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Purpose: As a result of concerns regarding growth and change arising from the Humbertown Shopping Centre redevelopment proposal, City Council directed that a Secondary Plan Area Study be undertaken for the Apartment Neighbourhood to the north.

- The Study Area is approximately 15 hectares, generally covering lands that front onto The Kingsway and/or Anglesey Blvd.

Note: The Study Area does physically include the Humbertown Shopping Centre, but these lands and the Humbertown mixed-use redevelopment plan will only be considered as part of the contextual review of the surrounding environs.

Objective: To determine if a Secondary Plan or another planning tool(s), is required to help articulate a vision for the Study Area and guide the review of future development applications.

- The outcome of the Phase 1 Study is a recommendation on a direction and scope of work for a separate Phase 2 process, during which a more defined vision for the Study Area may be established along with new or additional development parameters.
STUDY AREA: OVERVIEW OF EXISTING LAND USES

Official Plan Designations

Apartment Neighbourhood:
- Stable areas of the City where significant growth is not anticipated. There may be opportunities for additional development on underutilized sites, and the Official Plan sets out criteria to evaluate these situations (Section 4.2).

Mixed Use Areas:
- Will absorb most of the anticipated increase in retail, office, service employment in the coming decades, as well as much of the new housing (Section 4.5).

Predominant Land Use

Walk-Up Rental Apartments
- 42 walk-up buildings.

Other Land Uses

- High-rise rental apartment building;
- Low/mid-rise condominium;
- Duplex;
- Vacant lot; and
- Humbertown Shopping Centre - future mixed-use residential and commercial development.
STUDY AREA: OVERVIEW OF EXISTING BUILT FORM

ZONING BY-LAW

Zoning:
• Residential Multiple (RM): maximum height of 14 metres.
• Residential Apartment (RA) Exception (X) 76: permits 17 storeys.
• Commercial Limited (CL) – site-specific amendments for the Humbertown redevelopment.

BUILDING CHARACTERISTICS

Heights:
• Predominantly 3 to 4 storeys.
• 5-storey condominium.
• 17-storey apartment.
• Humbertown redevelopment will range from 2 to 12 storeys.

Age & Style:
• Primarily walk-up apartments built in the 1950s - 1960s.
• Similar built form, architectural style and materials.
• Typical density range (existing) 0.3 to 0.6 floor space index (FSI).
• Paved sidewalks on all streets except Lambeth Rd.
• Streets lined with mature trees – some classified as ‘legacy trees’.
• Relatively consistent and generous building setbacks from the street.
• Mix of hard and soft landscaping (public and private realm).
• Pedestrian-activated crosswalk at Anglesey Blvd. and The Kingsway.
• Coloured paving for pedestrian crossings.
• Onstreet parking.
• Minimal street furniture.
• Large paved areas (asphalt driveways and surface parking lots).
• Varying conditions of public and private realm.
• Visible garbage and recycling facilities.
• Predominantly detached, single-family housing:
  • Varying style and size;
  • Varying age (most built +/- 40 years ago); and
  • Suburban (e.g. larger lots, few sidewalks).

• Some townhouses and duplexes.

• Few high-rise buildings.

• Significant amount of public and private recreational lands and open space:
  • Mature trees;
  • Woodlots and valley land;
  • Golf courses;
  • Parks and parkettes; and
  • Trails.

• Range of community services and facilities.

• Clusters of office, commercial and retail – generally located along major roadways.
ROAD NETWORK:
• Primarily local roads. Some collector and arterials.
• Many intersections operating at acceptable levels, but some with delays (particularly for left hand turns).
• Some roadway improvements identified for approved new development.

PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLING NETWORK:
• Few crossings for pedestrians. Limited sidewalks.
• 10.5 km north-south painted bike lane on Royal York Rd. (somewhat disconnected, not a full bike lane). No east-west cycling corridor.
• Low to moderate levels of active transportation (mode share).

TRANSIT NETWORK:
• Five bus lines serving surrounding area (i.e. 30 Lambton, 32 Eglinton West, 37 Islington, 48 Rathburn and 73 Royal York). Most have frequent peak hour headways.
• Bloor-Danforth subway line located 2 to 2.5 km south (i.e. Islington, Royal York and Old Mill stations).
• Moderate levels of transit usage (mode share).

Local residents have raised numerous concerns with existing transportation conditions.
### ISSUES RAISED TO-DATE BY WORKING GROUP AND PUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>COMMUNITY SERVICES &amp; FACILITIES</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Affordable housing and loss of rental stock</td>
<td>- Capacity of schools (JK-12, both TDSB &amp; TDCSB)</td>
<td>- Lack of on-street parking availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing mix (variety of types and sizes)</td>
<td>- Maintenance of public realm</td>
<td>- Parking capacity (including lack of visitor parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family neighbourhood</td>
<td>- Parks and open space capacity</td>
<td>- Connectivity throughout the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The ability to ‘age in place’</td>
<td>- Emergency services and response times</td>
<td>- Traffic generated by approved and potential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rental housing redevelopment viability</td>
<td>- Busing of students</td>
<td>- High volume of traffic on Royal York, Dundas, and Kingsway (difficult to exit driveways, slow, noise and visual impacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rental regeneration and maintenance</td>
<td>- Traffic and safety concerns from student drop-off/pick-up</td>
<td>- Non-Neighbourhood cut through traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land use compatibility</td>
<td>- Variations in community facilities</td>
<td>- Speeds inconsistent with safe streets/livable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suburban vs. urban</td>
<td>- Loss of greenspace at schools</td>
<td>- Lack of pedestrian crossings and dangerous crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changing contexts</td>
<td>- Sense of community</td>
<td>- Lack of sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact on real estate value</td>
<td>- Crime</td>
<td>- Differing opinions on cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evolution / redevelopment</td>
<td>- Social structure/web of life”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUILT FORM & URBAN DESIGN**

- Setbacks from street, buildings and surroundings
- Density
- Height
- Maintain neighbourhood character - ‘village’ feel
- Private amenity space and connectivity
- Overwatch/privacy issues
- Transition between heights and densities
- Sun/shadow impacts
- View corridors
- Best practices for architectural design and finishes
- Public art displays
- Design Guidelines
- Outdated rental buildings and amenities/equipment
- Earthquake protection

**ENVIRONMENTAL & NATURAL HERITAGE**

- Wildlife (e.g. deer)
- Planting and maintenance of legacy (native) trees
- Impacts on Humber River and groundwater
- Stormwater management practices
- Flooding
- Targeted planting to sustain species populations
- Ground radiation

**OTHER**

- Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)
- Transparency of development application processes
- Construction management planning
- Developer experience/track records
- Noise reduction measures
- Role of neighbourhood in review of proposals

**Note:** The issues are listed in the order in which they were raised/received and do not represent their priority or rank. For the purposes of this chart some descriptions of issues have been summarized by IBI Group. Copies of all written comments received by the City of Toronto will be provided as an appendix to the Final Study Report.
PRELIMINARY FINDINGS - SWOT OF PLANNING TOOLS

• A number of policies, regulations, guidelines and other controls (i.e. planning tools) regulate land use and development in the City of Toronto.

• A strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis was undertaken of these planning tools to determine which can best help articulate the vision for the Study Area and guide the review of future development applications. The SWOT evaluated the:
  • **Strengths of Existing Tools**: which of the existing tools provide the clearest, most definitive direction for articulating the vision for the Study Area and which have the greatest clout (‘teeth’)?
  • **Weaknesses of Existing Tools**: which of the current tools do not provide as clear a direction for articulating the vision for the Study Area and/or have less clout?
  • **Opportunities with Existing and New Tools**: When and how can existing and other tools give better clarity and direction for articulating the vision for the Study Area?
  • **Threats with Application of Existing and New Tools**: What risks are associated with the various tools, in terms of achieving the desired vision for the Study Area?

Note: The identification of potential weaknesses is not intended to suggest that the City’s policies, regulations, guidelines or processes themselves are weak or need to be changed, but rather that some tools are more appropriate than others to help articulate a vision for the Study Area.
## PRELIMINARY FINDINGS - SWOT OF PLANNING TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TORONTO OFFICIAL PLAN (OP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal document approved by City Council (relatively current).</td>
<td>• Currently no area specific policies for the Study Area.</td>
<td>• Currently under review. Modifications to various sections and policies being considered (e.g. May 20th Council report regarding Neighbourhoods and Apartment Neighbourhoods).</td>
<td>• Differing interpretation of broad policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposals must conform to the OP, or an amendment to the OP must be approved by City Council.</td>
<td>• Less prescriptive.</td>
<td>• Area specific policies and guidelines can be prepared (amendment to the OP).</td>
<td>• Without area-specific policies, applications will continue to be reviewed on a site-by-site basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some prescriptive policies (e.g. 4.2.2 Development Criteria for Apartment Neighbourhoods).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY OF TORONTO ZONING BY-LAW (ZBL) 569-2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal document approved by Council.</td>
<td>• Carried over from the former City of Etobicoke Zoning Code.</td>
<td>• Site-specific or area specific amendments can be prepared (amendment to the ZBL).</td>
<td>• Amendments to the OP introduce site-specific policies must confirm with the broader policy objectives of the OP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposals must conform to the ZBL, or an amendment to the ZBL must be approved by City Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• An update could establish height, density, setback and other provisions for an area.</td>
<td>• Decisions of City Council can be appealed to the OMB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detailed and prescriptive provisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRELIMINARY FINDINGS - SWOT OF PLANNING TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GUIDELINES** (e.g. Tall Buildings, Infill Housing and Streetscape) | • Reflect current planning objectives and best practices.  
• Approved by Council.  
• Help guide how new development fits in with an existing community.  
• Helps achieve other OP policies and objectives and support ZBL provisions. | • No guidelines specific to Study Area.  
• Not binding or statutory.  
• Varying degrees of detail.  
• Cannot be appealed to OMB. | • Not binding or statutory.  
• Cannot be appealed to OMB. |
| **DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS** (e.g. Site Plan Control and Technical Studies) | • Allows for detailed review of development proposals.  
• All significant development applications within the City are subject to Site Plan Control.  
• Detailed studies must be undertaken by qualified professionals.  
• Owners may be required to enter into an agreement to secure the construction of the project as per plans. | • Depending on the development scope, studies are not always required.  
• Limited opportunity for public input during Site Plan – since at this stage development proposals conform to the OP and ZBL.  
• Dependent on the provisions of statutory documents (OP and ZBL). | • Public cannot appeal a Site Plan decision or conditions (only the land owner may appeal).  
• Potential for technical studies to provide justification for more intense development. |
### PRELIMINARY FINDINGS - SWOT OF PLANNING TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SECONDARY PLAN** | N/A (one does not currently exist for the Study Area) | • Legal document, must be approved by City Council.  
• Development applications must comply to the Secondary Plan, or an amendment to the OP must be approved by City Council.  
• Prescriptive and provides degree of certainty.  
• Area-specific policies could recognize the unique characteristics of the Study Area and help articulate a future vision for the Study Area. | • Intended for areas where major physical change is expected or desired.  
• Generally will stimulate development and provide justification for more development.  
• Decisions can be appealed to the OMB. |
| **SITE AND AREA SPECIFIC POLICY (SASP)** | N/A (one does not currently exist for the Study Area) | • Legal document, must be approved by City Council.  
• Development applications must comply to the SASP, or an amendment to the OP must be approved by City Council.  
• Prescriptive and provides degree of certainty.  
• Site or area-specific policies could recognize the unique characteristics of the Study Area and help articulate a future vision for the Study Area. | • Less encompassing than a Secondary Plan. Generally focuses on land use issues.  
• May stimulate development and provide justification for more intense development.  
• Decisions can be appealed to the OMB. |
| **NEIGHBOURHOOD STUDY** | N/A (one does not currently exist for the Study Area) | • Has the potential to establish guiding principles and recommendations to recognize the unique characteristics of the Study Area.  
• Could recommend non-policy related measures (e.g. traffic calming, infrastructure improvements, etc.). | • Not legally binding unless it its translated into policies or regulations. |
Summary

- The City of Toronto has many strong tools and processes in place to guide land use and development, such as:
  - Official Plan policies for directing future growth, protecting stable neighbourhoods and development criteria for apartment neighbourhoods;
  - Zoning provisions that regulate height and density;
  - Guidelines (e.g. for tall and mid-rise buildings);
  - Technical studies with the submission of development applications; and
  - Mandatory site plan control.

- The Study Area would, however, benefit from more localized policies and planning tools that could:
  - Help articulate a vision for the area;
  - Provide more certainty and direction;
  - Assist with the application review and approvals processes; and
  - Address improvements and mitigation measures.
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

• A Phase 2 Study should be undertaken to develop a **Site and Area Specific Policy (SASP)** for the Study Area.
  - A SASP is a legal document with ‘teeth’. It becomes part of the Official Plan and must be approved by City Council.
  - A SASP is prescriptive. Site or area-specific policies can recognize the unique characteristics of the Study Area and help articulate a future vision.
  - All future development applications would either have to comply to the SASP, or an amendment to the OP must be approved by City Council.

• The Phase 2 Study should continue to explore how to best address and set parameters for issues such as:
  - Traffic;
  - Height and density;
  - Urban design;
  - Community services and facilities;
  - Transportation infrastructure; and
  - Provisions for rental housing.
NEXT STEPS / TIMING

July 3, 2014: Last day for submitting comments to the City on the IBI Group presentation of *Preliminary Findings and Draft Recommendations*.

Please either complete a comment sheet tonight (drop-box available) or submit your comments to:
Cynthia Owusu-Gyimah & Bill Kiru, Community Planning, Etobicoke York District
Tel: (416) 394-2608  Fax: (416) 394-6063  Emails: cowusug@toronto.ca & bkiru@toronto.ca
Mail: Planner at Etobicoke York District, 2 Civic Centre Crt., Floor 3, Toronto, ON, M9C 5A3.

July 16, 2014: IBI Group *Phase 1 Study Report* to be submitted to the City

The IBI Group Phase 1 Study Report will be uploaded on the City’s website as soon after submission as possible.

July 22, 2014: Last day for submitting comments to Cynthia Owusu-Gyimah at the City on the IBI Group *Phase 1 Study Report* (for input to the City’s Report).

The City Planning Staff Report will be uploaded on the City’s website before the EYCC Meeting – with the posting of the Agenda.

After July 22 comments on the Phase 1 Study Reports should be directed to: etcc@toronto.ca

August 12, 2014: Etobicoke York Community Council (EYCC) Meeting

Etobicoke Civic Centre, agenda/timing of City presentation to be confirmed (AM).

Council will provide a recommendation on how to proceed and timing.
Thank you for attending the Second Open House for the Humbertown Secondary Plan Area Study – Phase 1.
We appreciate your time and valuable input.

Questions & Comments?

Questions & Comments