



MICHAEL GOLDBERG, MCIP, RPP
mgoldberg@goldberggroup.ca
(416) 322-6364 EXT. 2100

April 10, 2023

Christy Chow, Planner
Toronto City Hall, 12th fl. E.,
100 Queen St. W.
Toronto ON
M5H 2N2

**RE: Planning Addendum Letter
15-17 Elm Street, City of Toronto
File No. 22 202864 STE 11 OZ and 22 202863 STE 11 SA
17 Elm GP Inc.**

Introduction

We are the planning consultants for 17 Elm GP Inc., the applicant of the lands located on the south side of Elm Street, bordered by Harry Barberian Lane to the east and south, approximately 60 m west of Yonge Street, municipally known as 15 and 17 Elm Street, in the City of Toronto (the “subject site”). A Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) application and Site Plan Approval (SPA) applications were jointly submitted on September 1, 2022 proposing a 30-storey mixed-use building on the subject site. Since then, the proposal as further detailed below has been revised in response to some of the circulation of comments received from City staff and external agencies, as well as feedback received from the community at the February 16th, 2023 virtual community consultation meeting and one-on-one session with key stakeholders, including the Panda Condo Board at 20 Edward Street.

The purpose of this Planning Addendum Letter is to identify the key revisions to the plans and to provide our planning opinion concerning these revisions. Our original Planning Report (dated August 2022) should be treated as a companion document to this letter. Please refer to that report for topic areas that are not changed by the revised application. This letter also addresses comments raised by City Planning and Urban Design.

Revised Proposal

The revised proposal is shown on the architectural plans prepared by Partisans Architects dated April 10, 2023, being submitted as part of this resubmission.

A comparison of the initial and revised proposal is outlined in the following table:

Site and Building Statistics		
	Initial Submission (September 2022)	Resubmission (April 2023)
Site Area	793 sq. m (0.20 ac.) (0.08 ha)	No change
Total GFA	14,363 sq. m	13,844 sq. m
Total Residential GFA	14,163 sq. m	13,541sq. m
Total Non-Residential GFA	200 sq. m	303 sq. m
Floor Space Index	18.12	17.46
Dwelling Units		
Studio	5 (3%)	0
One-bedroom	95 (55%)	81 (37%)
One-bedroom + Den	0	54 (25%)
Two-bedroom	51 (29%)	58 (27%)
Three-bedroom	23 (13%)	23 (11%)
Total	174 Units (100%)	216 Units (100%)
Amenity Space		
Indoor Amenity Space	348 sq. m	620 sq. m
Outdoor Amenity Space	298 sq. m	205 sq. m
Height		
Podium Height	10-storeys	8-storeys
Building Height	30-storeys (93 m + 6 m MPH)	No change
Parking		
Number of Vehicle Parking Spaces	22	23
Number of Bicycle Parking Spaces	192	203

Key features of the revised proposal include the following:

- The revised proposal continues to include a 30-storey mixed use building with two levels of mechanical penthouse. The building is uniquely shaped with an undulating and wispy cloud-like series of round sculpted forms that lengthen as they go up the building. The revised proposal includes a residential GFA of 13,541 sq. m., a non-residential GFA of 303 sq. m., and a total GFA of 13,844 sq.m. The FSI has been reduced from 18.12 to 17.46.
- The revised proposal includes a wide public realm space facing Elm Street with a north setback of 3.7 m to the property line and 6.9 m to the Elm Street curb. This north setback is maintained to the 4th floor, where the building cantilevers over 2.2 m. At the 8th floor, the building then steps back 3.5 m from the north to create an 8-storey podium element.
- Above the 8th floor, the tower at floors 9-30 is setback 3.5m from the front (north) property line, 1.7 m from the side (east) property line, and 4.4 m from the rear (south) property line. The tower is setback 12.3 m from the centre line of the Elm Street to

the north, 6.8 m to the center line of the lane to the south and 1.3 m to the center line of the lane to the east. The floor plate size is 554 sq. m (Gross Construction Area (GCA)).

- The residential lobby is accessed directly from Elm Street. Adjacent to the residential lobby is an entrance to the retail space, a mail and parcel room, garbage room, and south of which is a Type G loading space accessed from the lane to the east. The retail space has been expanded horizontally on the ground floor to create a greater presence along Elm Street. The height of the ground floor has been increased to 4.5m.
- One (1) level of underground parking with a total of 23 automated parking spaces are proposed. The 23 parking spaces are reserved exclusively for residents and are accessed by a private car-elevator.
- A total of 203 bicycle parking spaces are proposed, including 158 long-term (residential) bicycle parking spaces and 45 short-term (residential visitors) bicycle parking spaces. Short-term bicycle parking spaces will be located on the ground floor, while long-term bicycle parking spaces will be located on P1 and level 2.
- The proposal includes a widening of the abutting Harry Barberian Lane. A lane widening of 3 m is proposed along the north-south portion of the lane, which results in a 6 m wide lane. A 0.56 m widening is proposed along the east-west portion of the laneway. The widening is being proposed as a surface access easement.
- Access to the underground parking garage and loading/service area continues to be provided from Harry Barberian Lane. A proposed Type 'G' loading space is located interior to the building. One car elevator is proposed at the rear of the site that will provide access to the fully automated P2 parking level. No vehicular parking is proposed on P1. All back of house operations are internalized into the proposed building so that these activities do not face Elm Street and are not visible from the street or sidewalk.
- The revised proposal provides for a total combined indoor and outdoor amenity space of 825 sq. m. A total of 620 sq. m of indoor amenity space is provided for residents of the building located on the 2nd and 3rd floors. The total indoor amenity space equates to a ratio of 2.9 sq. m per unit of indoor amenity space. A total of 205 sq. m of outdoor amenity space is proposed on the 3rd floor and on the roof. The total outdoor amenity space equates to a ratio of 0.9 sq. m per unit of outdoor amenity space.

Planning Analysis

The height, massing and other urban design features of this proposal continue to be carefully and thoughtfully deployed in consideration of the interrelationship of the surrounding area context with the subject site. The proposed redevelopment continues to create a well-designed, high quality residential building on this underutilized site, offering a range of residential unit types and tenures, and amenities.

The podium height has been reduced from 10-storeys to 8-storeys. In our opinion, the height of the base building is appropriate in this *Downtown* context, and it adequately responds to

the existing and planned context as a means of presenting interesting and unique architecture to this site and of optimizing density on the subject site. In addition, the articulation in the lower portion of the building where the building cantilevers over the proposed open space along Elm responds to the 2 storey datum created in some of the buildings to the north and south of the subject site.

As it relates to separation distances, the tower setback to the north in combination with the right-of-way width of Elm Street exceeds the 12.5 m guideline and is therefore appropriate. Should a redevelopment of the site to the east occur, it is our opinion that the proposed tower setback of 1.7 m in combination with the right-of-way width of Harry Barberian Lane would be sufficient to allow for adequate light, view, and privacy in this *Downtown* context.

To the south, the tower is setback 4.4 m to the rear property line and 6.8 m to the center line of the lane. For approximately 6.5 m in width, the revised proposal includes a 9.7 m setback to the 20 Edward Street – Panda condominium building. Primary windows in this portion of the Panda tower face in an east and west direction and therefore are not impacted by the proposed building. The west portion/wing of the Panda condominium building was approved at 0 m from its property line. The majority of the proposed building is setback 25.5 m to the Panda tower. 20 Edward Street was approved by City Council on December 13, 2016. In the Final Staff Report dated August 18, 2016, Staff conclude that the separation distance to the north is well suited to meet the Tall Building Guidelines as the setback to the north is approximately 20 metres to the centre line of the public lane to the north in the middle portion of the site. There was no commentary about that portion of the Panda tower set back 0 m from the north lot line. In the middle portion of the subject site, the tower has a separation distance of 25.5 m to the Panda tower, thereby meeting the Tall Building Design Guidelines.

To the west, the existing 16-storey rental building has been built to its lot line adjacent to the subject site with a blank windowless wall condition. The subject proposal matches this condition. In our opinion, the building has been designed appropriately and sufficiently to ensure adequate light, view, and privacy in this *Downtown* context, where the urban fabric of this neighbourhood is tightly knit, dense, and a compact urban pattern.

As it relates to shadow impacts, the policies of the City of Toronto Official Plan ('OP') state that buildings are to be located and massed to adequately limit shadow impacts on adjacent *Neighbourhoods*, particularly during the spring and fall equinoxes, and also to maintain sunlight for pedestrians on adjacent streets, parks, and open space. The subject site is not close to any *Neighbourhoods*. The immediate adjacent uses in all directions are designated *Mixed Use Areas*. A new park was recently approved on the north side of Elm Street as part of the Chelsea Hotel redevelopment (33 Gerrard Street and 22 Elm Street). The proposed development will cast a quickly moving, slender shadow on the future park in March and September between 9:18 am and 12:18 pm. In general, the proposed development casts very limited additional shadows to the surrounding area. The shadow from the proposed development is slender, it moves quickly through the landscape, and in any one place, does not stay for any undue length of time.

In our opinion, the subject proposal continues to meet the applicable policies of the City OP and the intent and direction of the various City guideline documents.

Conclusions

This Planning Addendum Letter summarizes the built form changes made by the revised architectural plans for the subject site.

The Provincial policies contained in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 ('PPS') and A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019 ('Growth Plan') actively promote and encourage compact urban form, intensification, optimization of the existing land base and infrastructure, and development which will take better advantage of existing public transit. We conclude that the revised proposal continues to advance the policy imperatives expressed in these two Provincial policy documents, and is therefore consistent with the PPS and conforms with the Growth Plan.

From a local planning perspective, the revised proposal, if approved, implements, and satisfies the applicable policies of the City OP and the Downtown Plan (OPA 406). It has been demonstrated that the subject site can comfortably accommodate the height and density and provides for appropriate separation distances. The proposal complies with the helicopter flight path of Sick Children's Hospital ('Sick Kids') (which is currently in the process of being peer reviewed by Sick Kids consultants). The design of the proposed development has also been undertaken to sensitively accommodate for new residential dwelling units, contributing to the evolution of this area as a 'complete community'. The proposal also generally satisfies the visions for the subject site as expressed in the applicable City guidelines for tall buildings and in the policies and principles of the approved OPA 352 relating to tall buildings in the *Downtown*.

For the reasons stated above and in our original Planning Report, it is our opinion that the revised proposal represents good planning, is in the public interest, satisfies the policies of the Province and it appropriately implements the City's Official Plan. We therefore recommend approval of this revised proposal to both City staff and City Council.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Michelle Tiger at ext. 2110 or the undesignated at ext. 2100.

Yours truly,
GOLDBERG GROUP



Michael Goldberg MCIP, RPP
Principal