

Appendix 2: Lakeshore East Corridor – Official Plan Amendment – Response to Comments Summary

Comment No.	Respondent	Issue	Staff Comment	Recommendation for OPA
1	Deborah Goss and Trevor Baker at Public Meeting, Planning and Development Committee November 15, 2021	(1) Concern and feedback regarding Rangeview Estates built form, streetwall, setbacks, and linear greenspace	(1) Rangeview Estates is part of the Lakeview Waterfront Major Node and separate from this study. Staff can facilitate meetings between Rangeview Estates development master plan and the community.	(1) No action required
2	Boris Rosolak at Public Meeting, Planning and Development Committee November 15, 2021	(1) Comments and concern regarding 45 degree angular plane, appropriate transition, and community consultation.	(1) Existing transition policies in the Lakeview Local Area Plan will remain. Any development application such as an Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application is required to hold a public meeting.	(1) No action required
3	Leo Longo on behalf of CityPark Lakeshore Inc. at Public Meeting, Planning and Development Committee November 15, 2021 and written correspondence	(1) Request to explicitly recognize that 1381 Lakeshore Road East is a development application that was deemed complete prior to Lakeshore Road East OPA.	(1) Any application submission deemed complete prior to the adoption of this study will be reviewed on its own merits. The recommendation report explicitly recognizes the applications currently under review. The associated draft mapping is consistent with city-initiated OPA studies.	(1) No action required
		(2) Request that the Lakeshore East OPA be halted in favour of a	(2) A city wide Official Plan Review is currently underway. The Official Plan Review will address where growth and development should	(2) No action required

Comment No.	Respondent	Issue	Staff Comment	Recommendation for OPA
		comprehensive corridor study across entire city.	be accommodated.	
		(3) Request that council give direction to pursue mediation for OZ 20/018 W1 City Park.	(3) PDC and Lakeshore East Corridor Study is not the appropriate forum to discuss legal strategy for existing development applications under appeal.	(3) No action required
4	Mary Flynn-Guglietti on behalf of 2828778 Ontario Inc, the owner of 420 Lakeshore Road East, written correspondence	(1) Comment that the proposed OPA should be amended to consider the width of the right-of-way, such as the Toronto Mid-rise Building Guidelines.	(1) The corridor has two right-of-way widths. Staff have considered the right-of-way widths of 30 m and 44.5 m along Lakeshore Road East. The 44.5 m width represents a street condition that is inconsistent with the main street vision of the local area plan. As such, it is inappropriate to base the proposed heights exclusively on right-of-way widths.	(1) No action required
5	Councillor Dasko (Ward 1)	(1) Concern about the height of mechanical rooms over and above the proposed height limit.	(1) Mechanical rooms are required to be located above the highest storey. They contain vital building equipment such as elevators. Mechanical rooms less than 6 metres in height are not calculated toward overall height based on the zoning by-law. Urban design guidelines and staff can assist in locating and shielding a mechanical penthouse.	(1) No action required

Comment No.	Respondent	Issue	Staff Comment	Recommendation for OPA
6	Councillor Ras (Ward 2)	(1) Question about what happens with development applications currently under review.	(1) Development applications that were submitted and deemed complete prior to this study are reviewed under the policy framework that existed at the time of submission.	(1) No action required
		(2) Question about identifying a core area like Clarkson Village.	(2) Through the existing policy framework, the Lakeview Local Area Plan has identified an inner core and an outer core. The policies and mapping outlying the core areas are not changing.	(2) No action required
		(3) Would Section 37 be applicable?	(3) A community benefits charge would be applicable if a proposed development exceeds the new policy framework.	(3) No action required
		(4) Question about the likelihood of the proposed OPA succeeding.	(4) Staff are committed to providing a reasonable and defensible planning policy framework which would discourage future OPAs.	(4) No action required
7	Councillor Fonseca (Ward 3)	(1) Question about the Etobicoke Creek's impact to the boundaries of the proposed OPA.	(1) The proposed policies do not change the greenlands designation. Development applications would need to submit additional studies and a rezoning application for review.	(1) No action required

Comment No.	Respondent	Issue	Staff Comment	Recommendation for OPA
8	Councillor Parrish (Ward 5)	(1) Question regarding the Lakeshore BRT and MTSA impact to the proposed Lakeshore OPA.	(1) The MTSAs are currently in draft form and being evaluated by the Region and the Province. Based on the information received it is our understanding that the draft MTSAs would not affect the heights along Lakeshore Road East. Draft MTSA policies provide the ability to include Inclusionary Zoning.	(1) No action required
		(2) Question regarding heights in Rangeview Estates.	(2) The Rangeview Estates Precinct is part of the Lakeview Waterfront Major Node and separate from this study. The Rangeview Estates Precinct will primarily be a mix of townhouses and mid-rise buildings. Buildings of 5 to 8 storeys will front Lakeshore Road East, and buildings of 9 to 15 storeys will be located behind.	(2) No action required
		(3) Question regarding procedural fairness of applications under review.	(3) Development applications that were submitted and deemed complete prior to this study are reviewed under the policy framework that existed at the time of submission.	(3) No action required
		(4) Question regarding external urban design consultant.	(4) During the engagement process Staff contracted an external urban	(4) No action required

Comment No.	Respondent	Issue	Staff Comment	Recommendation for OPA
			design consultant to present best practices and to lead discussion in the workshops.	
		(5) Question regarding affordable housing in relation to City of Toronto's policies.	(5) The City of Toronto Inclusionary Zoning policies would apply to projects having 100 or more units. Mississauga's preliminary policy direction proposes targeting up to 5% of Gross Floor Area or units as affordable housing within the Lakeshore Road East MTSAs. For more information see the Inclusionary Zoning Update and Next Steps Report dated December 23, 2021.	(5) No action required
9	Councillor Starr (Ward 6)	(1) Question regarding where high buildings should be located.	(1) Based on the current MOP city structure taller buildings should primarily be located downtown, followed by major nodes, then community nodes, and finally in neighbourhoods.	(1) No action required
		(2) Question regarding how to measure the 45 degree angular plane.	(2) The 45 degree angular plane is measured from the property line. The angular plane is part of the transition policies. Additional setbacks to the rear property line are required in the zoning by-law.	(2) No action required

Comment No.	Respondent	Issue	Staff Comment	Recommendation for OPA
		(3) Question regarding the principle behind the 45 degree angular plane.	(3) The 45 degree angular plane is one tool in the built form guidelines to provide light and space between a proposed development and an existing low rise context.	(3) No action required
		(4) Question regarding the difference between the former Sheridan Ford site at the northwest corner of Dixie Road and Lakeshore Road East and the proposed development at 1381 Lakeshore Road East.	(4) The former Sheridan Ford site at 1345 Lakeshore Road East is 125 m in depth and 1.26 ha in area. The site at 1381 Lakeshore Road East is 50 m in depth and 0.42 ha in area.	(4) No action required
		(5) Question regarding the height of the approved development at the northwest corner of Dixie Road and Lakeshore Road East.	(5) The development at 1345 Lakeshore Road East ranges from 4 storeys to 12 storeys.	(5) No action required
		(6) Question regarding the public comments about the approved	(6) During the public consultations the community asked for confirmation of the height of the approved development and later used the	(6) No action required

Comment No.	Respondent	Issue	Staff Comment	Recommendation for OPA
		development at the northwest corner of Dixie Road and Lakeshore Road East.	height as a reference point.	