerns such as spills from bins, windblown litter, odour and pests.*

These are serious and permanent drawbacks that are not justified by concerns about Type G loading.

I therefore request that you add an additional recommendation:

Recommendation:

The Planning and Housing Committee request the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning not to include curbside staging of waste, recyclable materials or organics as options in the public and stakeholder consultation described in Recommendation 1.

Sincerely,

Councillor Dianne Saxe
Ward 11, University–Rosedale