



April 9, 2021

Project No. 2003

Mr. Matthew Zentner  
Community Planning, Toronto & East York District  
Toronto City Hall  
100 Queen Street West, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor E  
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Dear Mr. Zentner:

***Re: 506 to 516 Church Street, Toronto (“subject site”)  
Planning and Urban Design Addendum Letter  
File No. 20 172161 STE 13 OZ***

---

As you are aware, we are the planning consultants for Graywood CM GP Inc. (“Graywood”), the owner of 506-516 Church Street. In July 2020, we submitted a rezoning and official plan amendment application to permit the redevelopment of the subject site for a 15-storey mixed-use building (the “proposal”). In support of the application, we prepared a Planning and Urban Design Rationale report. Since the time of the original submission, comments have been received from City Staff and Graywood and their design team have participated in two working group meetings. As a result of comments received, and in combination with a new Site Plan Application (SPA), further revisions have been made to the proposal.

This letter has been prepared as an addendum to our July 2020 Planning and Urban Design Rationale report to address the revised plans. This addendum concludes that, with the design revisions, the proposed development continues to be appropriate from the perspectives of land use policy, built form and urban design. Subject to additional comments set out herein, the findings and analysis set out in our Planning and Urban Design Rationale Report continue to be relevant and accurate.

#### **Description of Revised Proposal**

A number of changes have been made to the proposal, which are outlined below. It is our opinion that the revisions will continue to support the development of the subject site with a transit-oriented mixed-use building that is contextually appropriate for the site.

Key changes are as follows:

- The revised development continues to propose a 15-storey residential building with retail units at grade. The proposed building will have a total height of 48.02 metres (52.72 metres including the mechanical penthouse).
- The streetwall height has been revised from 10.93 metres to 11.47 metres.

- The massing of the northern portion of the building has been revised to comply with the angular plane.
- The revised proposal now provides a step back every floor, opposed to stepping back every other floor in the previous submission. The setback from the existing heritage building has remained the same.
- The revised proposal has introduced a “windowless” wall on the northern elevation of the building facing Maitland Avenue, providing additional privacy.
- The number of dwelling units has increased from 173 units to 197 units. The increased number of units is primarily due to the introduction of additional studio units. While the proposed unit mix has shifted, the proposal continues to meet the requirements of the Downtown Secondary Plan, including at least 15% two-bedroom units and 10% three-bedroom units.
- The change in unit mix has also resulted in changes to other building components which are based on unit count (i.e. bicycle parking and amenity space).

#### Site Statistics

A summary comparison of the revised design to the original proposal is provided in **Table 1** below.

	Original Submission (July 2020)	Revised Design (March 2021)	Difference
<b>Site Area</b>	1,706.3 sq.m	1,706.3 sq.m	No Change
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	<b>13,780 sq.m</b>	<b>13,171 sq.m</b>	<b>[‐] 609 sq.m</b>
Residential GFA	12,708 sq.m	12,371 sq.m	[‐] 337 sq.m
Non-Residential GFA	1,072 sq.m	800 sq.m	[‐] 272 sq.m
<b>Amenity Space</b>	<b>668 sq.m (3.8 sq.m/unit)</b>	<b>724 (3.67 sq.m/unit)</b>	<b>[+] 97 sq.m</b>
Indoor	423 sq.m (2.4 sq.m/unit)	405 sq.m (2.05 sq.m/unit)	[‐] 18 sq.m
Outdoor	245 sq.m (1.4 sq.m/unit)	319 sq.m (1.6 sq.m/unit)	[+] 74 sq.m
<b>Floor Space Index (FSI)</b>	<b>8.08 FSI</b>	<b>7.72 FSI</b>	<b>[‐] 0.36 FSI</b>
<b>Height</b>	<b>15 Storeys</b> 46.72 metres 52.72 metres (MPH)	<b>15 Storeys</b> 48.02 metres 52.72 metres (MPH)	<b>No change</b> [+] 1.3 m No change (MPH)
<b>Dwelling Units</b>	<b>173 Units (100%)</b>	<b>197 Units (100%)</b>	<b>[+] 24 Units</b>
Studio Units	15 units (9%)	60 units (30%)	[+] 45 Units
One-Bedroom Units	72 units (42%)	72 units (37%)	No change
Two-Bedroom Units	65 units (38%)	45 units (23%)	[‐] 20 Units
Three-Bedroom Units	21 units (12%)	20 units (10%)	[‐] 1 Unit

<b>Vehicular Parking</b>	<b>40 spaces</b>	<b>40 spaces</b>	<b>No change</b>
<i>Long-Term</i>	30 spaces	27 spaces	[+] 3 spaces
<i>Short-Term</i>	10 spaces	13 spaces	[+] 3 spaces
<b>Bicycle Parking</b>	<b>184 spaces</b>	<b>206 spaces</b>	<b>[+] 22 space</b>
<i>Residential Long-Term</i>	156 spaces	178 spaces	[+] 22 space
<i>Residential Short-Term</i>	18 spaces	20 spaces	[+] 2 spaces
<i>Retail Long-Term</i>	3 spaces	2 spaces	[+] 1 space
<i>Retail Short-Term</i>	7 spaces	6 spaces	[+] 1 space
<b>Loading</b>	1 Type 'C' 1 Type 'G'	1 Type 'G'	<b>[+] 1 space</b>

\*\* Based on GFA definition in By-law 569-2013

### ***Unit Mix and Amenity Space***

As outlined in **Table 1**, the proposed unit mix has changed with the revised proposal. In this regard, there are now 197 units proposed, including 60 studio units (30%), 72 one-bedroom units (37%), 45 2-bedroom units (23%) and 20 3-bedroom units (10%).

The amenity space has been adjusted to be provided at similar rates as the original submission, resulting in an overall rate 3.67 square metres of amenity space per unit. The new proposal incorporates a minimum of 2.05 square metres of indoor amenity space per unit (405 square metres in total) and a minimum of 1.6 square metres of outdoor amenity space per unit (319 square metres in total). In the revised proposal, the amenity spaces are located on the second floor, fourth floor and fourteenth floor. While most of the proposed amenity space remains unprogrammed, an eight (8) square metre pet washing station and an 83 square metre 'Dog Run' are proposed on the 14<sup>th</sup> floor with frontage on Church Street.

### ***Parking and Loading***

As with the original submission, proposed vehicular access will continue to be from Donna Shaw Lane. While the overall proposed parking supply remains at 40 spaces, minor modifications to the parking supply breakdown are proposed. This includes reducing the long-term parking spaces by three (for a total of 27 spaces) and increasing the short-term parking spaces by three (for a total of 13 spaces).

The original submission proposed one Type 'G' and one Type 'C' loading space. The revised proposal has updated the plans to include one Type 'G' loading space at grade within the building's southwest quadrant. Access to the loading space has not changed from the original submission.

The overall supply of bicycle parking spaces has increased from 184 spaces to 206 spaces, including 178 long-term residential spaces, 20 short-term residential spaces, two (2) long-term retail spaces and six (6) short-term retail spaces.

## Commentary on Revised Proposal

### ***Intensification***

Residential/mixed-use intensification on the subject site is supportive of numerous policy directions articulated in the Provincial Policy Statement, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the City of Toronto Official Plan, all of which support intensification on sites which are well served by municipal infrastructure, particularly higher order public transit. As set out in Section 5.1 of our Planning and Urban Design Rationale report, the proposal will redevelop the site with an appropriately scaled transit-supportive development.

### ***Land Use***

The proposed mix of land uses, including residential and ground floor retail uses, continues to be in keeping with the land use permissions of the Official Plan, as set out in Section 5.2 of our Planning and Urban Design Rationale report. The revised unit mix will continue to conform with Policy 11.1 of the Downtown Secondary Plan by providing housing for a wide variety of residents and, in particular, addressing the lack of variety in the available housing mix. In total, 23 percent of the total of number of units will be two-bedroom units (15 percent required), and 10 percent of the total number of units will be three-bedroom units (10 percent required).

With respect to the Growing Up Guidelines, the proposal continues to exceed the recommendation for unit mix within the Growing Up Guidelines, which similarly recommends a minimum of 10 percent three-bedroom units and 15 percent two-bedroom units.

### ***Height and Massing***

It continues to be our opinion that the subject site is an appropriate location for a building of this scale given its location within the *Downtown*, its proximity to a major transit station and its frontage on a major street. The height and massing of the revised proposal continues to respect the surrounding area and continues to meet the intent of SASP 382, which ensures that new buildings respect and reinforce the general physical characteristics, scale massing, setbacks and heritage value along Church Street. The proposal is comprised of two elements with characteristics of a podium and tower element (southerly portion) and a typical terraced mid-rise building (northerly portion).

The revised proposal includes a streetwall height of 11.47 metres along Church Street, which is slightly higher than the existing heritage building. However, it more closely aligns with the existing condominium building's streetwall height to the south at 70 Alexander Street (11.4 metres). The slight increase in the streetwall height continues to integrate and reinforce the character of the existing heritage building on the subject site.

### ***Shadow Impacts***

A revised Shadow Study has been prepared by Diamond Schmitt Architects for March 21<sup>st</sup>, September 21<sup>st</sup> and June 21<sup>st</sup> for each hour between 9:18 a.m. and 6:18 p.m. The study has been updated to show the incremental shadow of the proposal versus the shadow cast by an as-of-right (16 metre) building and a building that would comply with the angular policies of SASP 382.

Given the minor built form adjustment made to the proposal, the overall shadow impact is similar to that created by the initial proposal. It therefore continues to be our opinion that the incremental shadow impacts on neighbouring properties, sidewalks and parks are "adequately limited" in accordance with the applicable Official Plan and Site and Are Specific policies, having regard for the site's location within an urban context and the proximity of existing tall buildings.

### ***Urban Design***

From an urban design perspective, the revised scheme continues to respond appropriately to the surrounding built form context and it continues to be our opinion that the proposed development conforms to the urban design and built form policies of the Official Plan and is in keeping with relevant urban design guidelines, including the North Downtown Yonge Urban Design Guidelines, the Avenues and Mid-Rise Building Guidelines, Tall Building Guidelines.

### **Conclusions**

The findings set out in our Planning and Urban Design Rationale report dated July 2020 are still relevant and applicable to the revised design. As a result, it is our opinion that the proposed development continues to be appropriate and desirable and approval of the Official Plan Amendment and rezoning application is recommended.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this addendum letter, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned or Alexis Beale of our office.

Yours very truly,  
**Bousfields Inc.**



Louis Tinker, MCIP, RPP

cc      Christine Yee, Graywood CM GP Inc