

May 15, 2020

Sabrina Salatino  
Senior Planner, Community Planning, City Planning, Etobicoke York District  
City of Toronto  
Etobicoke York District  
2 Civic Centre Court, 3rd Floor  
Toronto, ON M9C 5A3

**Re: Combined ZBA/DPS/OPA Application, 2150-2194 Lake Shore Boulevard West and  
23 Park Lawn Road**

---

Urban Strategies Inc. is acting on behalf of the land owners, FCR (Park Lawn) LP and CPPIB Park Lawn Canada Inc. (the 'Owners') in submitting the enclosed combined Official Plan Amendment (OPA), Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA), and Draft Plan of Subdivision (DPS) application for the site municipally known as 2150-2194 Lake Shore Boulevard West and 23 Park Lawn Road ("2150 Lake Shore" or "the site").

A previous OPA application was made in October 2019. Urban Strategies was directed that the City would not accept a combined OPA, ZBA, and DPS application without the October 2019 OPA application being closed and refiled. As such, this previous OPA application will technically be closed, allowing for its appropriate integration with this application, so that planning approvals for the site can proceed via this single, combined OPA, ZBA, and DPS application. The Official Plan Amendment included with this application has not changed in any material way, save for changes to the Land Use Designation Map to reflect revisions to the proposed development.

The reports, studies, and drawings within this application have been provided in support of the proposed Official Plan Amendment, draft Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision, which together provide for the appropriate redevelopment of the site. Where relevant, these materials endeavor to respond to staff comments received on the October 2019 OPA application. To this end, a consolidated matrix of all of the comments received on the October 2019 OPA application, along with responses and related revisions, is attached to this cover letter.

The Owners and Project Team look forward to continued engagement with the City and community through the review of this application and during the ongoing work on the Secondary Plan process, to align the Master Plan and emerging policy framework, ultimately resulting in a mutually-supported vision for the redevelopment of the site.

## Site Description

2150 Lake Shore is located in southeast Etobicoke on the northeast corner of Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard West. The site is approximately 11.2 ha / 27.6 acres in size and was formerly occupied by an industrial bakery, which has since been demolished. Today the site is predominantly vacant, excepting a one storey BMO bank building located at the corner of Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard West.

## The Revised Master Plan

The Master Plan for the site has further evolved from the October 2019 OPA application, in response to comments and suggestions from City Staff and other key stakeholders, and as a result of a more detailed review to support this combined OPA, ZBA, and DPS application.

The fundamental vision and key elements of the Master Plan remain consistent with the October 2019 submission, including introduction of a new local street network, a relief road to direct traffic away from Park Lawn and Lake Shore, and an integrated transit hub centred around a new GO station. The Master Plan also continues to provide a diverse network of open spaces, including a public park and two large squares. The galleria, located at the heart of the project, provides a focal point and key pedestrians connections that knit together the project's range of new residential, employment, retail and entertainment uses. The project continues to include diverse range of building types and distinct architecture, including fifteen towers with heights ranging from 16 to 70 storeys. Key revisions to the Master Plan include approximately doubling the size of the proposed park, a significant increase in the provision of office-type employment (Column 1 non-residential uses in SASP 15), and the potential inclusion of two elementary schools, subject to further discussion with the Toronto District School Board, Toronto Catholic District School Board, and provincial approval and funding.

The Master Plan is conceptual and illustrative in nature. It illustrates how development could unfold under the Draft Official Plan Amendment (OPA), Draft Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision. This application has been filed in support of these policy instruments, which provide for the orderly redevelopment of the site by implementing and building upon Site and Area Specific Policy 15, as well as the suite of other provincial and municipal policies that pertain to the site.

## The Application Package

In support of this combined OPA, ZBA, and DPS Application, the following materials have been submitted digitally only at this time:

- 2020 Development Approval Application form
- Fee Schedule 3.3 (Combined OPA/ZBA) & Schedule 6 (DPS)
  - The Owners will pay fees via EFT once confirmed, as directed
- Project Data Sheet
- Cover Letter & Comment/Response Matrix
- Pre-Application Consultation Checklist
- Planning & Urban Design Rationale
- Draft Official Plan Amendment
- Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
- Public Consultation Strategy
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Shadow Study
- Digital Building Mass Model
- Toronto Green Standard Checklist
- Energy Strategy
- Accessibility Design Standards Checklist letter
- Housing Issues Report
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Natural Heritage & Environmental Impact Assessment
- Arborist Report & Tree Preservation Plan
- Pedestrian Level Wind Study
- Air Quality Study
- Noise and Vibration Study
- Transportation Impact Study
- Servicing Report
- Stormwater Management Report
- Geotechnical Study
- Hydrological Review Study
- Contaminated Site Assessment letter
- Compatibility / Mitigation Strategy
- Rail Safety Strategy
- Boundary Plan of Survey
- Topographical Survey
- Architectural & Landscape Drawing Set
- Basement Drawing Set
- Civil Drawing Set

The Owners and applicant appreciate the City's efforts to adjust submission protocols to allow this application to advance digitally during the COVID emergency. Should physical

copies of any of the following be required at a later time, the Owners and applicant would be happy to coordinate this.

We look forward to ongoing conversations with City Staff to advance this exciting project. If there are any points requiring clarification please contact us directly.

Yours very truly,

URBAN STRATEGIES INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Cyndi Rottenberg-Walker, FCIP, RPP  
Partner  
416-340-9004 ext.214

## Comment/Response Matrix: October 2019 OPA Application

Last Updated May 15, 2020

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response By	Support by	Doc Reference	Date response issued
<b>City Planning, December 20 2019</b>		<b>Sarah Henstock, Community Planning Etobicoke York; Corwin Cambray, SIPA</b>				
<b>A Strategic Initiatives, Policy &amp; Analysis</b>						
<b>Comments</b>						
A.1	Staff are undertaking a detailed review of the proposed heights and densities shown in the Master Plan. Once the general site plan layout of the site is determined, staff will be able to provide more detailed comments regarding the built form, including the total number of towers/buildings/units and the proposed heights.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
A.2	First Capital Realty is encouraged to exceed the minimum required 98,000 square metres of non-residential gross floor area in SASP 15.	The draft ZBA mirrors the minimum 98,000 m2 of non-residential GFA and split between Column 1, 2 and 3 uses, established in SASP 15. The Owners are not supportive of the policy instruments that are the subject of this application exceeding the minimums already established in SASP 15, given the long term build out of the site and related market uncertainty. That said, the Owner's understand the City's interests and will continue to explore the feasibility of providing additional non-residential GFA above established SASP 15 minimums through the phased build out of the site. To that end, the revised Master Plan proposal includes approximately 101,050 m2 of non-residential GFA, excluding the potential school GFA. This also reflects a significant increase in the proportion of 'Column 1' uses.	USI		ZBA, Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
A.3	The Master Plan proposal should allow for the potential and the opportunity of providing more employment and non-residential uses close to the station and as part of the first two phases of development.	The draft ZBA intentionally does not include maximum non-residential GFA thresholds; only maximums for total GFA and minimums for non-residential GFA, as per SASP 15. This provides flexibility for additional provision of non-residential GFA in all phases. The revised Master Plan positions the significant majority of non-residential GFA clustered around the GO station, and primarily spread between the first three phases of development.	USI		ZBA, Phasing Plan, Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20

A.4	As the Master Plan advances, the breakdown of proposed uses on the site should show an appropriate mix of non-residential land uses in accordance with the requirements of SASP 15 (Schedule B).	This is reflected in the revised Master Plan and ZBA.	USI		ZBA, Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
A.5	<p>City Planning consulted with Children's Services, Parks Forestry and Recreation, Toronto Public Library and also undertook a survey of human service agencies in the area to share information on growth estimates and get feedback on estimated needs to support future growth. Based on the feedback we have received, the following has been identified by the sectors to support growth: two to four non-profit child care centres to support the proposed development on this site; a public community recreation facility to support the proposed development and estimated future growth in the surrounding area; and non-profit community agency space to support the proposed development and estimated future growth in the surrounding area. The Toronto Public Library will be providing comments by the end of January 2020. In addition , City Planning convened a meeting of your planning consultant, City staff and the TDSB and TCDSB in November to allow the school boards to present information on school capacity in the area. Both school boards have identified an interest in school facilities on this site. City Planning has requested that discussions continue with the applicant and the school boards to explore how schools could be accommodated on site. A report back meeting with City staff, the applicant and the school boards is scheduled for late January 2020.</p> <p>Consideration of the size and location of CS&amp;F spaces and facilities should be discussed with staff as the next submission is being prepared in order to achieve the integration of spaces and facilities into the application proposal and in consideration of their delivery commensurate with development phases.</p>	Noted. These discussions have continued as intended, including exploration of two potential elementary schools shown in the revised proposal. The Owners look forward to further discussions to confirm permitted densities on the site, along with the package of community benefits that will be delivered, which must be understood holistically.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20

A.6	City Planning staff have reviewed the material submitted by Arup that responds to the sustainability policies of the City of Toronto including the sustainability strategy, the Energy Strategy and the Green Infrastructure Strategy, as outlined in Site and Area Specific Policy 15. The application aims to integrate a holistic sustainability vision into the Master Plan by incorporating zero carbon, biodiversity, climate adaptation and resilience and water management among the guiding themes . Within the sustainability strategy, Arup has identified several emerging issues such as the embodied carbon impact of materials, public realm design for future climate and infrastructure design for climate hazards. Toronto Green Standard Tier 4 has been identified as a performance level target under consideration.	The sustainability strategy has been further developed across the 7 overarching themes with some project-specific objectives and highlights described in the sustainability chapter. The TGS requirements will inform strategies for future site developments and have been considered in more ambitious criteria by the design team where applicable/required. Further close and extensive collaboration with the design team will inform the aimed performance level targets for each discipline (at building and masterplan scale).	Arup		Planning & Urban Design Rationale - Sustainability Chapter	15-May-20
A.7	Potential items for Section 37 could include, but are not limited to: a. Community Services and Facilities b. Public Art c. Affordable Housing (in addition to the requirements outlined in SASP 15) d. Streetscape Improvements	Noted. The Owners look forward to further discussions to confirm permitted densities on the site, along with the package of community benefits that will be delivered, which must be understood holistically.	USI			15-May-20
A.8	Items that are not Section 37 community benefits include, but are not limited to: a. Approval and funding of the Park Lawn GO Station b. Any costs related to providing a school on-site c. Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces	The Owners question the rationale for excluding approval and funding of the Park Lawn GO Station and/or POPS from Section 37 community benefits, given their importance and inherent value they will bring to existing and future residents, and request reconsideration of the value of these elements as part of future discussions on community benefits.	USI			15-May-20
A.9	The Secondary Plan and area-specific Zoning By-law will include policy direction and requirements to ensure that planned infrastructure, transit facilities, servicing and community services and facilities are available through all phases of development.	Noted. This is reflected in the provisions of the draft ZBA included with this application.	USI		Draft ZBA, Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
A.10	The Park Lawn GO Station will be secured as part of Phase 1. Access to the station, in any interim condition on-site, must be safe and accessible.	Noted. This is reflected in the provisions of the draft OPA and draft ZBA.	USI		Draft OPA & ZBA, Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
A.11	It is anticipated that future development applications will be submitted in accordance with the phasing strategy contained within the Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment.	Noted.	USI		Draft ZBA, Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
A.12	First Capital Realty should consider interim measures on the site as the phases develop, especially as they relate to access to the GO Station from the existing uses surrounding the site.	Noted. The Owners look forward to further discussion on these opportunities through the concurrent Secondary Plan and development approvals processes.	USI			15-May-20

A.13	A staff report on the Christie's Planning Study and the Official Plan Amendment application is scheduled for Planning and Housing Committee on January 22, 2020. The report will be available approximately one week prior to the meeting.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
A.14	Staff are in discussion with Real Estate Services regarding the use of the City-owned parcel application and Christie's Planning Study. Staff will provide more information to First Capital Realty as it becomes available.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
A.15	The Rail Safety Strategy, prepared by Hatch, will be peer reviewed by the City. The peer review will be a high level analysis of the proposed uses and building locations proposed on the site. Further detailed peer reviews will be required associated with Zoning By-law Amendment applications.	Noted. A Revised Rail Safety Strategy is included with this application. Hatch would be happy to coordinate with the peer reviewer to address any questions, clarifications, and/or revisions, if required.	USI	Hatch	Rail Safety Strategy	15-May-20
A.16	Staff recommend not submitting a Draft Plan of Subdivision application until agreement is reached on the internal road network and block layouts.	Noted. As per further discussion with Staff in the time that has passed since the October 2019 OPA application, we understand Staff are supportive of the current application.	USI			15-May-20
<b>Required Revisions</b>						
AA.1	Staff recommend removing reference to a 'Phase O' and begin the phasing strategy with 'Phase 1'.	Noted; Phase 0 has been removed, with the supporting infrastructure that was originally positioned as Phase 0 now included with Phase 1.	USI		Phasing Plan	15-May-20
AA.2	The public park must be relocated away from Gardiner Expressway to a central location where it would have the most amount of sunlight and least amount of shadow and wind impacts from the existing buildings within the context.	The public park is located in a central location, balancing distance from the Gardiner to the north/west with shadows from existing development along Park Lawn and Lake Shore to the south and east. The Park is appropriately shielded from the Gardiner by buildings that line its northern edge.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
AA.3	The combination of an enlarged public park and strategically placed POPS must be included through the revision of the Master Plan.	The public park has been approximately doubled in size to +/- 1 ha, and a network of of strategically placed POPS continue to be proposed in the revised Master Plan.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
<b>More Information Requested</b>						
AAA.1	Staff request that First Capital Realty confirm the ownership of the two digital billboards located on the property. Any supporting documentation is requested to be submitted, including the orientation of the signs, luminosity, hours of operation and lease agreements. An assessment of the impacts of the two billboards on the proposed adjacent or nearby uses, in particular residential and parkland uses, is requested to be undertaken by First Capital Realty.	These signs are temporary, will be removed upon the redevelopment, and are not intended to form part of this application.	USI			15-May-20
<b>B Housing Policy</b>						
<b>Comments</b>						



	<p>The Master Plan notes a 'Variety of Housing' as one of the key principles of the plan. It further notes that the development should include a mix of options that consider the needs of current residents, as well as for future residents and generations, and a diversity of housing type and tenure, including affordable, rental, and family-sized condominiums can provide accessible and appropriate housing options for Torontonians.</p>	<p>Noted. This approach has been maintained in the revised Master Plan.</p>	<p>USI</p>		<p>Planning &amp; Urban Design Rationale, Housing Issues Report</p>	<p>15-May-20</p>
	<p>As part of the review of this application and the development of a Secondary Plan for the area (the Christie's Planning Study), an Affordable Housing Strategy will be required. Page 9 of the Housing Issues Report notes that the owners 'look forward to further refining this [affordable housing] strategy with the City through the Secondary Plan and development approvals processes.' In subsequent submissions and in coordination with the development of the Secondary Plan, a draft affordable housing strategy that includes the proposed delivery mechanisms for the affordable housing should be provided for the site. While specific details regarding detailed floor plans and the design of amenity spaces may occur at a later date and as part of a future zoning amendment application, the overall components of an affordable housing strategy must be agreed to in principle at the Official Plan Amendment stage and will be incorporated into the Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Further discussion will be required through this application and the Secondary Plan process to confirm the overall components of the affordable housing strategy.</p>	<p>USI</p>		<p>Housing Issues Report, Draft Zoning By-law Amendment</p>	<p>15-May-20</p>
	<p>The approximate provision of 40% two-bedroom units and 10% three-bedroom units currently supports the unit mix objectives of the Growing Up Guidelines, Official Plan housing policies, and the Growth Plan's growth management and housing policies to accommodate within new development a broad range of households, including families with children .</p>	<p>Noted. This target continues to inform the proposed unit Mix in the Master Plan.</p>	<p>USI</p>		<p>Planning &amp; Urban Design Rationale, Housing Issues Report</p>	<p>15-May-20</p>
	<p>An average size of 1,100 square feet for the three-bedroom units would generally adequately support the unit size objectives of the Growing Up Guidelines to accommodate within new development a broad range of households, including families with children, which recommends three-bedroom units of 100 square metres or larger.</p>	<p>Noted. This target continues to inform the proposed unit Mix in the Master Plan.</p>	<p>USI</p>		<p>Planning &amp; Urban Design Rationale, Housing Issues Report</p>	<p>15-May-20</p>

	The Growing Up Guidelines recommend that two-bedroom units be at least 87 square metres or larger. In order to support the unit size objectives of the Growing Up Guidelines (to accommodate within new development a broad range of households, including families with children), the majority of the proposed two-bedroom units should be designed to be within close range of this size, as the Master Plan develops.	Noted. The draft ZBA commits to providing 10% 3bd+ units and 15% 2bd units, in keeping with the targets established in the Growing Up Guidelines. The Master Plan continues to target unit sizes for these units in keeping with this comment and Growing Up Guidelines. While the Master Plan continues to explore the potential provision of additional 'market sized' 2 bd units above and beyond the targets established in the Growing Up Guidelines, the provision and sizing of these units are proposed to be determined at a later time.	USI		Housing Issues Report	15-May-20
<b>Required Revisions</b>						
BB.1	The Planning Rationale and Housing Issues report should also refer specifically to Policy 3.2.1.9, as noted above.	Noted. This policy is addressed in both documents.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale / Housing Issues Report	15-May-20
<b>More Information Requested</b>						
BBB.1	Staff would like to meet with First Capital Realty to begin the initial conversations on how the affordable housing will be delivered on the site in accordance with the options outlined in SASP 15.	Noted. Initial meetings have been held as per this comment, and the Owners are prepared to continue to explore the provision of community services and facilities in the context of the entire development.	USI			15-May-20
<b>C Community Planning</b>						
<b>Comments</b>						
C.1	Tower separate distances as shown in the Master Plan are appropriate as they are similar to what currently exists within the area context (particularly in Humber Bay Shores). Tower separation distances should remain as a minimum of 30 metres as revisions to the Master Plan are submitted.	Noted. 30 m separation distances have been maintained in the revised Master Plan, and are reflected in the draft ZBA.	USI		Draft ZBA	15-May-20

C.2	Tower floorplate sizes for residential buildings should be a maximum of 750 square metres, in accordance with the City's Tall Building guidelines.	The City's Tall Building Guidelines provide flexibility for taller buildings to exceed this maximum in certain circumstances, including for taller towers where larger building cores are required, and where larger separation distances are provided. In keeping with these reliefs provided in the Guidelines, and with the surrounding context, proposed towers maintain an average floor plate size of 800 m2.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
C.3	The taller built form proposed on the site should transition to mid-rise heights towards Lake Shore and Park Lawn to address the mid rise built form along the southern and western edges of L these streets. Tall buildings may be located above the mid-rise base buildings only with the inclusion of generous setbacks to ensure the pedestrian scale is maintained.	Taller building elements have been shifted back from the Park Lawn and Lake Shore frontages through a combination of tower setbacks and in some cases shifting towers internal to the site to position mid-rise buildings fronting these streets.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
C.4	The site should maximize soil volumes for tree planting, especially in POPS and private pedestrian connections.	Noted. As the design of the proposal is advanced through this and future development approvals process (e.g. SPA), the Owners remained committed to meeting or exceeding City requirements for soil volumes to ensure healthy trees, following best practices.	USI			15-May-20

**Required Revisions**

CC.1	Detailed micro-climatic analysis should be done to ensure a comfortable use of public realm. The existing wind condition is most uncomfortable in front of The Marginal Boulevard and The Marine Parade Drive. The proposed design does not adequately mitigate the uncomfortable wind conditions. The meandering streets are deployed to break the wind effects, however, the location of these streets does not align with where the uncomfortable wind conditions are. Instead the development proposes an open space on the opposite side of The Marginal Boulevard despite this uncomfortable condition.	RWDI has submitted a Pedestrian Wind Assessment, which concludes that conditions on the site are generally within acceptable levels, also flagging some areas where mitigation will be required, and recommending appropriate mitigation strategies. This initial assessment has been undertaken as a computational desktop study due in part to the COVID 19 Pandemic. To provide a baseline understanding of how the buildings are performing, it did not include landscaping. A future resubmission will be accompanied by a more detailed revised Pedestrian Wind Assessment, allowing for a wind tunnel assessment, and for mitigation measures and landscaping to be implemented to ensure comfortable use of the public realm.	USI	RWDI	Pesestrian Wind Assessment	15-May-20
------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	------	----------------------------	-----------

CC.2	The shadow impacts should be assessed based on the number of hours as oppose to kW/m2. The proposed location of the site is shown to have the most amount of Solar Radiation but looking at the shadow analysis in chapter 3.8 of the master plan, it is evident that the proposed public park would only have 3 hours of partial sun light which is insufficient according to City of Toronto's guidelines requiring 5 continuous hours of sunlight to be achieved.	A revised shadow study is included with the revised proposal, following the City's terms of reference. Additional analysis for the months of April, May, July and August has also been provided, for a broader understanding of the performance of the park between March & September. Revisions to the proposed massing have been employed to enhance provision of sun on the park, which are discussed in detail in the Planning & Urban Design Rationale. USI is not aware of any City-wide guidelines requiring 5 hrs of continuous sunlight on a public park; where these types of metrics have been employed in area-specific policy frameworks, they respond to the distinct local context and constraints. Should any such metrics be explored through the Secondary Plan, these should similarly respond to the constraints of the existing high density context.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
<b>More Information Requested</b>						
CCC.1	Has First Capital Realty investigated the opportunity of integrating the future Park Lawn GO Station into a building on the site?	The Owners and consultant team are reviewing all options and will share with the City when plans are available.	FCR			15-May-20
<b>D Transportation Planning</b>						
<b>Comments</b>						
D.1	All streets must be public streets and designed to the City's Complete Street guidelines. New streets will be designed to provide connections with adjacent neighbourhoods; promote a connected grid of streets that offers safe and convenient travel options; extend sight lines and view corridors; divide larger sites into smaller development blocks; provide access and addresses for new development; allow the public to freely enter without obstruction; implement the Complete Streets approach; and provide access for emergency vehicles.	The majority of the street network is public and has been designed to provide a connected street network with adjacent communities, convenient travel options for all users and will divide the Master Plan into appropriately sized development parcels. All streets are designed as fully multi-modal facilities consistent with the Complete Street practices and policies of the City and will incorporate facilities for pedestrians, cycling, transit and vehicular activity. One private street is proposed to enable below grade facility connectivity that will benefit the servicing opportunities afforded to adjacent blocks that benefit the at-grade public realm. The private street will be designed to look and feel as a public street.	BA			15-May-20

D.2	Transportation Planning, in concept, agrees with the possible benefits of designing both Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard as "complete main streets". The City's "main streets" are considered as key corridors of activity, designed as vibrant, comfortable, pedestrian-oriented destinations in their own right to strengthen a sense of place. A comprehensive analysis of the proposed design of both Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard will be undertaken through Christie's Planning Study and Park Lawn and Lake Shore Transportation Master Plan (TMP). Currently, the Official Plan identifies the right-of-way widths of both Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard West to be 36 metres.	Noted - the identified right-of-way width provisions are made within the Master Plan. Significant enhancements to the streetcape and design arrangements on both of these major streets is outlined in the Master Plan for consideration as part of the TMP.	BA			15-May-20
D.3	In general, staff are supportive of prioritization of pedestrians and cycling on the internal street network. Further analysis is required to determine the layout of the local street network, which will be the focus of the workshop on January 16, 2020 .	The design arrangement of the internal street network has been advanced through discussions with City staff and a refined plan is presented within the Master Plan.	BA			15-May-20
D.4	The proposed 'relief road' will be assessed through the TMP, including the role, design and function of the road in the overall street network. Overall, Staff agree that the 'relief road' provides benefits to the site by providing consolidated access and servicing.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
D.5	The Official Plan discourages locating vehicular access, loading and servicing areas from main streets and Avenues. Staff are supportive of First Capital Realty's intent to reduce the number of access and loading areas on the site. Consolidated access for loading and servicing allows the internal street network to be narrower, prioritizing cycling and pedestrian movements, and reducing pedestrian and cycling crossing distances at intersections. Accesses for parking and loading will not be permitted on Park Lawn Road and/or Lake Shore Boulevard. The City will continue to review the appropriate locations for vehicular access, loading and servicing through the Christie's Planning Study and subsequent revisions to the Master Plan.	The Master Plan is continuing to show development access onto Park Lawn and the Relief Road as key elements of the consolidated access plan for the Project as a whole. Access is taken at two signals onto Park Lawn Road and the Relief Road (below the northerly "D Blocks") as well as secondary unsignalized access locations providing major access connectivity into a below grade "street" network that links all major parcels at the P2 level and specific development direct block access (i.e. potential school block). This allows for the relocation of the typical access ramp facilities from the grade level and the Loop Road (Street B) to maximize the emphasis on the pedestrian realm within this area and benefit TTC LRT operations on Street B (by removing higher levels of traffic directly). The access facilities onto the arterial streets allows for an effective distribution of vehicular activity at high quality, safe and well conceived, consolidated access locations while responding to the public realm vision of the Master Plan.	BA			15-May-20

D.6	Due to the prioritization of transit on the site, staff will assess the potential for reduced parking rates. First Capital Realty should ensure that adequate commercial and retail parking is provided to service the site.	Noted. A series of minimum parking standards are presented within the Zoning By-law Amendment application. These are reduced compared to the By-law 569-2013 "Rest of City" standards that would ordinarily apply to this area and reflect standards that are appropriate in highly transit accessible locations such as the 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West property given the substantial investment being made in new transit infrastructure (a new GO Station, TTC / GO Transit Hub and new LRT facilities) that will serve the site and broader area. These new transit facilities - combined with planned pedestrian and cycling networks and the mixed-use "complete" nature of the project - are all highly supportive of substantially reduced parking standards as part of a strong, proactive demand management programme for the site as a whole. Reduced resident parking standards are proposed equivalent to an effective overall supply of 0.4 spaces / unit together with minimum commercial / retail standards of 1 spaces / 100sm is proposed shared between all non-residential uses and residential visitors to minimize overall parking supply needs. These standards are reflective of parking needs in transit accessible locations across the City and are considered to be appropriate for adoption for the 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West site. The adoption of a reduced minimum parking standard regime at the outset of the project presents a significant opportunity to build a new community with a reduced reliance on automobile transportation from the "ground up". A reduced resident parking ratio of 0.4	BA			15-May-20
D.7	Generally, the City discourages the encumbrance of public streets below grade for loading and service connections and parking. Below grade encumbrances may be considered in circumstances where no other alternatives can be achieved. These considerations will be balanced with the overall policy objectives identified through the Secondary Plan planning process. Furthermore, these considerations must be technically achievable, and approved by the General Manager of Engineering and Construction Services, the General Manager of Transportation Services, The Chief Planner & Executive Director of City Planning and Toronto City Council.	The use of "tunnels" below certain portions of the proposed public street network is an essential component of the overall Master Plan consolidated parking and loading plan. In recognition of issues surrounding encumbering City street rights-of-way, the proposed parking garages do not extend into / within any public street right-of-way except for the direct "tunnel" connections proposed at key locations. Study has been undertaken demonstrating the ability for public services / utilities to run above any tunnel connections to enable the overall consolidated access plan for the property.	BA			15-May-20

D.8	Transportation Planning is supportive of an integrated transit hub on the site anchored by the Park Lawn GO Station.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
D.9	Distances between transit connections at Park Lawn GO Station for streetcar and bus service should be minimized and be fully accessible.	Noted. Transit stops on the LRT service connection to the Transit Hub are currently shown on Lake Shore Boulevard West and at the GO Station - a distance of less than 300m. Bus stops serving the GO Station are located on Park Lawn Road close to the GO Station as per TTC preferences. Location details are the subject of ongoing discussions with the TTC and City.	BA			15-May-20
D.10	Direct, convenient access to the Park Lawn GO Station is desired from both sides of Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard as well as both sides of the CN Rail Line.	Noted. Station access will form part of the MX station design process and TPAP. The Master Plan intent is to fully integrate GO Station access with adjacent development and open spaces.	BA			15-May-20
D.11	Transportation Planning staff are developing a new set of Transit Station Design Guidelines with expected completion in 2020. The emerging directions within the guidelines will be useful and applicable to the site in the design of the transit hub.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
D.12	As part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) an access plan for the GO Station will be required. The access plan will demonstrate how the station will connect the surrounding context around the GO Station, including transit, walking, cycling (including secure bike parking) and accessibility. For example, the access plan would set out a strategy/design/plan for a walkway with clear sightlines, lighting, way finding other design elements, elevators or other ways to address accessibility and access to a station entrances and GO platform at west end (e.g. grade differential from a potential TTC surface stop on Park Lawn) - while this is more detailed, these station access plan elements need to be identified early for station design and procurement.	Noted. The station access plan will be developed as part of the station concept design later, indicatively, in the fall 2020.	Hatch			15-May-20
D.13	Design best practices surrounding the GO Station will be incorporated into the sitespecific Urban Design Guidelines that are being drafted by staff.	Noted.	Hatch			15-May-20
D.14	As the GO Station design advances, staff request the opportunity to review and comment on the technical specifications that Metrolinx has shared with the applicant and review them in collaboration with the Toronto Transit Commission. Additionally, staff would like to review station design elements with the applicant such as green building standards, EV charging stations, etc.	The Owner will share the preliminary station design in due course (as per response to D. 12, anticipated in the fall of 2020). This design will include technical specifications that Metrolinx has required.	Hatch			15-May-20

**Required Revisions**

DD.1	All transportation data sources used in the analysis should be included in appendices in the back of the Transportation Impact Study (TIS Report). This includes but is not limited to turning movement count sheets, signal timing plans, transit data, pedestrian count data etc. with the dates clearly indicated. If transportation data have been adopted from other studies, than that source data must also be included.	Noted. This material was provided as part of the October 2019 OPA submission materials. If further information is required - it can be readily provided under separate cover	BA		TIS	15-May-20
DD.2	All new streets within the proposed Master Plan must be public streets.	see response to comment D.1	BA		TIS	15-May-20
DD.3	Remove any driveways with direct access from Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard.	see response to comment D.5	BA		TIS	15-May-20
<b>More Information Requested</b>						
DDD.1	Staff request to be kept informed of the on-going discussions between First Capital Realty and Metrolinx on the delivery of the GO Station, including the status and timing of the Initial Business Case and items such as, the -level of service (trains per hour), ridership numbers and modal split.	The updated IBC was approved by Metrolinx Board on April 29th, and Metrolinx is targeting to publish the document (on their website) ahead of the Public Meeting planned for May 28th.  The updated IBC does two key things: - Confirms a high level station design concept that Metrolinx supports (consistent with the 5% design concept advanced by First Capital Realty and its consultants) - Verifies that Metrolinx confirms that the station is a good project, in the public interest, and should be pursued. It does this on the basis of high-level ridership and cost-benefit analysis.	Hatch			15-May-20
DDD.2	Staff request more information be provided on the re-location and re-configuration of the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard access ramps. The re-location and re-configuration proposed by First Capital Realty will be accessed through the TMP, however, greater detail and information is required on the overall network implications and how the changes proposed impact Lake Shore Boulevard east of the site.	Further information has been provided to the City as part of ongoing discussions relating to the relief road and connection options to the Gardiner Expressway. The implications of various connection options will be assessed as part of detailed modelling work undertaken as part of the application process and City-led TMP as base modelling outputs from the TMP are available.	BA			15-May-20
DDD.3	Staff request additional information on the costs, design specifications and considerations associated with the 'relief road'.	see response to DDD.2	BA			15-May-20
DDD.4	First Capital Realty is requested to submit a preferred residential and commercial and retail parking rate for the site, with appropriate justification, for the City's consideration.	Proposed parking standards are proposed as part of the ZBA application. See response to comment D.6	BA			15-May-20
<b>E Heritage Planning</b>						
<b>Comments</b>						



	<p>HP staff are in the process of evaluating the cultural heritage value of the water tower, including its potential to commemorate the Mr. Christie Bakery site and its connection to the manufacturing history of the community. HP staff appreciates the applicant's commitment to the retention of the water tower and encourage further discussion about how and where it can be retained in a manner that would best conserve/commemorate the site's manufacturing history. The water tower is currently painted with the Christie company logo. While the logo is important in identifying the company associated with both the water tower and the former use of the site, staff understand that the viability of maintaining the logo may present numerous legal, copyright and other issues that would preclude its retention. The conservation strategy outlined in the HIA proposes the retention and relocation of the water tower to the new public park as a key component of an interpretation plan for the site. Two alternative options provided include relocation of the tower slightly west and no relocation at all. The location of the water tower will require further discussion with City Planning and Parks staff and the applicant's team.</p>	<p>The May 2020 Heritage Impact Assessment expands on the earlier submission with a Water Tower Relocation Analysis (HIA Appendix C), which is intended to inform further discussion with City Planning and Parks Staff. The Relocation Analysis explores how and where the Water Tower should be retained in order to best conserve / commemorate the Site's manufacturing history, as well as the Tower's identity as a landmark. The Relocation Analysis considers (a) the conservation of the heritage value conveyed by the Water Tower; (b) the provision of similarly prominent views to those that currently exist; and (c) the Water Tower's potential for placemaking. The Relocation Analysis concludes that the Water Tower could be successfully relocated to the neighbourhood park, Station Square or Boulevard Square, with slight preference for the neighbourhood park. / The concept of placemaking / branding signage on the Water Tower is considered to be of value, whether or not it will be possible to retain the Christie logo on the tank.</p>	ERA		Heritage Impact Assessment + HIA Appendix C: Water Tower Relocation Analysis	15-May-20
<b>More Information Requested</b>						
	<p>As the research and evaluation of the water tower was requested in a motion presented by Councillor Grimes at the Etobicoke York Community Council in 2016, staff will be reaching out to the Councillor's office for a meeting in the new year in an effort to understand his expectations for the water tower in the context of the proposed commemoration strategy to date.</p>	<p>It is ERA's recommendation that the Councillor have the opportunity to review the May 2020 Heritage Impact Assessment and Water Tower Relocation Analysis. The recommended conservation strategy for the site is a robust interpretation program, which would communicate the histories and heritage value on Site through a series of media. The Water Tower is proposed to be retained and adapted as an interpretive medium within that larger strategy. Other interpretation themes, ideas and precedents are explored throughout the HIA, and may be of interest to the Councillor.</p>	ERA		Heritage Impact Assessment + HIA Appendix C: Water Tower Relocation Analysis	15-May-20
<b>Parks, Forestry &amp; Recreation , December 9 2019      Rosanne Clement, Development Application Unit; Nick Garisto, Parks Planner</b>						
F	Comments					

	<p>The Official Plan contains policies to ensure that Toronto's system of parks and open spaces are maintained, enhanced and expanded. Map 8B of the Toronto Official Plan shows local parkland provisions across the city. The lands which are the subject of this application are in an area with less than 300 people population. The Site is in a Parkland Acquisition Priority Area, as per Chapter 415, Article III of the Toronto Municipal Code. The Parkland Strategy includes a new methodology to measure and assess parkland provision, using the baseline of residential population against the area of parkland available across the city. According to the Strategy's methodology, the development site is currently in an area with no population (given its vacant condition) and therefore does not have a measured parkland provision level. It is important to note, however, that the parkland provision levels contained in the Strategy were assessed using City Planning's development pipeline data, and the development application that is the subject of this memo is a new addition to the pipeline and its resulting population is not captured in the current analysis and mapping.</p> <p>However, as per the Parkland Strategy Figure 11, the site is within an area that is expected to experience a 25% to 50% reduction in parkland provision levels per capita between now and 2033, based on surrounding projected population growth. Furthermore, the conversion of the site from Employment Areas to Mixed Use Areas will also necessitate the need for parkland to serve new residential uses. Given the future expected growth both on the development site itself and surrounding sites, a parkland deficit will be generated if no new parks are created. This anticipated parkland deficit must be addressed through the creation of a new park to serve the future population.</p>	<p>The Owners are supportive of the provision of public park land on the site to serve the mix of uses proposed on the site, and reflective of the extent and nature of existing park land surrounding the site.</p>	USI			15-May-20
	<p>At the alternative rate of 0.4 hectares per 300 units specified in Chapter 415, Article III of the Toronto Municipal Code, the parkland dedication requirement is 10 000 m<sup>2</sup> or 112 % of the net site area. However, for sites that are greater than 5 hectares, a cap of 20% of the development site is applied to the residential use while the non-residential use is subject to a 2% parkland dedication. In total, the parkland dedication requirement is approximately 15,240 m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>Detailed discussion of parkland dedication is included in the Planning &amp; Urban Design Rationale. The size of the proposed park has been approximately doubled in the revised Master Plan to a size of +/- 1 ha.</p>	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20

	The applicant is required to provide the full parkland dedication on-site as a singular, large park block. One large park can accommodate greater programming and design opportunities as well as greater flexibility in park uses to serve the anticipated population, when compared to multiple smaller on-site parkland dedications.	Detailed discussion of parkland dedication is included in the Planning & Urban Design Rationale. The enlarged park in the revised Master Plan positively responds to staff's request to enlarge the proposed park, and is in keeping with the flexibility for parkland dedication arrangements provided in Toronto's Official Plan and Municipal Code (including arrangements to address parkland dedication on-site, off-site, through cash-in-lieu, and/or some combination thereof).	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
	Further discussion is required pertaining to the size, configuration and location of the on-site parkland dedication. The land to be conveyed should meet the requirements set out in Policy 8 of Section 3.2.3 of the Official Plan. The amount of parkland dedication is subject to changed contingent to finalized net site area and residential, non-residential GFA split.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
F.1	Sun and shadow conditions in the park - The park in the proposed master plan is heavily shadowed for the majority of the day from March 21st to September 21st. Buildings must be located and massed to ensure that no less than 75% of the public park area is in direct sunlight between 9:18am and 5:18pm from March 21st to September 21st.	A revised shadow study is included with the revised proposal, following the City's terms of reference. Additional analysis for the months of April, May, July and August has also been provided, for a broader understanding of the performance of the park between March & September. Revisions to the proposed massing have been employed to enhance provision of sun on the park, which are discussed in detail in the Planning & Urban Design Rationale. This proposed metric of ensuring 75% of the public park is in direct sunlight between 9:18 pm and 5:18 pm from March 21 to September 21st is not in keeping with the constraints of the local context and constraints, and is not met by existing parks in the area. Should any such metrics be explored through the Secondary Plan, these should respond to the constraints of the existing high density context.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20

F.2	Wind Conditions in the park - Buildings must be located and massed to limit and/or mitigate wind impacts on the park. Wind conditions in the majority of the park must be suitable for sitting (long exposure).	RWDI has submitted a Pedestrian Wind Assessment, which concludes that conditions on the site are generally within acceptable levels, also flagging some areas where mitigation will be required, and recommending appropriate mitigation strategies. This initial assessment has been undertaken as a computational desktop study due in part to the COVID 19 Pandemic. To provide a baseline understanding of how the buildings are performing, it did not include landscaping. A future resubmission will be accompanied by a more detailed revised Pedestrian Wind Assessment, allowing for a wind tunnel assessment, and for mitigation measures and landscaping to be implemented to ensure comfortable use of the public realm.	USI	RWDI	Pesestrian Wind Assessment	15-May-20
F.3	Park shape - The proposed park shape will pose programming challenges; the northern "panhandle" of the park is a pinch point and does not provide significant opportunity for programming. A park without any narrow appendages is required.	The enlarged public park in the revised proposal does not include any narrow appendages.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
F.4	Park location – Locating the park on a main street is appropriate. However, the park should be the heart of the community and be centrally located on the development site to be equitably accessible to all users. The park must have generous public street frontage(s) to provide the greatest possible benefit, safety, accessibility and visibility for those accessing the park.	The enlarged public park is located ceintrally within the heart of the site, with frontage provided by the public Street B (the 'loop road').	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
F.5	Park connections - While the wide green streets and largos included in the proposal contribute to a well-designed public realm, a more visually and environmentally significant connection from the park to the South Mimico Creek Trail and the Martin Goodman Trail is required. A corridor between the abovementioned three sites that is pedestrian, cyclist, pollinator and animal friendly should be provided.	The landscape strategy within the Planning & Urban Design Rationale supports such connections between South Mimico Creek Trail and the Martin Goodman Trail, though acknowledging that lands beyond the site required to meaningfully create these connections are outside of the scope or control of this application.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
F.6	Water tower – The potential for adaptive re-use of the water tower and the most suitable location for the water tower within the development block are currently being considered by the City.	Noted. The revised Master Plan continues to locate the water tower within the proposed public park, as well as exploring an alternative location in the 'Station Square' POPS at the GO Station.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20

	A Secondary Plan for the development site is currently being developed by the City, concurrent with the development application review process. The Owner should be aware that the Secondary Plan will contain policies stipulating the requirement of an on-site park, as well as park planning and design criteria. As the application process proceeds, the Owner and staff from the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division will have opportunities to further discuss the Secondary Plan process and proposed policies.	Noted. The Owners welcome further discussion on these matters.	USI			15-May-20
	Parks is interested in securing the design and construction, by the Owner, of Above Base Park Improvements. There may be opportunities to use the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for this work. Further discussion is required. Should this be agreeable, the following clause will require the approval of City Council: Council approve a Development Charge credit against the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for the design and construction by the Owner of the Above Base Park Improvements to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PF&R). The Development Charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the Owner of designing and constructing the Above Base Park Improvements, as approved by the General Manager, PF&R, and the Parks and Recreation component of Development Charges payable for the development in accordance with the City's Development Charges By-law, as may be amended from time to time.	Noted. The Owners are willing to discuss this, which must be understood holistically in relation to the overall development, including cost implications, extent of DC credits, provision of Section 37 community benefits, and permitted densities.	USI			15-May-20
<b>G Conditions of Parkland Conveyance</b>						
	If this application is approved, the following conditions of approval are recommended to be included: Recommended Conditions of Approval	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.1	Per Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 415-28, prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit, the Owner shall convey on-site parkland to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PF&R).	Noted. Further discussion will be required on the timing of conveyance of the public park to allow for the phased redevelopment of the site.	USI			15-May-20
G.2	The Owner will be required to convey the 1.524 ha (15,240 m <sup>2</sup> ) portion of the development site for public parkland purposes. The subject parkland conveyance is to be free and clear, above and below grade of all physical obstructions and easements, encumbrances and encroachments, including surface and subsurface easements, unless otherwise approved by the General Manager, PF&R.	Noted. Further discussion will be required to confirm the parkland dedication requirement, and the appropriate combination of delivery mechanisms, which may include on-site dedication, and potential cash-in-lieu contributions for any portion of the requirement not met on-site.	USI			15-May-20

G.3	The Owner is to pay for the costs of the preparation and registration of all relevant documents. The Owner shall provide to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor all legal descriptions and applicable reference plans of survey for the new parkland.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.4	Prior to the transfer of fee simple of the Park Block to the City, the Park Block shall nonetheless be deemed to be parkland in respect of the limiting distance requirements of the Ontario Building Code Act, 1992. Parks, Forestry and Recreation staff advises that the applicant must design the building to achieve Ontario Building Code (OBC) setbacks related to fire separation on the development site itself, on the portions of the building that abut the park. The greater of a 5 metre setback or the required setbacks which meet the OBC for fire separation will apply to any building located next to the Park. Prior to the issuance of any above grade building permit, the applicant will be required to demonstrate adequately that the OBC requirements have been achieved to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5	Prior to conveying the parkland to the City, the Owner must:	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.1	Submit a Qualified Person Preliminary Statement Letter, that is dated and signed by the applicant's Qualified Person, as defined in Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended, describing the lands to be conveyed to the City, and identifying what environmental documentation will be provided to the City's peer reviewer to support this conveyance. All environmental documentation consistent with Ontario Regulation 153/04 requirements shall be submitted with reliance extended to the City and its peer reviewer and any limitation on liability and indemnification is to be consistent with Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended, with insurance requirements or such greater amount specified by the Executive Director, Engineering & Construction Services and copied to the General Manager, PF&R (see the Policy for Accepting Potentially Contaminated Lands to be Conveyed to the City under the Planning Act, adopted by City Council on February 10 and 11, 2015);	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.2	Pay all costs associated with the City retaining a third-party peer reviewer, including all administrative costs to the City (7%), and submit an initial deposit of \$8,000.00 towards the cost of the Peer Review in the form of a certified cheque, to the Executive Director, Engineering & Construction Services. The Owner must submit further deposits when requested to cover all costs of retaining a third-party peer reviewer (unused funds will be refunded to the applicant by the City);	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

G.5.3	Submit, to the satisfaction of the City's peer reviewer, all Environmental Site Assessment reports prepared in accordance with the Record of Site Condition Regulation (Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended) describing the current conditions of the land to be conveyed to the City and the proposed Remedial Action Plan based on the site condition standards approach, to the Executive Director, Engineering & Construction Services;	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.4	At the completion of the site assessment/remediation process, submit a Statement from the Qualified Person based on the submitted environmental documents, to the Executive Director, Engineering & Construction Services for peer review and concurrence, which states:	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.4.1	In the opinion of the Qualified Person:	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.4.1.1	It is either likely or unlikely that there is off-site contamination resulting from past land uses on the development site that has migrated onto adjacent City lands that would exceed the applicable Site Condition Standards; and	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.4.1.2	To the extent that the opinion in 5.4.1.1 is that past migration is likely, it is either possible or unlikely that such off-site contamination on adjacent City lands poses an adverse effect to the environment or human health.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.4.2	Land to be conveyed to the City meets either:	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.4.2.1	The applicable Ministry Generic Site Condition Standards (Tables 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9; subject to applicable exemptions as stated in Ontario Regulation 153/04) for the most environmentally sensitive adjacent land use; or	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.4.2.2	The Property Specific Standards as approved by the Ministry for a Risk Assessment/Risk Management Plan which was conducted in accordance with the conditions set out herein.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

G.5.5	The Qualified Person's statement, referenced in condition 5.1 above, will include a Reliance Letter that is dated and signed by the applicant's Qualified Person, as defined in Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended, confirming that both the City and the City's peer reviewer can rely on the environmental documentation submitted, consistent with Ontario Regulation 153/04 requirements, and the Qualified Person's opinion as to the conditions of the site. All environmental documentation consistent with Ontario Regulation 153/04 requirements and opinions shall be submitted with reliance extended to the City and its peer reviewer and any limitation on liability and indemnification is to be consistent with Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended, with insurance requirements or such greater amount specified by the Executive Director of Engineering & Construction Services.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.6	For conveyance of lands requiring a Record of Site Condition (RSC):	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.6.1	The Owner will file the Record of Site Condition (RSC) on the Ontario Environmental Site Registry; and	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.5.6.2	The Owner will submit the Ministry's Letter of Acknowledgement of Filing of the RSC confirming that the RSC has been prepared and filed in accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended, to the Executive Director, Engineering	Noted.	USI			15-May-20



G.6	<p>The Owner, at their expense, will be responsible for the base construction and installation of the parkland ("Base Park Improvements"). The Base Park Improvements include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Demolition, removal and disposal of all existing materials, buildings, foundations and associated servicing;</li> <li>b. Grading inclusive of 300mm depth topsoil supply and placement. Where lands have been environmentally risk assessed in accordance with MOECC regulations, the required depth profile of the environmental soil / soft cap will be 1.5 m of engineered fill compacted to 95% SPD (Standard Proctor Density) and certified by the consulting engineer;</li> <li>i. In the case of a risk-assessed site, all materials brought on site shall comply with the site-specific standards outlined in the Certificate of Property Use. In the case where no risk assessment of the site was required, all materials brought on site shall comply with the Ontario Regulation 153/04 Table 3 RPI standards;</li> <li>c. Sodding #1 nursery grade;</li> <li>d. Fencing, where deemed necessary;</li> <li>e. Sanitary and storm service connections with manholes at streetline;</li> <li>f. Water and electrical service connections; (minimum water: 50mm to the street line including backflow preventers, shut off valves, water metre and chamber; electrical connection to the street line and electrical panel in a lockable cabinet (100 Amp service));</li> <li>g. Street trees along all public road allowances abutting City-owned parkland; and</li> <li>h. Standard park sign (separate certified cheque required).</li> </ul>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.7	All work is to be completed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.8	Prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit, the Owner shall submit a cost estimate and any necessary plans for the Base Park Improvements, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.9	Prior to issuance of the first above grade building permit, the Owner shall post an irrevocable Letter of Credit in the amount of 120% of the value of the Base Park Improvements for the parkland, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R. No credit shall be given towards the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for costs associated with Base Park Improvements.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

G.10	The construction of the Base Park Improvements to the park block shall be completed within one (1) year after the issuance of the first above grade building permit to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R. Unforeseen delays (e.g. weather) resulting in the late delivery of the park block shall be taken into consideration and at the discretion of the General Manager, PF&R when determining a revised delivery date for the park block.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.11	Should the Owner undertake Base Park Improvements on the park block following conveyance of the park block to the City, the Owner must enter into an agreement with the City that outlines in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, and duration to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R. The Owner will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the applicant on the park.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.12	Prior to conveyance of the parkland, the Owner shall be responsible for the installation and maintenance of temporary fencing around the parkland until such time as the development of the park block is completed.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.13	The Owner shall ensure that the grading and drainage of the adjacent development blocks are compatible with the grades of the parkland to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.14	The Owner must provide documentation from a qualified environmental engineer that any fill or topsoil brought onto the site meets all applicable laws, regulations and guidelines for use in a public park.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

G.15	<p>Should the owner agree to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements for a Development Charge credit against the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges, the following condition apply:</p> <p>The Owner agrees to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements to the new park for a Development Charge credit against the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&amp;R. The Development Charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the Owner of installing the Above Base Park Improvements, as approved by the General Manager, PF&amp;R, and the Parks and Recreation component of Development Charges payable for the development in accordance with the City's Development Charges By-law, as may be amended from time to time. The Owner is required to submit a design and cost estimate to be approved by the General Manager, PF&amp;R, and a letter of credit equal to 120% of the Parks and Recreation Development Charges payable for the development. The design, cost estimate and ultimately, the letter of credit, will be required prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.16	<p>The Owner will be responsible to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&amp;R. Areas to be addressed in the design of the Park are: park programming, sustainable design and plantings, community and public safety, ground surface treatments, seating, vandalism prevention, etc. Final design and programming of the parkland shall be at the discretion of the General Manager, PF&amp;R.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.17	<p>Prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit for the development of the site, the Owner is required to submit working drawings, specifications and landscape plans showing the scope and detail of the work for the Above Base Park improvements for review and approval by the General Manager, PF&amp;R.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.18	<p>The construction of Above Park Improvements to the park block shall be completed within one year after the issuance of the first above grade building permit to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&amp;R. Unforeseen delays (e.g. weather) resulting in the late delivery of the park block shall be taken into consideration and at the discretion of the General Manager, PF&amp;R when determining a revised delivery date for the park block.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

G.19	Should the Owner undertake Above Base Park Improvements on the park block following conveyance of the park block to the City, the Owner must enter into an agreement with the City that outlines in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, and duration to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R. The Owner will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the applicant on the park.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.20	The Owner, upon satisfactory completion of the construction and installation of the Base Park Improvements shall be required to guarantee such work and associated materials. The Owner shall provide certification from their Landscape Architect certifying that all work has been completed in accordance with the approved drawings. Should the cost to construct the Above Base Park Improvements as approved by the General Manager, PF&R be less than the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for the development, the difference shall be paid to the City by certified cheque prior to a reduction of the Above Base Park Improvement Letter of Credit. Upon the City's acceptance of the certificate, the Letter(s) of Credit will be released less 20%, which will be retained for the 2 year guarantee period known as the Parkland Warranty Period.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.21	Upon the expiry of the Parkland Warranty Period, the outstanding park security shall be released to the Owner, provided that all deficiencies have been rectified to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&R.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.22	As-built drawings in print/hardcopy and electronic format, as well as age referenced AutoCAD file, shall be submitted to PF&R. A complete set of "asbuilt" plans shall be provided electronically on CD in PDF format and in age referenced AutoCAD file, in addition to two (2) sets of full size bond hardcopied to the General Manager, PF&R. The plans shall include, but not limited to, specifications, locations of all hidden services, and all deviations from the design drawings, shop drawings, inspection reports, minutes of meetings, site instructions, change orders, invoices, certificates, progress images, warranties, close out documentation, compliance letters (for any play structures and safety surfaces), manuals etc. The files are to be organized in folders, including a file index, and submitted with written warranties and related documents such as list of contractors and sub-contractors, together with contact persons, telephone numbers, warranty expiry dates, and operating manuals	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
G.23	Spare or replacement parts, special tools, etc, as provided by manufacturers, if any, are to be provided to PF&R.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

	<p>The stockpiling of any soils or materials or use as an interim construction staging area on the conveyed parkland is prohibited unless an agreement, other than a Park Occupation Permit (POP), has been obtained from the Manager of Business Services, PF&amp;R – Christina Iacovino, 416-392-8578. The agreement, if approved, will outline in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, duration, restoration plan and costs, and compensation to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&amp;R. The agreement must be secured prior to the issuance of any shoring and excavation permits. The Owner will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the applicant on the park. Any compensation accrued shall be applied to park improvements within the ward in consultation with the Ward Councillor.</p> <p>The Owner will be required to provide an environmental assessment report, prepared by a qualified engineer, at the end of the permitted occupation to verify that the parkland continues to meet the applicable laws, regulations and guidelines respecting sites to be used for public park purposes. The Owner will be required to provide a Record of Site Condition (RSC) after the staging period, prior to conveyance. The construction of the park shall commence after the occupation to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PF&amp;R. The Owner will be responsible for paying all costs associated with the City retaining a third-party peer reviewer for the environmental addendum.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	-----	--	--	-----------

	<p>If the Owner of the property enters into a Section 37 Agreement with the City as part of this development application, this unit requests to be involved in the negotiations. Funds directed towards the area parks and facilities within the Ward should form part of the benefits package.</p> <p>Parks, Forestry and Recreation staff are currently completing a detailed recreation needs analysis for the site and surrounding area to identify required future indoor and outdoor recreation facilities. Planning for recreation facilities is guided by the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan 2019 - 2038 (FMP). The FMP addresses recreation facility gaps and growth-related needs by recommending new or replacement facilities where appropriate and maximizing opportunities for partnerships to leverage investments for the development of recreation facilities. The FMP's projections are based on City Planning's development pipeline data, and the development application that is the subject of this memo is a new addition to the pipeline. The conversion of the site from Employment Areas to Mixed Use Areas will further necessitate the need for new recreation facilities to serve new residential uses.</p> <p>Pending the outcome of this analysis, recreation facilities may be requested as part of a Section 37 Agreement. Future comments from this Division will identify the requested facilities.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	<p>Comments regarding any necessary street tree plantings and requirements under the Trees Bylaw or the Ravine and Natural Feature Protection Bylaw will be forwarded directly to your attention by Urban Forestry.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	<p>Given the current rise in dog-owning populations, especially within high-density developments, the applicant is expected to provide dog amenities on-site with proper disposal facilities such as dog relief stations. This will help alleviate pressure on neighbourhood parks.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
<b>H Engineering &amp; Construction Services, December 9 2019 Grace Tesa, Development Engineering</b>						
	<p>Engineering and Construction Services (ECS) in consultation with Toronto Water (TW) require the applicant to provide more tangible calculations identifying the capacity needs and the ability of the City's existing infrastructure to support the proposed Master Plan.</p>	Noted - please see the submitted Functional Servicing Report (sections 2.4 and 3.7) and Stormwater Management Report (section 5) for further details.	ARUP		Functional Servicing Report; Stormwater Management Report	15-May-20

	Staff from ECS and TW attended a meeting with ARUP on December 3, 2019. At the meeting, ARUP presented a conceptual infrastructure strategy for First Capital Realty's Master Plan. The infrastructure scope of work and analysis required was discussed. ARUP has agreed to provide ECS and TW staff with three separate memos identifying the applicant's strategies and approaches for water, stormwater and sanitary infrastructure. The receipt of these memos will assist staff in determining if the proposed approach is acceptable and what technical matters will need to be addressed.	Arup prepared the memos and shared these with the City of Toronto on 04/02, 13/02 and 11/03/2020 for water, sanitary and storm water, respectively. Feedback was received (with exception for the latter) as well as further information on existing infrastructure in shapefile format - thank you for this. Our Functional Servicing Report and Stormwater Management Report have been developed in consideration of this information.	ARUP		Functional Servicing Report; Stormwater Management Report	15-May-20
	Future development applications for Plan of Subdivision and Re-zoning will also address the infrastructure requirements in greater detail. The use of Holding Provisions is contemplated to address infrastructure requirements as the Christie's Planning advances and a recommended Secondary Plan is brought forward to Council in November 2020. If upgrades to the existing infrastructure network are required as a result of First Capital Realty's Master Plan, the applicant will be responsible for ensuring that the necessary upgrades have occurred prior to development occurring on the site.	Noted. We look forward to discussing the updated analysis and work with the city in more detail. This includes establishing what, if any, upgrades to existing infrastructure are required and when these are required. Refer to sections indicated in item above for potential upgrades to the existing network.	ARUP		Functional Servicing Report; Stormwater Management Report	15-May-20
<b>I Environment &amp; Energy Division, December 6 2019 David MacMillan, Environment &amp; Energy Division</b>						
	EED staff look forward to working closely with the applicant in several key areas as part of the Christie's Planning Study and future development applications, including:	Agreed and thank you for the engagement to date. Updates have been made to the energy strategy as well as sustainability framework which have been submitted as part of the ZBA/DPS/OPA joint application.  A baseline strategy approach has been taken where a low carbon strategy (see section 3 of Energy Strategy report) has been developed that does not rely on significant off-site initiatives.	ARUP		Energy Strategy Report and Sustainability section in Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
I.1	Further exploration of renewable thermal energy solutions, such as:	The project continues to develop and confirm the approach to energy including exploring the role that district energy can play and potential roles for third parties (e.g. district energy developers).  Wide opportunities, such as leveraging Humber Wastewater Treatment Plant or Lake Ontario remain on the table.  Conversation is also ongoing with Toronto Hydro.  We look forward to continuing the discussions on these topics as	ARUP		Energy Strategy Report	15-May-20
I.1.a	Potential for energy sharing via thermal energy network (district energy);		ARUP			
I.1.b	Heat recovery from sanitary infrastructure, including the Humber Wastewater Treatment Plant effluent, and new sewer lines along Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard, both of which would require further discussions with Toronto Water;		ARUP			
I.1.c	Heat exchange with Mimico Creek/Lake Ontario, which would involve approvals at each level of government.		ARUP			
I.2	Strategies to achieve Toronto Green Standard Tier 4, especially passive design elements, as building architecture evolves through design development.		ARUP			
I.3	Implications of above- and below-grade (i.e. parking garage) development phasing on energy infrastructure, such as:		ARUP			
I.3.a	Borefields for geo-exchange systems;					
I.3.b	Thermal network distribution piping.					

I.4	Alignment with Toronto Hydro on expected electrical demands and a possible secondary electrical feed.	the project moves forward.	ARUP			
I.5	The implementation strategy for energy solutions, including the potential for partnering with third-party utilities (i.e. energy developers).		ARUP			
<b>J Urban Forestry, Tree Protection &amp; Plan Review, November 7 Jetmir Balashi, Tree Protection &amp; Plan Review, Etobicoke York District</b>						
	At the earliest stages of design, special attention should be given to the retention and protection of existing healthy mature trees, located on City road allowance or private property, over the planting of new/replacement trees, as large mature trees provide significantly greater contributions (e.g. environmental, community benefits) than new or small trees. Please be advised that there are existing protected trees, located on City road allowance and private property.	Noted. An arborist report has been submitted with this application.	DTAH		Arborist Report	15-May-20
	The proposed new public and private road should be designed to city standards including satisfactory street tree planting with sufficient soil volumes (minimum 30m3 of soil per tree or shared trees) to allow the growth of large growing shade trees to maturity, and planning municipal servicing and utilities in a manner that is compatible with trees existing within the road allowance.	Noted. Soil cells will be used in the new public and private roads to ensure uncompacted soil volume, that meets or exceeds the City of Toronto standards, are provided. Document references: 2.7.2 regarding general planting strategy; 2.7.4 regarding the combined soil volume strategy for both street trees and stormwater	DTAH		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
	Buildings and underground building structures should be designed and built with sufficient setbacks from the property lines, proposed and existing public and private roads to allow for the satisfactory planting of large growing shade trees on private and/or city land as per the City of Toronto specifications.	The private lands coordinate below grade structures, the required soil volume for soil cells and consider mounding soil to achieve the required planting volume. Both public and private tree planting strategies include a diverse palette. Reference: 2.5.4 regarding the public and private planting and ecology strategy.	DTAH		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
	The development of land should be designed and built from the earliest stages with sufficient soft landscape area in order to achieve or exceed the city's private and public (street) tree planting requirements, as defined under the Toronto Green Standard – Version 3, Tier 1 of the Ecology section.	Noted. See the above response regarding tree planting soil volumes and 2.7.4 regarding the Toronto Green Standard reference in the master plan document.	DTAH		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
<b>K Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) A.J. Takarabe, Operations Planning, Strategy &amp; Service Planning, TTC</b>						



	<p>We have reviewed the plans with respect to transit and we note that this application is for the lands to be covered by the Park Lawn Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The TMP is proposing major changes to the street network, which may include a significant redesign of Lake Shore Boulevard as well as Park Lawn Road and significant transit infrastructure to be provided within the site itself. As the streetscape design discussions continue to unfold, we have provided comments based on the retention of the existing/similar conditions along Lake Shore and the most recent submission as well as discussion with City staff.</p>	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	<p>At the westbound streetcar stop on Lake Shore in front of the subject site, we require the applicant widen the streetcar platform and Lake Shore Boulevard for accessibility and safety reasons. The streetcar stop must accommodate bus operation which requires that a 2.4m wide platform be provided in addition to any additional space required for railings of street furniture.</p>	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	<p>TTC is supportive of the objectives of the Park Lawn Transportation Master Plan (TMP). We support the provision of additional transit facilities that enable the expansion and improvement of transit in the Park Lawn and Lake Shore area. The comments below are being made to ensure that the interests of TTC infrastructure and the needs of our customers - the new customers who are originating from the site and those who are travelling on the vehicles around and through the site – are protected through the redevelopment and to ensure that benefits from the investments in transit and of the new development are maximized.</p>	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	<p>The applicant and TMP have both proposed a streetcar loop facility to provide a connection with the GO station that will be on the north end of the site. TTC is supportive of this proposal as it provides a critical connection for customers and allows an increase in service to be more effectively delivered to this area. In order to service the loop and efficiently travel through the site, the following conditions must be met:</p>		BA			15-May-20
	<p>All new tracks should be in a dedicated right-of-way so that transit vehicles are able to move customers through the site with minimal delay.</p>	All tracks are to be provided in dedicated ROW.	BA			15-May-20
	<p>Track geometry should be optimized to ensure a safe and efficient operation, minimizing curves and conflicts with other road users. In particular, crossings of the cycle track or sidewalk must provide adequate visibility for all users.</p>	Details relating to track geometry and related matters are the subject of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City and can also be addressed as part of future detailed design / planning processes.	BA			15-May-20

	All streetcar facilities must be able to accommodate bus operation and adhere to TTC design standards.	Noted. Details relating to track geometry and related matters are the subject of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City and can also be addressed as part of future detailed design / planning processes.	BA			15-May-20
	The streetcar loop must provide sufficient space to accommodate the proposed service, which at a minimum may include at least two loading platforms and one unloading platform in addition to space for streetcars to layover. TTC will continue to provide additional comments regarding the requirements of the streetcar facility as modeling data is refined and new ridership projections become available.	The Station loop has been modified to respond to TTC requests for additional drop-off bays and configuration needs. This matter is also the subject of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City.	BA			15-May-20
	Transit signal priority is required for all signalized intersections within the site as well as on the access and egress from the site. Given the heavy volumes of transit vehicles that will be entering and exiting the site onto Lake Shore Boulevard, transit vehicles must be prioritized in order to ensure a reliable and efficient operation is provided. TTC would appreciate if signal plans could be made available as early in the process as possible to ensure that the proposed designs will accommodate the vehicle volumes. All signal timing plans should be made subject to review by TTC.	Noted. Details will be assessed as part of the ongoing process and as part of micro-simulation modelling to be undertaken as part of the application and City-led TMP. Details will also be confirmed and advanced as part of future detailed design / implementation processes.	BA			15-May-20
	The streetcar facility must also include dedicated washroom facilities for TTC operators.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	An analysis should be conducted to determine whether double-track/bi-directional operation may help to reduce the potential bottlenecks at the accesses and egresses from Lake Shore Boulevard which provides a benefit to all road users.	This analysis will be presented / discussed as part of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City.	BA			15-May-20
	TTC anticipates continuing to run bi-directional service on Park Lawn Road and service along Lake Shore Boulevard to service the Marine Parade Drive development. At this time, TTC does not support the operation of buses on the "Relief Road" given the use of the road is as a highway by-pass and is likely to be congested in addition to removing service from the Park Lawn/Lake Shore intersection.	Bus stop locations have been relocated onto Park Lawn in response to TTC comments. Stop locations are the subject of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City.	BA			15-May-20

	On Park Lawn Road, the bus stops north of Lake Shore should be placed so that they provide an excellent connection to the proposed Park Lawn GO station. Both the northbound and southbound bus stops should include a connection to the GO Station platform. All stops must include a level concrete platform that is at least 16 metres in length and 2.4 metres in width from the curb and should include space for a transit shelter unless they are beneath the overpass. In all cases, no obstructions are permitted less than 2.4m from the curb within the 20 metres on the approach to any transit stop. Provision for a waiting area should also be made to avoid waiting customers obstructing the pedestrian clearway.	Noted - see response to above comment. Double bay stops are proposed on both sides of Park Lawn Road within lay-by facilities to respond to anticipated bus service frequency and service needs. Design details are the subject of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City and can also be advanced as part of future detailed design / implementation processes.	BA			15-May-20
	TTC supports extending some local bus connections in the area to the GO station which may change the requirements for the transit infrastructure in and around the subject site. At this time, TTC does not support the proposed extension of the 77 Swansea to the site as it duplicates the streetcar service provided along The Queensway in the same area. In order to maximize the connectivity of the site with other key transit corridors – including the Line 2 Bloor-Danforth subway, the road geometry into, out of and within the site should accommodate bus movements.	Noted - this has been reflected in the ZBA / updated OPA materials	BA			15-May-20
	In order to better understand the potential traffic concerns, it may be useful to perform a micro simulation at the corridor level to evaluate the operations of the site accesses and Lake Shore Boulevard intersections as well as how they interact with other intersections in the vicinity of the site. It would be beneficial to perform this analysis as early as possible so that any changes can be contemplated earlier in the process. Any proposed changes to roadway geometry or capacity, particularly around the Park Lawn/Lake Shore intersection should include a micro simulation analysis so that the impacts of the changes can be fully understood.	This analysis will be addressed as part of further work undertaken as part of the application and the City-led TMP process. This will be presented / discussed as part of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City and following the availability of base modelling outputs from the City-led TMP process.	BA			15-May-20
<b>L</b>	<b>Enbridge, October 30 2019</b>		<b>Alice Coleman, Long Range Distribution Planning, Enbridge Gas Inc.</b>			
	Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application(s). Enbridge Gas Inc. reserves the right to amend or remove development conditions.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
<b>M</b>	<b>Toronto Hydro, November 4 2019</b>					
	All proposed work must maintain the minimum horizontal and vertical clearances as per Toronto Hydro Construction Standard 31-0100 & 31-0700, attached heretG. Clearance measurements are taken from the edge of the hydro plant to the edge of the proposed work.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

	[Information on 'locates', relocations of Toronto Hydro Assets, and other construction related guidelines are included in Toronto Hydro's Utility Circulation Response]	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
<b>N</b>	<b>Toronto Catholic District School Board, December 10 2019</b>		<b>Michael Loberto, Planning and Development Services, TCDSB</b>			
	This development falls within the fixed attendance boundary of: St Mark Catholic School; The closest Secondary schools serving this area are: Bishop Allen Academy and Bishop Marrocco/Thomas Merton Catholic Secondary School	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	The TCDSB has identified a need for a school site under the Christie Secondary Plan Study which is associated with this development proposal and is working with the City and developer to secure the most optimal location for a school site. The TCDSB wishes to continue productive dialogue related to school accommodation, with City Planning and the developer throughout the Secondary Plan process.	Noted. The revised Master Plan explores the potential to locate a TCDSB elementary school on the site, located long the northern edge of the proposed park. The Owners look forward to continuing productive dialogue on this potential opportunity as well.	USI			15-May-20
	The TCDSB has been actively working with City Planning to pursue accommodation opportunities within Etobicoke to address significant enrolment pressures which have been triggered by; the intensity and volume of development applications in the area, resulting in strain on local schools. The need for a school site was identified and supported by the Provincially approved Toronto Catholic District School Board Education Development Charges By-law 2019 NG.194 and associated Background Study, which explicitly identifies 2150 Lakeshore Boulevard West as an Approved EDC Site.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	The TCDSB has applied to the Ministry of Education for capital funding for a replacement for Bishop Allen Academy - as supported by the respective local member of provincial parliament, city councillor and TCDSB Trustee. Additionally, the TCDSB has engaged in communications with the City with respect to CS&F planning for the Mimico-Judson Regeneration Area Study, located to the west of this proposal, to ensure representation of school boards interests.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
<b>O</b>	<b>Economic Development and Culture, January 7 2020</b>		<b>Matthew Premru, Economic Development Officer</b>			

O.1	EDC agrees with the placement of the exclusive Employment Areas designation on lands along the western edge of the site (abutting the Gardiner Expressway). SASP 15 contemplates development within this designation exclusively for employment generating uses to create a prominent, identifiable employment node with uses consistent with the Official Plan and favouring those under Column 1 of Schedule B in SASP 15 ("Column 1 "). As lands within this exclusive designation represent only a small proportion of the overall site, development here will not include any residential or disproportionate parks uses. These lands are also important in that no other area will be able to effectively accommodate the further expected employment growth over time. Upon re-development of the site, the remainder of the site (i.e. on lands now designated Regeneration Areas) will have very limited ground floor expansion opportunities and will be further constrained vertically by the proposed stratified land use designation regime that will essentially "cap" the expected ground or lower level employment space with residential above.	The revised proposal has reconfigured the proposed General Employment Area, in keeping with SASP 15, bringing this area into the central galleria at the heart of the site to create a cluster of employment surrounding 'Station Square' (the large POPS located at the GO Station). While the Master Plan does not currently propose strata arrangements, in keeping with the flexibility provided for in SASP 15, the draft ZBA maintains the potential for strata arrangements. The draft ZBA also incorporates minimum requirements for non-residential employment, as per SASP 15 (including the minimum requirement of Column 1 uses).	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale, draft ZBA	15-May-20
O.2	Taking advantage of the proximity to the proposed GO transit station, it is expected that development will be primarily in an office building format. EDC supports FCR's notion of standalone office buildings and their proposed location in close proximity to the new GO transit station. Regarding built form for this purpose, it should include design considerations that will maximize visual prominence and thereby enhance prestige. This takes fuller advantage of the prime exposure this location will offer along a major highway and rail line, creating a highly sought after and valuable feature amenable to attracting large scale corporate "anchor" tenants.	The revised Master Plan generally maintains the approach supported by EDC, including standalone office building formats, with the shift to bring the General Employment Area into the galleria working to enhance the prestige of employment uses that will be located in this prominent location at the heart of the site (interfacing with public park, the galleria, and station square/the GO Station).	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
O.3	EDC agrees with Tate Economic Research Inc's (TER) findings in the Economic Development Strategy that this site will be a preeminent office destination with key locational and access features superior to other sites within this office market area. For example according to the BA Group's analysis, a future GO train ride from this site to Union Station is estimated at only 12 minutes. In this regard EDC also agrees that transit investment is critical for major office development and thereby supports the recommendation to prioritize capital investments to this end, particularly towards a new transit station. It is expected that this development will be able to take advantage of the positive correlation between higher office demand and rental rates with increased proximity to a major transit installation both in the immediate and long term.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

O.4	<p>Along with the favourable site characteristics mentioned, EDC also accepts TER's finding that with in their identified office market area there is demand/support for more than the 47,474 square metres (511,000 square feet) currently proposed. Both of these factors with good cause point to the long term success and significant upside employment space potential of this development. EDC expects growth potential for employment uses beyond the roughly 50,000 square metres of Column 1, Schedule B uses in SASP 15 ("Column I") which were established only as minimums for that exercise. With that, the applicant is requested to provide conceptual drawings demonstrating a site and building design that accommodates near term demand while optimizing opportunities for future growth with a view of ultimately establishing higher as of right permissions that could expedite this form of development in the future.</p>	<p>The revised Master Plan includes approximately 64,392 m2 of Column 1 uses, illustrating the potential for these uses to exceed the minimum established in SASP 15. The draft ZBA appropriately incorporates minimum non-residential requirements, as per SASP 15, and intentionally does not include maximum thresholds for non-residential GFA (only maximums for total GFA), providing flexibility for future growth of non-residential uses throughout the long-term build out of the site.</p>	USI		<p>Planning &amp; Urban Design Rationale, draft ZBA</p>	15-May-20
O.5	<p>Regarding the timing for delivery of space for "Column 1" uses, EDC expects the proponent will be able to take advantage of significant immediate demand approaching the completion of the proposed transit station. Although this employment node and accompanying workforce may be aided by the supplemental local amenity arising from the anticipated nearby residential development, EDC does not believe that a very substantial critical mass of this will be required to act as an initial primary catalyst to lead or achieve the minimum non-residential targets (as TER may have suggested) . Establishing this location as a prominent and recognizable corporate office/business node in the early phases of development is one of the keys to attracting further office and related employment uses and so EDC seeks an approach for the vast majority of the required floor area minimums to be met at the earlier development stages . This should include significant standalone office buildings in each of phases I and 2 incorporating visually prominent building features and a design that will be amenable to future expansions .</p>	<p>The Draft ZBA proposes a minimum provision of Column 1 uses in the first phase of the project, providing appropriate flexibility for the remainder to be secured in future phases.</p>	USI		<p>Draft ZBA</p>	15-May-20

O.6	Otherwise for "Column I" uses that may be contemplated elsewhere in the Plan area (i.e. on lands now designated Regeneration Areas), EDC recommends that it be provided in minimum 5,000 square metres or as large as possible contiguous areas. This will maintain the potential to effectively attract a large tenant (i.e. corporate headquarter) as well as to maintain eligibility for the City of Toronto Imagination, Manufacturing, Innovation and Technology (IMIT) property tax incentive for qualifying uses.	The Owners are supportive of this notion of exploring eligibility for IMIT incentives through the provision of Column 1 uses in contiguous areas (among other requirements to ensure eligibility). However, to be clear such a minimum would not be appropriate in the site specific zoning, so as to maintain flexibility to respond to market conditions and opportunities over the long-term, phased build out of the site, in keeping with SASP 15.	USI			15-May-20
O.7	In accordance to SASP 15 section 4.i. regarding a Compatibility/Mitigation strategy and in relation to the applicant's proposed Public Consultation Strategy, EDC appreciates and agrees with the Ontario Food Terminal (OFT) being identified as a major stakeholder. The OFT is recognized as a major employer and facility of provincial significance with intentions for long term presence and continued growth at this location which is in close proximity to the subject lands. Due to the nature and scale of this operation and the potential for future complaints/conflict including noise, air and traffic, it is requested that further direct engagement with the OFT be included as part of the consultation process. The results of an initial consultation will assist City staff in identifying the scope of further impact study.	A revised Compatibility/Mitigation Strategy has been submitted with this application, as has a Public Consultation.	USI		Compatibility / Mitigation Strategy; Public Consultation Strategy	15-May-20
<b>P Transportation Impact Study (TIS), March 25 2020 Richard Beck, Program Manager, Transportation Planning</b>						
	The following comments are provided on the Transportation Impact Study prepared by BA Group, dated September 2019 and the Architectural drawings submitted as part of the Official Plan Amendment application submitted by First Capital Realty for 2150 & 2194 Lake Shore Boulevard West and 23 Park Lawn Road. These comments are in addition to those provided on December 20, 2019.		BA			15-May-20

	<p>All transportation routes, street cross-sections and their configurations, including but not limited to pedestrian clearways, cycling infrastructure, transit infrastructure and vehicular travel lanes within proposed and existing public streets must adhere to City standards, and transit service provider standards. Further direction will be secured in a comprehensive set of Urban Design Guidelines developed through the City-led Secondary Plan process with input from the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The proponent is expected to adhere to these guidelines through the development application process and reflect this work in subsequent revisions to the Transportation Impact Study. Generally, it is expected the rights-of-way of all public streets (existing and proposed) will prioritize pedestrian, active and transit modes over private vehicles.</p>	<p>Noted - details relating to the cross-section elements of new streets will be established further as part of the OPA / ZBA and Plan of Sub-division processes.</p>	BA			15-May-20
	<p>The analysis provided to date, by the proponent, includes the following: Area Mobility Assumptions, Multi-Modal Travel Demand Forecasting, Transit Hub Activity Projection, Transit Travel Assessment, Vehicle Travel Assessment, Active Travel Assessment and Traffic operations. These are not considered acceptable by Transportation Planning and Transportation Services staff for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proponent's traffic simulation models are not properly calibrated.</li> </ul> <p>Transportation Planning has assessed the model submitted to date by the proponent and the Gardiner is operating at free-flowing conditions, which is inaccurate. Transportation Planning finds that the proponent's analysis has no baseline traffic conditions, which will need to be provided by the TMP work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Ridership forecasting has no input from the City of Toronto GTAV4 model.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted - the micro-simulation work is to be refined and reassessed in the context of base modelling outputs from the City-led TMP process. Future conditions modelling in the area will be undertaken as part of the TMP and as part of the 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West application process. The process related to modelling work is the subject of discussions with City staff and updated modelling and other related technical work will be submitted to the City for review under separate cover as base modelling materials are made available.</p>	BA			15-May-20
	<p>The proponent must revise their TIS with the following inputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outputs from the City's GTAV 4 ridership model. The City has received some ridership information from Metrolinx and will be sharing it with the proponent as soon as possible.</li> <li>• Updated baseline traffic conditions that will be determined through the TMP work being led by Transportation Services.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. See response above. Traffic operations analyses / modelling will be reassessed based upon outputs from the City's TMP base modelling process.</p>	BA			15-May-20
	<p>The City led TMP is assessing the broader transportation network in the area which significantly impacts the proponent's application. Understandably, the proponent has not applied this assessment to their analysis because this work has not been completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The resubmissions of the proponents TIS in each stage of the development review process must reflect the TMP's findings.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted - this is the subject of ongoing discussions with City staff.</p>	BA			15-May-20



	More detailed comments are provided on these items below:		BA			15-May-20
<b>TIS (Technical Study VOL1):</b>						
	Pg56: The travel times assumed to various parts of Toronto/GTA are of concern. For example, if a trip from the subject site to Union Station is expected to take 15min, how could a trip to St Clair Station take 15-20min?	Further details will be provided as part of subsequent submissions.	BA			15-May-20
	The future shares of various modes represent significant modal shifts (particularly to GO transit) and should be justified with regional travel demand modelling or other numerical analysis techniques combined with expert judgment. Additional justification is required.	Mode share and other forecasting metrics will be confirmed and informed by the City-led modelling process being undertaken as part of the TMP. Outputs and information will be incorporated into subsequent technical submissions once base outputs from the City TMP is available.	BA			15-May-20
	Pg61: What was the comparator station? How is it feasible to project the station actively at Park Lawn to all other GO stations?	Travel characteristics were reviewed at the Exhibition GO Station. This was used to establish a general understanding of travel characteristics in a GO Station context.	BA			15-May-20
	Pg62: Further explanation of the sources of the transit capacity numbers is required. It is unlikely that TTC or GO would operate services with the amount of excess capacity assumed. In the case of TTC, is the proponent looking at the capacity on outer part of a service which reaches capacity before most of these riders would be alighting? Continued discussion between Metrolinx, the City and the proponent is required to ensure that sufficient GO capacity can be provided to serve the subject site.	Travel demand and mode allocation will be confirmed through the modelling work inputs from the City led-TMP process.	BA			15-May-20
<b>TIS (Technical Study VOL2):</b>						
	Pg100: The travel times will need to be checked against the new assumptions from Metrolinx which are still outstanding.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Pg104: These distributions will need to be checked against the City's regional travel demand model (GTA Model v4) results. The City will be seeking measures to increase the amount of local trip making through resubmission of the TIS required as part of the development review process.	Noted	BA			15-May-20

	Pg106: The proxy sites used are not comparable to the subject site. Transportation Planning recommends the following proxies: • Mimico GO, Liberty Village/ Exhibition GO and Dundas-Bloor West GO	The outlined sites are considered to be relevant to the discussion of mode share in a transit focussed environment such as that being established at Park Lawn with the introduction of the new GO Station, enhanced GO rail service, TTC inter-connection - and - importantly the introduction of a wide range of local supporting non-residential (including employment) uses that will greatly urbanize the local Humber Bay Shores environment well beyond that which can be achieved at Mimico. This can be reviewed further as part of the ongoing application review process.	BA			15-May-20
	The active transportation mode share appears ambitious and will require refined forecasting and TDM measures to support this outcome.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Pg116: It has not been demonstrated that there will be sufficient office in the local area to attract the number of trips the proponent has anticipated. The proxies of Yonge-Eglinton and Yonge-St Clair have significant local office employment comparatively and are not considered appropriate proxy sites.	It is unclear what this comment is referring to - P116 is seeking to establish a O-D distribution and mode split for the proposed commercial uses. The trip generation of the proposed uses is derived from typical person trip generation parameters of such uses. This can be discussed further as part of the review of the development application.	BA			15-May-20
	Pg178: Please demonstrate that there is sufficient unused capacity on the Lake Shore GO line to absorb all of these projected GO trips.	This can be advanced base upon input from the City's GTA model based upon service inputs provided by MX. This will be addressed as part of ongoing discussions with the City once base modelling information is available	BA			15-May-20
<b>Vehicle Parking Rates</b>						
<b>TIS (Technical Study VOL1):</b>						
	Page 64: The proponent has not submitted a specific proposed parking rate yet. The proponent has indicated residential and non-residential parking will be provided at reduced rates (PA-3 or lower) for preliminary planning purposes.	This is addressed as part of the updated OPA / ZBA application. See response to comment D.6	BA			15-May-20
	Shared parking between non-residential uses to maximize the efficiency of the supply is supported by Transportation Planning. Further details on the sharing of parking spaces will need to be developed.	see above and response to D.6	BA			15-May-20
	Transportation Planning supports not including commuter parking on-site.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Transportation Planning agrees to minimizing the vehicle parking supply, while ensuring that the demands of the site are met. Maximum rates for the site may be considered by Transportation Planning	Noted	BA			15-May-20

	In future applications, the proponent must propose a parking rate and provide a proxy parking utilization study to support the parking rates for all residential/commercial/employment uses. As indicated above, proxy locations outside of Toronto's Yonge Line 1 corridor must be used. The level of transit service and active mobility infrastructure on the Yonge corridor is not comparable to the subject site. Trip distribution undertaken by consultants for nearby development sites indicates that many people are projected to travel west to Peel Region and beyond or to north Etobicoke or York Region. These trips will likely require a personal vehicle and on-site parking. It is recommended that the consultant look at Mimico GO area, Humber Bay Shore area, Liberty Village, area Exhibition GO station area or the Bloor-Dundas West GO station area as a comparable analysis to assess parking demand.	See response to D.6. Notwithstanding the suggested restriction on the applicability of Line 1 examples, it is considered that all transit accessible areas are relevant and provide useful guides and reference points as to what minimum standards could be adopted to fully promote non-automobile dependent travel. The exclusion of such areas is seen to limit the range of positive parking environments that can be drawn from. The use of historical data from the Mimico and Humber Bay Shores areas in particular is considered to be far from reflective of parking needs of a dense, mixed-use environment with a new GO station and TTC transit hub. Any data from these areas is considered to be reflective of a car dominant, highway base context. This will be subject of subsequent discussion as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
<b>Active Transportation Network</b>						
<b>Cycling Infrastructure</b>						
	The following comments were prepared with input from Transportation Services, Cycling and Pedestrian Projects Group and will be further refined through the Plan of Subdivision process. Preliminary comments on the cycling network proposed as part of this development are outlined below:		BA			15-May-20
	Access to GO Station - Revised drawings should include a dedicated, direct cycling facility that connects the bicycle parking for the station to the larger cycling network, the Access Street (proponent's "Relief Road") Multi-use Trail (MUT) and the Loop Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This could be done through the transit plaza or via another route. If another route is chosen, it would have to be highly visible from the external road network. Providing a direct route will minimize the number of people choosing to cycle through the shared space.</li> </ul>	This can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Public Street A – The City prefers uni-directional cycle tracks on Public Street A (cycle tracks that lead to/from the signal at Park Lawn).	Noted - this can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Private Drive A - Private Drive A appears to provide a more direct access to the north end of the site and is a suitable location for cycling infrastructure.	Noted - this can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20

	Park Lawn - Depending on final road configuration and right-of-way width, the City requests the provision of a uni-directional or bi-directional cycling connection on Park Lawn from Lake Shore to Queensway	Bicycle facilities are proposed on the site frontages including Park Lawn Road and as part of new infrastructure to be constructed as part of the development. This can be reviewed as part of the development process while the extension of cycling infrastructure across the broad area should reviewed in the context of the City-led TMP.	BA			15-May-20
	Loop Road – Revise plans to show a uni-directional cycling facility on the internal Loop Road. A bi-directional is not acceptable because this facility type is not preferred for new roads especially when there is significant development on both sides of the road.	A bi-directional facility continues to be proposed on the loop road (Street B). This arrangement is compatible with the proposed loop road cross-section configuration and the ability to optimize cycling access to adjacent development and the GO Station. This can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Access Street – The City recommends that the MUT currently shown on the north side of the road should be switched to the south side of the road to eliminate the need to cross the road to connect into the site. Additionally, the existing Legion Road MUT looks like it is on the south side as it approaches Park Lawn, having the Access Street MUT on the south side would avoid a two-stage crossing of Park Lawn for cyclists.	The bicycle facility on Street A (relief road) has been removed as part of the current Master Plan with access to the GO Station provided via the Loop Road (street B) and Park Lawn Road. The overall cycling network needs should be assessed as part of the City's TMP.	BA			15-May-20
<b>Bicycle Parking</b>						
<b>TIS (VOL 1)</b>						
	Transportation Planning generally supports bicycle parking principles as proposed. <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure must comply with Toronto Green Standard Version 3 and incorporate the following specific elements:</u>		BA			15-May-20
	No secured long-term bicycle parking facilities are to be located more than one level above grade and no more than one level below grade within the developments blocks or GO Station lands.	Noted - this can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Access to below-grade or above grade secured long-term bicycle parking facilities are to be provided primarily with bicycle parking stairs (shallow grade stairs with bicycle rails), bicycle ramps, or dedicated bicycle elevators.	Noted - this can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Transportation Planning request that all short-term bicycle parking is to be located at-grade to improve visibility and convenience for visitors to the site.	Noted - the Master Plan shares the same bicycle parking accessibility and convenience goals. Visitor parking may not be provided at-grade as part of the Master Plan but will be readily accessible. This can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application	BA			15-May-20

	Transportation Planning request additional outdoor weather protected convenience bicycle parking located at-grade to improve visibility and convenience for visitors to the site.	Noted - this can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Transportation Planning requests that bicycle repair facilities be provided for each phase of development within the secure designated long-term parking facilities. In addition, bicycle repair facilities should also be provided within the GO Station lands.	Noted - this measure is included within the proposed Demand Management Framework and can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Transportation Planning requests that the proponent work to secure a funding partnership to supply Toronto Public Bike share facilities in appropriate locations within in Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces on site and within the GO Station lands	Noted - this measure is included within the proposed Demand Management Framework and can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
	Continued refinement of the bicycle parking rates will occur through the development application process to ensure that cycling demands are met. At the Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan application stage, it is requested that the proponent provide more details regarding the bicycle infrastructure that will be used for outdoor short-term bicycle parking and indoor long-term bicycle parking. These details can include renderings or specification sheets, manufacturer information and model numbers.	Noted - this can be reviewed further as part of the continued review of the application.	BA			15-May-20
<b>Site Access</b>						
<b>TIS (VOL 2 Part 1)</b>						
	Pg64: Transportation Planning discourages locating vehicular accesses, loading and service areas from main streets and Avenues.		BA			15-May-20
	Consolidated access for loading and servicing allows the internal street network to be narrower, prioritizing cycling and pedestrian movements and reducing pedestrian and cycling crossing distances at intersections. Further to this, consolidating accesses discourages the number of personal vehicle trips which is consistent with the City's objectives and policies related to mobility.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Access for parking and loading from Park Lawn Road and/or Lake Shore Boulevard is discouraged. If proposed, it will need to be assessed with a view to eliminating all unnecessary pedestrian/vehicular conflict points. Primary vehicular accesses are preferred off the proposed Access Street.	See response to comment D.5	BA			15-May-20

	All vehicle accesses to the proposed GO Station and its (below grade pickup and drop-off activities) should be consolidated with vehicle access off the proposed Access Street, "Street C" and/or "Private Street B", where possible.	Noted. Station related pick-up / drop-off facilities for the GO Station are shown being provided below grade within the development, on Street A (relief Road) and the Loop road (street B) adjacent to Station Plaza recognizing the way pick-up / drop-off activity functions at an urban GO Station (i.e. more like a City subway station than a commuter based suburban GO Station). This will be reviewed further as part of the TPAP, Station planning process and as part of the development review process.	BA			15-May-20
	Vehicular and pedestrian access points to the larger study area will be further developed through the TPAP and Secondary Plan processes as the Master Plan exercise evolves.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
<b>Pick-up and Drop-off (for the GO Station and along the internal street network)</b>						
	Transportation Planning agrees that decreasing car parking rates has enabled the rise in emerging ride sharing services such as Uber and Lyft. However, it is unsubstantiated that these services promote the reduction of overall single occupant vehicle use, trip generation and traffic congestion. Transportation Planning agrees that these services require space to allow for the associated pick up / drop off activities to occur in a safe and organized manner. While Transportation Planning sees these activities as a method of creating mobility choice, we do not want to encourage these trips over active mobility trips. The provision of higher order transit, surface local transit and many active transportation routes as well as an ample supply of goods and services through potential permitted uses on site is seen as the preferred method to reduce automobile dependence	Noted	BA			15-May-20

	All pick up and drop off activities as well as short-term surface layby spaces along the public streets are highly discouraged (particularly along the Loop Road). The proponent shall work to secure all pick up and drop off activities within convenient underground facilities on site or at grade near vehicle accesses and residential accesses and egresses.	The master plan proposes to accommodate building vehicular pick-up / drop-off activity in a responsive and pro-active manner through use of the below grade servicing / parking areas and - importantly - also the street network adjacent to building entrances and major facilities. A pick-up / drop-off strategy is outlined in the updated OPA / ZBA application. Laybys are provided at select locations on the loop road to accommodate short-term stopping activity although it is recognized that some short-term activity will also occur at other locations. The use of the street network for limited levels of front door activity is not seen to be impediment in a complete street environment to the pedestrian character and function of the Loop Road and other streets and it is considered that pro-active planning for such activity will avoid issues over time and enable the Plan to operate well under a variety of activity conditions.	BA			15-May-20
	It is recommended that as part of the proponent's revised functional plans that a comprehensive wayfinding strategy be developed for all users as part of ongoing development of TDM measures for the site.	Noted. This can be provided as part of subsequent submissions.	BA			15-May-20
	Transportation Planning is supportive of short-term parking spaces adjacent to residential core locations within the underground parking garage; and, a pick-up / drop-off area adjacent to school, daycare and hotel uses, if appropriately designed.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	All pick-up / drop-off for GO Station and adjacent office uses are to be located below grade.	See response above re: pick-up / drop-off	BA			15-May-20
	The amount and arrangement of all pick-up / drop-off areas and laybys are to be further refined as part of future development applications.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
<b>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</b>						
	Transportation Planning agrees in general with the measures proposed in concept. A comprehensive implementation and monitoring program strategy is expected as part of the Secondary Plan process. The proponent is requested to reflect these in subsequent revisions to the TIS. It is requested that the proponent meet with the City and its relevant divisions to workshop these initiatives prior to resubmitting future revisions to the TIS.	noted. This can be addressed s part of subsequent submissions	BA			15-May-20

<b>Street Network</b>						
<b>Access Street</b>						
	The proponent should proceed with furthering the design of the Access Street. The design must be informed by the City led TMP through all stages of the development process and will adhere to ongoing input from staff. Transportation Planning (in consultation with Transportation Services), at this time, does not support the reconfiguration of the Gardiner Ramps at the east end of the site, but further analysis of the ramps is being conducted through the TMP process.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	It is Transportation Planning's position that the road is required to serve the development (and is being evaluated by the TMP).	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Further discussions with First Capital regarding completion of Phases 3 and 4 of the Municipal Class EA for the Access Street will be required.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
<b>Internal Street Layout</b>						
	Transportation Planning will continue to work with the proponent through the Secondary Plan process to arrive at the layout of the internal street network.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
<b>Rights-of-way (ROWs) widths of Public Streets and general operation direction</b>						
	Loop Road – Transportation Planning recommends a right-of-way of approximately 25 meters.	A right-of-way width of 23m is proposed within the Master Plan as compatible with its local street context, the uses to be accommodated within the ROW and urban design considerations relative to building disposition. This can be reviewed further as part of the application review process.	BA			15-May-20
	The proponent must demonstrate how the pick-up and drop-off for the GO Station will be discouraged on the Loop Road. The proponent is also requested to justify the rationale for allowing private vehicles on the Loop Road. Transportation Planning emphasizes that priority of the Loop Road should be given to transit and active modes.	See comment above. It is not considered necessary to limit pick-up / drop-off for the GO Station on the loop road. The level of activity is likely to be limited given the relative location of Station Plaza within the "depth" of the site and travel path requirements to reach Station Plaza in a vehicle (the Loop of the road and one-way sections limit immediate accessibility by car). Also - the Master Plan creates considerable opportunity for people from Humber Bay Shores to walk or cycle (or take transit) to reach the GO Station as a far more convenient way to connect to the O Station if that was their destination. Further - the use of the loop road for pick-up / drop-off is not considered to be an impediment to the creation of a "great" urban context on the Loop Road.	BA			15-May-20



	All other public streets internal to the site should generally have a right-of-way width of 18.5 meters to 20 meters.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Access Street – Subject to analysis from the TMP.		BA			15-May-20
	Park Lawn Road – Currently being assessed as part of the TMP. Currently, the Official Plan identifies the right-of-way width of Park Lawn Road to be 36 metres.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Lakeshore Boulevard – Currently, the Official Plan identifies the right-of-way width of Lake Shore Boulevard West to be 36 metres.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	As the TMP and Secondary Plan processes continue the City will determine if further conveyances of land are required along Park Lawn and Lake Shore.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
<b>Transit Service</b>						
<b>Park Lawn Road</b>						
	Transportation Planning, in discussions with TTC, does not support the operation of buses on the Access Street given the road is likely to be congested by removing vehicular trips from the Park Lawn/Lake Shore intersection.	Noted - buses have been relocated to Park Lawn Road as per TTC comment	BA			15-May-20
	On Park Lawn Road, the bus stops north of Lake Shore should be placed so that they provide an excellent connection to the proposed Park Lawn GO Station. Both the northbound and southbound bus stops should include a connection to the GO Station platform. TTC will provide further direction on the appropriate locations and sizing.	Noted - the Master Plan shares this objective and believes that can be achieved. The master plan is suggesting that both northbound and southbound TTC stops on Park Lawn be located south of the rail corridor to maximize passenger convenience. TTC current comments identify a preference for the southbound stop to be north of the rail corridor. This is the subject of ongoing reviewing with the TTC / City.	BA			15-May-20
	Discussion on the location and size of bus stops on Park Lawn are subject to ongoing discussions with the TTC, City Planning and the applicant.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
<b>Loop Road</b>						
	Transportation Planning supports the TTC's general comments on transit facilities and operations on the Loop Road as provided to the proponent on December 20, 2019.	Noted	BA			15-May-20
	Transportation Planning and TTC requests that the proponent conducts an analysis to determine whether double-track/bi-directional operation of streetcars may help to reduce the potential bottlenecks at the accesses and egresses from Lake Shore Boulevard which provides a benefit to all road users.	Noted. This analysis will be presented / discussed as part of ongoing discussions with the TTC / City.	BA			15-May-20

	<p>Further to the above, the proponent (with input from the City and TTC) shall conduct an analysis to look at providing bidirectional streetcar operation with restricted private vehicle access on the Loop Road allowing for the prioritization of its right of way to pedestrians, active transportation modes and transit modes. It is unsubstantiated at this stage as to why private vehicles are required to operate on the Loop Road north west of Public Street A.</p>	<p>Noted and see above re: the review of uni / bi-directional track needs. With respect to the removal of vehicular access entirely, we offer the following: City streets are generally provided to offer a range of access to adjacent development and function as complete mobility environments. With this in mind, the Loop Road design and overall Master Plan consolidated access / servicing strategy is focussed upon reducing but not eliminating vehicle usage of the Loop Road which enables the public realm and pedestrian experience to be exceptional on the loop road as part of a truly complete and contemporary street environment. In fact - the continued use of the loop road by vehicles in a limited and "calm" pedestrian-centric environment is considered to be an optimal configuration for the Loop Road in this context and recognizing the role that this important street can play. While the desire to minimize automobile usage and the footprint cars present on a plan, we do not agree that the removal of vehicular access along the loop road benefits the Master Plan or community in the longer term in a context where the "right" outcome can be designed to accommodate all street user needs in a highly sophisticated and excellent public realm environment. This and other loop road design related factors can be reviewed further as part of the application review process.</p>	BA			15-May-20
<p><b>Q Community Services and Facilities (CS&amp;F), January 22 2020 Susan Kitchen, SIPA; Alexandra McDonough, SIPA</b></p>						
	<p>Each of the sectors of children's services, libraries, and community recreation were provided with the growth estimates for the area and asked to provide comments on estimated future needs, if any, to support growth. City staff also undertook a survey of human service agencies in the area to better understand the facilities and programs in the area and gain insight into estimated future needs that could be associated with growth. The City convened a meeting of the 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard landowner, the TDSB and the TCDSB in November 2019 so that the school boards could share information on current school enrolment and capacity and provide insight into estimated future needs. Following is a summary of the feedback received.</p>	<p>Noted &amp; received, thank you.</p>	USI			15-May-20
<p><b>Children Services - Child Care Centres</b></p>						

	<p>Children's Services has a Council approved Licensed Child Care Growth Strategy (2017-2016) which targets to serve 50% of children age 0 to 4 by 2026 City Wide. Children's Services February 2019- Ward Priority Map for early years child care spaces identifies 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West as being located in an area that has a medium child care spaces as a proportion of children, which is 30% to 39% licensed space to serve children 0-4. Currently the Focus Area has enough licensed capacity to serve only 4% of children 0-4 years of age while the CSF Study Area is only slightly higher at 9%.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20										
	<p>Based on the Child Care Growth Strategy target, and using a 62 space facility service model, Children's services estimates future child care centre needs as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="225 597 1077 813"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="225 597 741 646">Geographic Area</th> <th data-bbox="741 597 1077 646">Estimated Needs (62 space facility model)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="225 646 741 686">Christie Site</td> <td data-bbox="741 646 1077 686">2 to 4 centres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="225 686 741 727">Focus Area</td> <td data-bbox="741 686 1077 727">2 to 3 centres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="225 727 741 768">CSF Study Area</td> <td data-bbox="741 727 1077 768">4 to 4 centres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="225 768 741 813"><b>Total Estimated Facility Needs</b></td> <td data-bbox="741 768 1077 813"><b>8 to 11</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Geographic Area	Estimated Needs (62 space facility model)	Christie Site	2 to 4 centres	Focus Area	2 to 3 centres	CSF Study Area	4 to 4 centres	<b>Total Estimated Facility Needs</b>	<b>8 to 11</b>	Noted. It is assumed that a child care facility would be integrated with the potential school facilities explored in the revised Master Plan. The Owners are prepared to explore the provision of community services and facilities, which must be understood holistically in relation to permitted densities and the related total Section 37 contribution	USI			15-May-20
Geographic Area	Estimated Needs (62 space facility model)															
Christie Site	2 to 4 centres															
Focus Area	2 to 3 centres															
CSF Study Area	4 to 4 centres															
<b>Total Estimated Facility Needs</b>	<b>8 to 11</b>															
	<p>Children's Services seeks new facilities to accommodate a minimum of 62 children with 1 room of 10 infants, 2 rooms of 10 toddlers and 2 rooms of 16 preschool [2 to 4 centres estimated on the Christie Site]. According to the Child Care Growth Strategy child care facilities should provide a minimum of 30 square feet of unobstructed indoor space and 60 square feet of outdoor space. For a 62 child care centre this amounts to 1,860 square feet of indoor space and 3,737 square feet of outdoor space which totals 5, 597 square feet. Children's Services advises that cost of construction a child care centre depends on where the child care centre is housed- stand alone, base of a condo or within a school the cost to construct varies between \$5 million and \$6.5 million and centres typically have a lease of 99 years. (Refer to attachment in Appendix for Child Care Term Sheet).</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20										
<b>Parks Forestry and Recreation (PFR) - Community Recreation Centres</b>																

	<p>The Council approved Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan (FMP) 2019-2038 provides updated planning priorities and identifies emerging needs and opportunities .The PFR FMP is based on growth estimates over the next 20 which did not identify the Christie site as an area of development since the development application came in after the FMP in 2019. As such the future growth anticipated for the Christie site and area has created a CRC service provision level gap. The FMP establishes a CRC City Wide Service provision level of 1 CRC per 34,000 within a 2 to 2.5 KM radius. The total estimated future population growth of 29,084 to 33,948 within the Christie Secondary Plan, Focus Area and CSF Study Area meets the threshold for a new or expanded CRC Facility, which is not identified or budgeted for in the FMP.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	<p>PFR has identified two possible options to respond to estimated future growth and its impact on service provision levels. One option is to build a new CRC within the Christie Secondary Plan Area at 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard site and the second option is to revitalize or replace an existing CRC in the area.</p>	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	<p>A new facility within the Secondary Plan area could be located/ integrated within a tower podium, be co-located with other public uses such as child care and/or a school in a community hub, or as a standalone CRC. If an existing facility was to be revitalized or replaced, it is likely that Ourland Community Centre or Fairfield Seniors' Centre would be the sites considered; both sites have the potential to accommodate expansion.</p>	<p>Noted. The Owners are prepared to explore the provision of community services and facilities, which must be understood holistically in relation to permitted densities and the related total Section 37 contribution.</p>	USI			15-May-20
	<p>CRCs should be mid-size to large multi-component centres, ranging from at least 45,000 ft2 to 65,000 ft2. PFR advises that cost of construction for a new community recreation centres is an estimated cost of \$700 per ft2.</p>		USI			15-May-20
	<p>City Planning is currently waiting for feedback from PFR regarding their preferred option to expand service delivery of a community recreation centre in the Christie's Planning Study.</p>		USI			15-May-20
<p><b>Schools - TDSB and TCDSB</b></p>						

	As with the other sectors, the school boards were provided with the growth estimates and requested to provide comments on estimated future needs. To facilitate this, City Planning convened a meeting of both school boards and the consultant for landowner (USI) on November 29, 2019 to provide the school boards the opportunity to present information on student capacity of each school serving the Christie's Planning Study. City Planning requested that the school boards and landowner meet to discuss their respective needs and what opportunities might be available for schools on their lands as the provision of schools is not a community benefit under Section 37 of the Planning Act. It is our understanding that these discussions are occurring. A report back meeting has been scheduled for January 23, 2020.	Discussions with both school boards are ongoing, and have contributed to the exploration of a location for potential elementary school facilities for both TDSB and TDSB within the revised Master Plan. Further discussion is required with both school boards on the proposed location and design, between the school boards and City of Toronto on the potential to co-locate shared school yard facilities within the public park, and between the school boards and province to advance funding and approvals. The Owners will continue to support these productive discussions, to further explore the potential for school facilities on the site.	USI		Planning & Urban Design Rationale	15-May-20
<b>Toronto Public Libraries</b>						
	The Toronto Public Libraries (TPL) recently completed a city wide Facilities Master Plan (FMP), January 2019 to examine facility needs against service delivery and growth areas and develop a 30 year investment roadmap.	Noted. Additional feedback has been received from TPL, included in the following section of this matrix.	USI			15-May-20
	There are two TPL serving the CSF Study Area: Humber Bay Branch and Mimico Centennial. Humber Bay Branch is undersized for a Neighbourhood Branch at 2,400 square feet which is well below the 10,000 square feet optimal size and is listed in the TPL Facilities Master Plan (FMP) as being in critical condition with a 2018 replacement cost of \$1,257,600. Mimico Centennial is substantially larger with 17,469 square feet but is also listed in the FMP as being in poor condition with a 2018 replacement of \$9,153,756.	Noted. Additional feedback has been received from TPL, included in the following section of this matrix.	USI			16-May-20
	City Planning met with TPL regarding the growth estimates and the need to serve an increase population that was not contemplated prior to the submission of the application at 2150 Lakeshore Avenue West. The TPL has expressed an interest to expand Library capacity in the CSF Study Area and will work towards looking at preferred options after consultation with City Councillor of Ward 3.	Noted. Additional feedback has been received from TPL, included in the following section of this matrix.	USI			17-May-20
<b>Human Services</b>						
	Human Services refers to non-profit community based organizations that deliver a wide-range of programs and services across the city. They can include: youth, family and homelessness services; employment, education and immigrant services; health, medical and disability services; and seniors services.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	On November 7, 8 and 9, 2017, City Council adopted the Community Space Tenancy Policy that provides a framework for leasing City space to the non-profit community based sector. This policy is led by SDFA and RES.	Noted.	USI			16-May-20

	City Planning identified 18 Human Service Agencies operating in the CS&F Study Area providing: job training, supportive housing, senior programs and services, community health care, and food/furniture banks. Each agency was contacted to participate in a survey to understand who the local agencies serve, how much capacity they have and what challenges and opportunities they see for the future delivery of their programs and services in the area.	Noted.	USI			17-May-20
	This survey identified a general lack of community space in the area. Eighty percent (80%) of agencies surveyed are currently operating over capacity. Based on their existing needs, a number of agencies identified the need for additional space including a community kitchen, warehousing space, and space to expand their programs and services estimated to total at least 40,000 sq. ft. Many agencies surveyed indicated that the new residents resulting from the proposed development would increase pressure on their resources and space in the future.	Noted. The owners are prepared to explore the provision of community services and facilities in the context of the entire development.	USI			18-May-20
<b>R Community Services and Facilities (CS&amp;F) Addendum, May 8, Susan Kitchen, SIPA; Alexandra McDonough, SIPA</b>						
	This memo is an addendum to our CSF Comments memo provided on January 22, 2020.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	As part of the Christie's Planning Study (2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West) a Community Services and Facilities (CS&F) profile was completed. Each of the sectors of children services, libraries, and community recreation were provided with growth estimates for the area and asked to provide comments on estimated future needs. Comments for each sector were provided in our January 22, 2020 memo where it was noted that the Toronto Public Library (TPL) had expressed an interest to expand library capacity in the CSF Study Area and for which comments would be provided at a later date.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
	We have now received comments from the TPL confirming their interest in expanding library capacity by relocating the Humber Bay branch to the Christie Lands as a 15,000 square feet space, either freehold or leased. TPL advises that the Humber Bay project is currently not part of the library's 10-year capital plan. However, given the population growth estimates for this site and area, the relocation and expansion of the existing Humber Bay branch has been identified as a need.	Noted. The Owners are prepared to explore the provision of community services and facilities, which must be understood holistically in relation to permitted densities and the related total Section 37 contribution.	USI			15-May-20
	Based on 2020 dollars, TPL estimates the design and construction of a 15,000 square foot freehold space at \$11.25 million or \$4.5 million for interior fit up of a leased space. These budgets include all finishes, furniture and equipment.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20

	The TPL has provided Humber Bay Branch Requirements which are attached for information and reference.	Noted.	USI			15-May-20
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	-----	--	--	-----------