

**THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF GEORGINA**

**REPORT NO. DS-2024-0019**

**FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF  
COUNCIL**

**April 10, 2024**

**SUBJECT: OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS  
LOTS 1 TO 15, BLOCK A AND DOREDA DRIVE, PLAN 447, AND LOT  
5 AND PART OF LOTS 6 AND 8, PLAN 170  
232 CAMERON CRESCENT, KESWICK**

---

**1. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. That Council receive Report No. DS-2024-0019, prepared by the Development Planning Division, Development Services Department dated April 10, 2024, respecting Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions on behalf of 2833367 Ontario Ltd., for the property municipally addressed as 232 Cameron Crescent, Keswick and legally described as Lots 1 to 15, Block A and Doreda Drive, Plan 447, and Lot 5 and Part of Lots 6 and 8, Plan 170;**
- 2. That Council refuse the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications as submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions on behalf of 2833367 Ontario Ltd., which seek approval to facilitate the construction of a mixed use, high density development comprised of an apartment building with a height of up to 20 storeys and 380 dwelling units, and a commercial building with a height of 2 storeys and 808 square metres of gross floor area; and,**
- 3. That in the event of an appeal(s) to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), Council direct the Town's Solicitor, staff and/or consultants to appear at the OLT in support of Council's position concerning the subject applications.**

**2. PURPOSE:**

This report provides a review, analysis and recommendations on proposed Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) applications submitted to permit a high density residential / commercial mixed use development comprised of an apartment building with a height of up to 20 storeys and 380 dwelling units, and a commercial building with a height of 2 storeys and a 808 square metres (~8,697 square feet) of gross floor area.

**3. BACKGROUND:**

**Owner:** 2833367 Ontario Ltd. (c/o Peter Cortellucci)

**Applicant:** Cortel Group (c/o Elena Teryohin)

**Agent:** Innovative Planning Solutions (c/o Kevin Bechard)

**3.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY AND SURROUNDING LAND USES**

The subject property is located on the south side of Cameron Crescent (south leg), west of The Queensway South. The subject property is currently vacant, save and except for pile foundations previously constructed in support of an approved mixed use, mid-rise development proposal (Refer to Attachments 1 to 3).

**North:** Low density residential uses

**South:** Maskinonge River

**East:** Marinas, associated marine services and The Queensway South

**West:** Lake Simcoe

Refer to *Table 1* below for a summary of property information.

<b>Table 1 – Summary of Property Information</b>	
<b>General Property Information</b>	
<b>Municipal Address</b>	232 Cameron Crescent
<b>Legal Description</b>	Lots 1 to 15, Block A and Doreda Drive, Plan 447, and Lot 5 and Part of Lots 6 and 8, Plan 170
<b>Roll Number</b>	146-004
<b>File Numbers</b>	02.207 / 03.1180
<b>Lot Area</b>	4.2 hectares (10.38 acres)
<b>Lot Frontage</b>	98.67 metres
<b>Existing Zoning</b>	Site-specific Medium Density Urban Residential (R3-46), site-specific General Commercial (C1-42 (H)) and site-specific Open Space (OS-60, OS-61)
<b>Proposed Zoning</b>	Site-specific Medium Density Urban Residential (R3-___), site-specific General Commercial (C1-___) and site-specific Open Space (OS-___)
<b>Existing Keswick Secondary Plan Designation</b>	Maskinonge Urban Centre and Neighbourhood Residential
<b>Adopted Keswick Secondary Plan Designation (June 2023)</b>	Maskinonge Urban Centre and Existing Neighbourhood
<b>York Region Official Plan</b>	Urban Area / Community Area / Built-up Area

<b>Land Use and Environmental Considerations</b>		
<b>Existing Buildings</b>	None	
<b>Proposed Buildings</b>	20 storey apartment building containing 380 dwelling units and 2 storey commercial building containing 808 square metres of floor area	
<b>Natural Features</b>	Wetlands	
<b>Natural Hazards</b>	Floodplain	
<b>Regulatory Status</b>		
<b>LSRCA</b>	Yes	
<b>MTO</b>	No	
<b>Heritage Act</b>	No	
<b>Servicing</b>		
	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Water</b>	N/A	Municipal
<b>Sanitary</b>	N/A	Municipal
<b>Access</b>	N/A	Three (3) full-move accesses to Cameron Crescent

Refer to Attachments 3 and 4 respectively for the Location Map and Site Photos of the subject property.

### 3.2 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

The proposal contemplates a mixed use development, the primary component of which is a residential apartment/condominium complex including a mid-rise podium and high-rise tower which will provide 380 apartments consisting of 236 one-bedroom units and 144 two-bedroom units. A total of 490 vehicle parking spaces are provided, including 88 visitor and commercial spaces on surface lots and 402 residential spaces within 2.5 levels of above-grade parking garage.

The proposed residential building includes an approximately 195-metre long 7-storey mid-rise component consisting of 2.5 levels of parking with up to 5 storeys of residential units above. The proposed podium is generally located on the existing foundation footprint of the former approved but unfinished development of the site. At the east end of the 7-storey podium is a tower component proposed with an additional 13 storeys of residential units situated above for a total height of 20 storeys. The proposed tower floor plate is approximately 900 square metres (9,687.5 square feet) in area. This residential complex is situated generally along the northern edge of the site. The owner has indicated that the project will be marketed as the “Lighthouse” reflecting the conceptual design of the residential tower.

The proposal includes a shoreline boardwalk along Lake Simcoe, connecting to a passive recreational space, seating area, commercial plaza and boat docking area.

A significant portion of the passive open space would be open to general public access. However, the public access is restricted on the site through barriers / gates and the at-grade component of the site along the north side of the residential complex is restricted to resident use where private amenity space is provided, including a small beach. Additional outdoor recreational space is provided for resident use on the roof of the podium, through private balconies and facilities internal to the building itself.

In addition, a commercial building with a height of 2 storeys and 808 square metres of floor area is located towards the southeast portion of the site. Small boat docking slips exist on the southern portion of the site.

Access to the site is proposed from Cameron Crescent, the south leg of which the applicant proposes to upgrade from a 7.0 to 8.5-metre pavement width including the incorporation of a 1.5 metre sidewalk to The Queensway South. Vehicular access within the site is proposed by a horseshoe-shaped driveway to the entrance of the condominium building and accesses to the loading area and parking garage. A separate driveway off Cameron Crescent is proposed for access to the parking lot for the commercial building(s).

Specific non-residential uses for the commercial building have not been identified at this time.

Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) applications have been submitted to permit the proposed development.

Refer to Attachment 5 for the proposed Development Concept Plan and Elevation Plans.

Since the December 13, 2023 statutory public meeting, the applicant has provided an update to certain technical supporting materials and has provided a matrix responding to first circulation agency comments but has not changed the proposed OPA or ZBA, the proposed number of dwelling units, building height, site plan, floor plans or elevations.

#### Application for Official Plan Amendment (OPA)

The subject property is designated 'Maskinonge Urban Centre' (MUC) and 'Neighbourhood Residential' in the existing Keswick Secondary Plan (existing KSP). Permitted uses in the MUC designation include low / medium / high density residential, retail / service commercial, marinas / tourist commercial, business and professional offices, institutional and community, automobile-oriented and special needs housing uses.

The Applicant has applied for an OPA to increase the maximum permitted building height on the subject property from 6 to 20 storeys. The applicant has not applied to redesignate the portion of the site in part from Neighbourhood Residential to

MUC, nor has the applicant's Official Plan Amendment sought to allow development on the site at a density that exceeds the maximum permitted density for High Density Residential development in the MUC of 100 units per hectare (uph). If the subject Official Plan Amendment were to be approved, the proposed OPA would need to be modified to, amongst other matters, provide for a site specific exception to allow for a net residential density in excess of 100 uph and to redesignate a portion of the site from Neighbourhood Residential to MUC.

Staff note that in 2006 the previous owner of the subject site (Brookfield Millhouse Inc. and Crates Landing Ontario General Partners) acquired the property immediately to the north of their original landholding, being a residential lot on the west side of Cameron Crescent (Lot 8, Plan 170, formerly 230 Cameron Crescent) to be added to the balance of the approved mixed use development. The primary purpose was to utilize the subject property as a landscape buffer/transition between the proposed medium density residential uses and the existing low density residential uses to the north, as well as for storm water management and passive recreational uses. On that basis, the majority of the subject property was zoned Open Space (OS-60), while the balance was zoned Medium Density Urban Residential (R3-46) to accommodate a building extension to provide additional terracing and enhanced elevations for a proposed 6-storey apartment building. In relation to that specific development proposal, the interpretation policies of the KSP were utilized to "stretch" the adjacent MUC designation and zone a portion of those lands R3-46.

On July 12, 2023, Council adopted the proposed new Keswick Secondary Plan (new KSP). An approval Notice of Decision was issued by York Region on September 29, 2023. Portions of the new KSP have been appealed. Approval of the remaining portions of the new KSP is pending approval by the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

Section 13.1.9.1 of the new KSP specifies that complete development applications submitted prior to the approval of the new KSP shall not have to meet the requirements therein. Applicants are, however, encouraged to re-examine proposed applications based on the new KSP. References to the new KSP will be made throughout this report.

Refer to Attachment 6 for a copy of the applicant's draft OPA.

#### Application for Zoning By-law Amendment

The subject property is zoned site-specific Medium Density Urban Residential (R3-46), site-specific General Commercial (C1-42 (H)) and site-specific Open Space (OS-60, OS-61).

A Zoning By-law Amendment application has been submitted to rezone the subject property to site-specific Medium Density Urban Residential (R3-\_\_\_), site-specific

General Commercial (C1-\_\_\_) and site-specific Open Space (OS-\_\_\_) zones in order to facilitate the applicant's development proposal.

Refer to Attachment 7 for a copy of the applicant's draft ZBA.

The proposed Zoning By-law has not been adjusted or resubmitted since the public meeting on December 13, 2023. As noted in this report, there are a number of issues that would need to be addressed in the final Zoning By-law should the current development proposal be approved. These issues include addressing the comments from the LSRCA set out in Section 3.7 including accurate depiction of the floodplain limits, clarifying buildable and non-buildable development limits, and proper reflection of the wetland feature including the 15-metre buffer. If the subject application were to be approved, the proposed Zoning By-law would require substantial modifications prior to passage.

### 3.3 PREVIOUS PLANNING ACT PROCESSES / APPROVALS

The subject property has been subject to various *Planning Act* processes and development approvals since 2005. These are outlined in the December 13, 2023 public meeting staff report in detail. For the purposes of this report and comparison only the previously approved proposal from 2014 is presented below. Refer to Attachment 8.

<b>Zoning By-law Amendment 03.1020 / 03.1077 – Approved October 30, 2008 / Holding Symbol Lifted May 21, 2014</b>			
<b>Permitted Building / Use</b>	<b>Proposed Height</b>	<b>Proposed Floor Area Ratio (Max. 3.0)</b>	<b>Proposed Density (Max. 100)</b>
154 condo apartment units	5 / 6 storeys or 24 m.	1.9	91 units per net residential hectare
6 'live-work' units	4 storeys or 18 m.	1.9	91 units per net residential hectare
140 hotel units	6 storeys or 24 m.	1.9	Not applicable
1,028 m <sup>2</sup> (11065 ft <sup>2</sup> ) spa / conference centre	2 storeys or 18 m.	1.9	Not applicable
3,042 m <sup>2</sup> (32743 ft <sup>2</sup> ) of commercial	2 storeys or 18 m.	1.9	Not applicable

<b>Zoning By-law Amendment 03.1180 – Current Proposal</b>
---

<b>Permitted Building / Use</b>	<b>Proposed Height</b>	<b>Proposed Floor Area Ratio</b>	<b>Proposed Density</b>
380 condo apartment units	7 storeys or ~28.25 m. for podium, 20 storeys or 72.25 m. for tower	1.69 *	141 per net residential hectare*
808 m <sup>2</sup> (8,697 ft <sup>2</sup> ) commercial	2 storeys or 11 m.	1.69 *	Not Applicable

\* The applicant has calculated the net residential land area as 2.69 hectares, resulting in a proposed FAR of 1.69 and a density of ~141 units per net residential hectare. Notwithstanding, the net residential land area appears to have been calculated incorrectly by including the area of the required environmental buffers/MVPZ. In this regard, the actual net residential land area is estimated to be ~1.81 hectares, resulting in an FAR of approximately 2.53 and a density of approximately 210 units per net residential hectare. Staff have verified these calculations with the applicant.

The current development proposal is substantially different than the most recent development proposal approved by Council in 2008 and advanced to the initial stages of construction in 2014. The main differences include the following:

- Increased number of residential units from 150 to 380 units;
- Increased maximum number of storeys from 6 to 20 storeys;
- the tower component is 20 storeys; the podium is 7 storeys;
- Increased density from 91 to approximately 210 units per net residential hectare;
- Increased Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 1.69 to approximately 2.53;
- Decreased commercial GFA from 4,070 m<sup>2</sup> (43,808 ft<sup>2</sup>) to 808 m<sup>2</sup> (8,697 ft<sup>2</sup>);
- Encroachments into previously-approved protected Open Space zones;
- Removal of the proposed terminus cul-de-sac on Cameron Crescent;
- A reduction in the proposed residential parking rate from 1.5 to 1.14 spaces per unit;
- Encroachments into a previously-approved buffer (formerly 230 Cameron Crescent) between the proposed apartment building and abutting residential uses to the north; and,
- Addition of more substantial publicly accessible and private amenity spaces.

The proposed OPA / ZBA seek to replace all previous approvals.

### 3.4 SUBMISSION MATERIALS

Submission documents are available directly from the Town or at the below links:

[Submission documents - Original Submission](#)

[Submission Documents - February 12, 2024](#)

On February 12, 2024, the applicant made a second submission of materials associated with the applications. These included updates and responses to the various technical comments and issues identified in the first circulation but did not include any changes to the proposed building, site plan elevations, density, floor area or proposed number of dwelling units on the site.

3.5 PUBLIC MEETING

A statutory public meeting as required by the *Planning Act* was held on December 13, 2023. A copy of the related Staff report and Council minutes are provided below.

[DS-2023-0096 Staff Report December 13, 2023](#)

[December 13, 2023 Council Public Meeting Minutes](#)

At that meeting a number of concerns and issues were raised by members of the public and Council. These related to a number of issues including; traffic flow on Cameron Crescent, public access and safety, loss of established trees, water and septic system impacts, shadow impacts, traffic impacts, loss of privacy, potential for short term rental accommodations and noise.

3.6 PUBLIC CIRCULATION

Complete applications were received by the Town on September 19, 2023 and were deemed complete via letter on September 29, 2023.

A Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting was mailed to all assessed property owners within 120 metres of the subject property on October 6, 2023. The Notice was posted to the Town website on October 6, 2023.

Two (2) public notice signs were posted on the property on October 13, 2023.

Three written submissions from the public have been received. The comments identified concerns regarding traffic, building height and massing, drainage, affordable housing, commercial viability, property values and peaceful enjoyment of property.

Five notification requests have been received.

Refer to Attachment 9 for redacted copies of public comments.

All interested parties were sent notice of the April 10, 2024 Council meeting on March 27, 2024.



### 3.7 EXTERNAL AGENCY AND TOWN DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

All Town department and external agency comments received on the first and second submission by the applicant are available in Attachment 10. Selected comments on the second submission are summarized below.

#### Development Engineering Division

The Development Engineering Division has indicated no objection to the proposal and has provided a list of considerations and agency clearances required to be satisfied during detailed design and Site Plan approval if the proposed OPA and ZBA applications are approved. This includes reports/plans associated with dewatering, construction management / phasing plans and vibration monitoring during construction.

#### Fire Department

The Fire Department has indicated no objection to the subject applications, but has noted detailed design comments relating to matters including fire access routes and emergency vehicle turning movements, Ontario Building Code conformity, adequate water supply and flows, accessibility during construction and safety walkthroughs. This includes a requirement for the maintenance of two means of access into the development. The specific implementation of these matters can be adequately addressed during the Site Plan approval stage if the OPA and ZBA applications are approved.

#### Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA)

The LSRCA has noted that the entire site is regulated and that the context of their review relates to delegated responsibility from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards under the PPS 2020, the Lake Simcoe Protection Act and other applicable regulations.

In reviewing Schedules “A” and “B” to the applicant’s draft Zoning By-law, LSRCA staff have identified the following concerns:

- It is unclear if the zone lines on both schedules reflect the existing approved floodplain limits.
- The delineation of the zone boundary lines that illustrate “buildable land area” and “non-buildable land area” on Schedule “B” do not match the site-specific zone lines on Schedule “A”.
- The proposed R3 Zone and C1 Zone does not reflect the limits of development and encroaches into areas that should be restrictively zoned in accordance with the minimum 15-metre buffer to the Lake Simcoe shoreline and the Maskinonge River.

- The proposed OS-YY Zone does not appear to reflect the entire limits of the Wetland Feature including the 15-metre buffer.

LSRCA has determined that the applications are in compliance with relevant provisions of the PPS related to natural hazards and has indicated no objections to the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment provided the applicant amends the zoning schedules to address staff concerns. The LSRCA has provided detailed technical comments pertaining to stormwater management, natural heritage and hydrology that can be addressed through a future Site Plan approval process if the OPA and ZBA applications are approved.

#### York Region

The Region of York has reviewed the Official Plan Amendment application and has no objections or comments on the OPA concerning land-use. The Region has further advised that the proposed OPA is exempt from Regional approval.

The Region has reiterated support of the LSRCA position on the subject applications and provided detailed technical comments in relation to transportation planning that will need to be addressed as part of subsequent application stages. These comments are further discussed in Section 4.7.

#### Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation

The Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation have provided comments noting that the site requires an Archaeological Assessment. This study has been prepared and circulated as part of the development review process. The submitted Archaeological Assessment has been registered with the province and found no evidence of artefacts or other circumstances requiring further stages of investigation on site. The comments further note that the wetland assessment prepared by the applicant's consultant does not give scoring to aboriginal values and cultural heritage. This has been acknowledged through discussions with the applicant and their consultant Dillion Consulting Limited and the maximum scoring for the wetland has been registered in the consultant evaluation.

## **4. ANALYSIS:**

The sections below represent an evaluation of the subject applications versus Provincial, Regional and Town planning documents, based on the information available as of the writing of this report.

### 4.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

The *Planning Act* requires that Council decisions on planning matters must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and shall conform with, or not conflict with, in-effect Provincial Plans.

#### 4.1.1 The Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS)

The *Planning Act* requires that decisions on planning matters by Approval Authorities be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2020). The PPS provides overarching policy direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development, and recognizes that municipal Official Plans are the most important vehicle for implementation of the PPS and for achieving comprehensive, integrated and long-term planning.

The Town's in-force Keswick Secondary Plan is consistent with the PPS that was in force at the time of its approval, and the recently approved new Keswick Secondary Plan (appealed) has been updated to align with the more recent Provincial planning policy direction and updates to the PPS in 2020.

The PPS establishes various policies and themes aimed at providing for appropriate development while protecting resources of Provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural and built environment. Relevant excerpts of various PPS policies of particular relevance to the consideration and evaluation of the applicant's development proposal are provided below.

Under the theme of Section 1.1 *Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient and Resilient Development and Land Use Patterns*, the PPS provides the following direction: Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by...*"promoting the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs"*, in addition to *"ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs"*.

Section 1.1.3.2 establishes that land use patterns within Settlement Areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses which...*"b) are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion"* and *"f) are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed"*.

Section 1.1.3.3 provides that *"Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for transit-supportive development, accommodating a significant supply and range of housing options through intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs."*

Under the theme of Housing, Section 1.4 of the PPS provides the following direction: Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities to meet projected market-based and affordable housing needs of current and future residents of the regional market area by... “c) *directing the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs; d) promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed; e) requiring transit-supportive development and prioritizing intensification, including potential air rights development, in proximity to transit, including corridors and stations...*” (Section 1.4.3).

The overarching theme of the PPS in relation to managing development and achieving efficient land use patterns revolves around comprehensive and coordinated planning to ensure that, for example, housing and intensification are located in areas appropriately served and supported by existing or planned infrastructure and public transit.

The subject proposal seeks approval for an increase in the permitted number of residential units from 150 to 380, and in the permitted building height from 6 to 20 storeys. Based upon a developable site area of 1.81 hectares the maximum density that would be permitted in the MUC designation on the site would be 181 dwelling units under the KSP 2004 and 154 dwelling units under the KSP 2023.

The Council-approved KSP 2023 establishes residential heights and densities for the Maskinonge Urban Centre of 6 storeys (20 metres) and a net residential density of 40 to 85 units per hectare. While the subject applications are reviewed formally under the provisions of the KSP 2004, consideration must also be given to the basic strategic land use directions made by Council in the approval of the KSP 2023.

The KSP 2023 establishes a Growth Management approach through the designation of two Local Strategic Growth Areas as reflected in the designation of the Mixed Use Corridor I land use designation along The Queensway and the Mixed Use Corridor II designation along the west side of Woodbine Avenue.

The Mixed Use Corridor I land use designation permits mid-rise residential development between 2 and 6 storeys with a density of between 40 and 85 units per net hectare and connects the traditional urban centres that have evolved along The Queensway corridor including the Maskinonge Urban Centre and the subject site which permits the provisions for mid-rise residential development.

Future high-rise residential development in the range of 7 to 12 storeys and a net residential density of between 85 and 155 units per hectare is planned for the Mixed Use Corridor II land use designation along Woodbine Avenue where it is the growth management direction of the KSP 2023 to concentrate future activities, services

and supporting infrastructure to create an urban mixed use corridor on sites that can support the long term housing needs of the community while minimizing land use conflicts with established residential areas.

The subject applications seek an approval very significantly out of scale and conformity to the KSP 2004 and KSP 2023 in part by changing the future direction and focus of the Town's recently established growth management objectives and ultimately requiring the redeployment of scarce and finite sanitary sewer and water servicing allocation that will no longer be available to implement the KSP 2023. If approved, the subject applications could attract similar development proposals in the area that might further reorient the planned growth management direction and objectives of the KSP 2023.

Considering both the specific nature of the applications and the broader public policy context, Staff is of the opinion that the proposed development is not consistent with the PPS.

#### 4.1.2 The Greenbelt Plan, 2017

The Greenbelt Plan (GBP) identifies where urbanization should not occur to protect the agricultural land base and ecological features / functions.

The subject property is identified as a 'Towns / Villages' in the GBP. Lands therein are exempt from the GBP, except for Section 3.1.5. (Agri-food Network), 3.23 (Water Resource System Policies), 3.26 (External Connections), 3.3 (Parkland, Open Space and Trails) and 3.4.2 (General Settlement Area Policies).

Provided that the technical issues associated with on-site wetland, currently forming part of the Maskinonge River Wetland complex and related shoreline environmental issues are resolved to the satisfaction of the Town and the LSRCA in accordance with the comments in this report, the subject applications could be considered to conform to the Greenbelt Plan.

#### 4.1.3 A Place to Grow Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2020 (Growth Plan)

The *Planning Act* requires that decisions on planning matters by City Council and the Ontario Land Tribunal conform with (or not conflict with) the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan). The Growth Plan provides overarching policy direction to accommodate and manage long-term growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe and recognizes that municipal Official Plans are the most important vehicle for successful implementation of the Growth Plan.

The Town's in-force Keswick Secondary Plan is consistent with the Growth Plan that was in force at the time of its approval, and the recently approved new Keswick Secondary Plan has been updated to align with the more recent Provincial planning policy direction.

Broadly speaking, the Growth Plan promotes intensification of existing built-up areas, with a specific focus on strategic growth areas such as urban growth centres and major transit station areas to focus on and take advantage of significant transit infrastructure investments that support building compact, transit-supportive and complete communities.

The subject property is in a 'Settlement Area'. Growth therein must contribute to complete communities, land use mix and constitute intensification near existing services, is consistent with the Growth Plan that was in force at the time of its approval.

The Growth Plan promotes intensification of existing built-up areas, with a specific focus on strategic growth areas as established in municipal Official Plans.

Section 2.2.1 of the Growth Plan provides, among other policies, the following direction:

Forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan will be allocated based on the following:

"a) the vast majority of growth will be directed to Settlement Areas that:

- i. have a delineated built boundary;
- ii. have existing or planned municipal water and wastewater systems; and
- iii. can support the achievement of complete communities;" and,

"c) within Settlement Areas, growth will be focused in:

- i. delineated built-up areas;
- ii. strategic growth areas;
- iii. locations with existing or planned transit, with a priority on higher order transit where it exists or is planned; and
- iv. areas with existing or planned public service facilities;"

The overarching theme of the Growth Plan in relation to managing growth and promoting intensification revolves around comprehensive and coordinated planning to ensure that, for example, housing and intensification are located in areas appropriately served and supported by existing or planned infrastructure and public transit.

The scale, form and intensity of development being proposed on the subject lands is inconsistent with the established direction of the KSP 2004 for the Maskinonge Urban Centre and the emerging public policy prerogative set out in the KSP 2023 to establish the Mixed Use Corridor II designation along Woodbine Avenue where future investments in infrastructure and supporting facilities will be focused.

Given both the physical and broader policy context, staff is of the opinion that the proposed development does not conform with the Growth Plan.

#### 4.1.4 The Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, 2009 (LSPP)

The Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (LSPP) protects, improves and restores the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe Watershed, including water quality, hydrology, hydrologic features and their functions.

Provided that the technical issues associated with an on-site wetland, currently forming part of the Maskinonge River Wetland complex and related shoreline environmental issues are resolved to the satisfaction of the Town and the LSRCA in accordance with the comments in this report, the subject applications could be considered to conform to the Greenbelt Plan.

#### 4.2 Keswick Secondary Plan, 2004 ( KSP 2004)

The KSP 2004 directs land use and development in Keswick and designates the subject site 'Maskinonge Urban Centre' (MUC).

The applications are subject to the KSP 2004, but shall have regard to the adopted and approved new KSP 2023 (currently under appeal). Applicable policies that are relevant to the consideration of the subject development proposal include the following:

The KSP 2004 establishes policies applicable to all Urban Centres in Section 13.1.3.2.1 as follows:

- a) It is the intent of the Town to promote the appropriate development of the three Urban Centres located along The Queensway. These Urban Centres are key components of the community structure and will, over time, provide opportunities to create a distinct character for Keswick. The locations of the three Urban Centres are shown on Schedule F1.
- b) Development in Urban Centres shall be compatible and sensitively integrated with the surrounding land uses in terms of building mass, height, setbacks, orientation, privacy, landscaping, shadow casting, accessibility and visual impact.
- c) All new development within the Urban Centres shall be consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines attached to this Secondary Plan as Appendix A.
- d) Urban Centres shall develop as mixed use districts. The mix of uses can take the form of one or more mixed use buildings on a site or two or more different, single use buildings on a site. While single use developments are not encouraged, they may be considered where mixed use developments are not feasible.

- e) Higher density uses and taller buildings shall generally be located adjacent to arterial roads.
- f) Buildings shall be located as close to the street line as possible in order to facilitate pedestrian access.
- g) Parking areas shall be located to the rear of, or at the sides of, the building. However, where this is not feasible Council may consider allowing parking within the front yard area.
- h) Retail and service commercial uses shall be the primary activity on the ground floor of mixed use buildings with residential or other commercial/office uses occupying upper storeys. Parking for residential and commercial uses shall be provided on-site.
- i) Parking for residential and commercial uses shall be provided on-site. However, Town shall consider reduced parking standards within the Urban Centres based on shared parking, municipally supplied parking, and/or on-street parking.

Section 13.1.3.2.3 establishes the policies for the Maskinonge Urban Centre, as follows:

- a) It is the intent of the Town that the primary function of the Maskinonge Urban Centre evolve as a tourist based, mixed use area focusing on the marinas and boating facilities of Lake Simcoe and the Maskinonge River. It is expected that this Urban Centre will consist of an array of smaller scale retail and service commercial uses, tourist/recreational uses, public facilities and higher density forms of housing. All new development within the Maskinonge Urban Centre shall be of high design quality, establishing and enhancing the character and image of Keswick.
- b) Within the Maskinonge Urban Centre, the following uses are permitted:
  - (i) low, medium and high density residential uses;
  - (ii) retail and service commercial uses;
  - (iii) marinas, and other tourist commercial uses;
  - (iv) business and professional offices;
  - (v) institutional and community uses;
  - (vi) automobile oriented commercial uses such as mechanical garages and service stations, but not including automotive body shops; and,
  - (vii) special needs housing.
- c) Waterfront development shall take into consideration the environmental significance and sensitivity of the waterfront areas – the Lake Simcoe shoreline and the Maskinonge River shoreline – and enhance the natural



waterfront environment in accordance with approval agency requirements including those of the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Conservation Authority, and York Region.

- d) New development within the Maskinonge Urban Centre will need to consider the development constraints associated with the regional storm flood plain and the policies of the Conservation Authority. The Town will work with the Conservation Authority to establish an appropriate development strategy to ensure the ongoing health and viability of this important Urban Centre within the Keswick community.
- e) Development of waterfront properties shall include land and/or other opportunities to provide public access to the shoreline.
- f) Development may have a maximum height of eight storeys (or 24 metres, whichever is less) on key gateway sites, as defined by the Town through a Community Improvement Plan, where compatibility issues can be mitigated. All other sites shall have a maximum height of six storeys (or 18 metres, whichever is less). A two storey minimum height for new development is required to maximize the efficient use of the land. However, where this is not feasible, Council may consider one storey developments.
- g) The maximum density of new development shall be a Floor Area Ratio of 3.0.
- h) Development adjacent to the Lake shall be oriented to provide views through, to, and along the water's edge.

The KSP 2004 permits high-density residential development in the MUC designation which shall have a maximum height of 18 metres (or 6 storeys), whichever is less, with a maximum density of 100 units per net residential hectare. The subject applications seeks approval for a high density residential development with a net residential density of 210 units per hectare and 20 storeys (72.25 metres) and is very significantly out of scale with the land use policy framework of the KSP 2004.

Furthermore as noted in Section 13.1.3.2.1 b), development in Urban Centres shall be compatible and sensitively integrated with the surrounding land uses in terms of building mass, height, setbacks, orientation, privacy, landscaping, shadow casting, accessibility and visual impact. It is Staff's assessment as supported by the Town's Urban Design Peer Review consultant that the development does not meet this basic land use compatibility policy objective of the KSP 2004. Staff also believe that the length, massing and scale of the residential complex will obstruct views of the shoreline to the north and south and not be in compliance with Section 13.1.3.2. h).

#### 4.3 New Keswick Secondary Plan (KSP 2023)

On July 12, 2023 Town Council approved the KSP 2023.

The subject site is designated Maskinonge Urban Centre in the KSP 2023. Applicable policies that are relevant to the consideration of the subject development proposal include the following:

Section 13.1.6.1.1 (a) ii) establishes that the Maskinonge Urban Centre functions predominantly as a tourist and recreational oriented area focused around marina related and other commercial uses surrounding the Maskinonge River. From the Maskinonge River, the Urban Centre stretches north along The Queensway to the intersection of The Queensway, Metro Road North and Morton Avenue locally referred to as the “5-corners”. It is envisioned that this Urban Centre will serve as a focal point of Keswick by developing into a mixed-use, tourist commercial, recreational and residential centre, with enhanced connections and public access to the Maskinonge River and Lake Simcoe shoreline.

Section 13.1.6.1.1 (b) provides that it is the intent of the Secondary Plan that the three Urban Centres are planned:

- i) As destinations for residents, tourists and businesses;
- ii) To promote economic revitalization, recognizing the potential for adaptive re-use, redevelopment and intensification;
- iii) To be successful mixed-use neighbourhoods that accommodate a broad range of housing types and tenures, and contribute toward the creation of a complete, healthy and sustainable community;
- iv) To include urban park spaces, where feasible, which connect to the Town’s trails and active transportation network;
- v) To act as hubs for local and regional transit, and to accommodate and support significant transit infrastructure; and,
- vi) To provide public service facilities, amenities and infrastructure that will attract population and employment growth.

Section 13.1.6.1.1 (c) provides that permitted uses on lands designated Urban Centres include:

- i) Existing low-rise residential uses;
- ii) Mid-rise residential uses;
- iii) Special needs housing;
- iv) Home occupations;
- v) Live-work units;
- vi) Public service facilities;
- vii) Short-term rental accommodations;
- viii) Day care facilities;
- ix) Places of worship;
- x) Private schools;
- xi) Restaurants, retail and service commercial uses, limited in size to 4,000 square metres of gross floor area per individual business;
- xii) Hotels;

- xiii) Business or professional office;
- xiv) Cultural, entertainment and recreational uses; and,
- xv) Parking facilities at-grade and/or in structures.

Section 13.1.6.1.1 (d) provides that buildings within the Urban Centres designation shall have a minimum height of 2-storeys and a maximum height of 6-storeys or 20 metres, whichever is less. Where a minimum height of 2-storeys is not feasible or desirable for the site, Council may consider 1-storey buildings without the need for an Amendment to this Plan. Further, additions or renovations to existing 1-storey buildings are not required to have a minimum height of 2 storeys.

Section 13.1.6.1.1 (e) provides that the Urban Centres shall develop as mixed-use districts. The mix of uses can take the form of one or more mixed-use buildings on a site or two or more different, single use buildings on a site. Where mixed-use developments are not feasible or desirable for the site, Council may consider single use developments without the need for an Amendment to this Plan.

Section 13.1.6.1.1 (g) provides that the design of buildings in the Urban Centres designation shall enhance the quality of the pedestrian environment by:

- i) Incorporating high-quality design including built form, architectural details, landscaping and signage;
- ii) Requiring that buildings be located close to the street, and shall facilitate pedestrian activity and access;
- iii) Requiring that all buildings abutting The Queensway include articulated façades and the use of quality materials;
- iv) Encouraging active uses at-grade abutting The Queensway such as restaurants, retail and service commercial uses to animate the streetscape;
- v) Requiring parking areas to be located in the rear or side yards of buildings. However, where this is not feasible Council may consider allowing parking within the front yard without the need for an Amendment to this Plan; and,
- vi) Residential dwelling units abutting The Queensway shall be located above the first floor, at-grade along the rear or side façades of a building, or fronting onto side streets.

Section 13.1.6.1.1 i) provides that where feasible, development of waterfront properties within the Maskinonge Urban Centre shall include land and/or other opportunities to provide public access to the Lake Simcoe shoreline and/or Maskinonge River shoreline.

Section 13.1.5.3.2 provides the following in respect of mid-rise residential development:

- a) Mid-Rise Residential Uses Mid-rise residential uses shall include all forms of residential buildings containing four or more dwelling units such live-work units, townhouses, and mid-rise apartment buildings.

- b) Mid-rise residential buildings shall have a maximum height of 6-storeys or 20 metres, whichever is less.
- c) Mid-rise residential development shall have a net density of between 40 to 85 units per net residential hectare.
- d) While it is recognized that this Secondary Plan identifies a maximum building height and density, such building height and density shall only be permitted where they are considered compatible with existing development, to the satisfaction of the Town.

The proposed development with a height of 20 storeys (72.25 m) and net residential density of 210 uph is very significantly in excess of the permitted height and density established in the KSP 2023 for the subject site in the Urban Centre designation particularly considering that High Density Residential uses have removed as a permitted use within the Urban Centre land use designation.

#### 4.4 Urban Design Guidelines for the KSP 2004

The Applicant has provided an Urban Design Brief which:

- Provides a broad policy context in which the proposal meets the urban design objectives of the existing KSP;
- Evaluates the impact of massing and shadowing on the overall compatibility of the proposal with nearby land uses;
- Outlines which site features will be private and which will be POPS;
- Protection of waterfront areas, including views;
- Screening of waste areas; and,
- Street orientation of buildings.

The applicant's Urban Design Brief is provided in the submission one materials and link.

The Urban Design Guidelines for the KSP 2004 provide the overall direction and vision for the development. The Guidelines further provide specific land use and design direction for the development of specific geographical areas that are established by the land use policies and designations of the Plan.

In this respect, the Guidelines establish The Queensway as Keswick's traditional main street that knits together residential neighbourhoods and connects the three planned urban centres being the Glenwoods Urban Centre, Maskinonge Urban Centre and the Uptown Keswick Urban Centre. Outside of the urban centres, the Guidelines establish that The Queensway should be developed with higher density residential uses to create a more urban condition and to support transit and the urban centres. It is also an objective of the guidelines to promote public access to the waterfront within the urban centres and to specifically focus tourist-related facilities in the Maskinonge Urban Centre.

The Guidelines specify that development in the MUC designation shall be attractive, high-quality and complement the character of the area. On that basis the conceptual design for the subject site anticipated open space access to the waterfront with low intensity tourist recreational uses. The specific nature of the proposed development with a concentration of high density development uses was not contemplated in the Urban Design Guidelines for the Keswick Secondary Plan where high density residential uses were targeted for sites along The Queensway addressing the street and supporting its role as a main street.

Staff are of the opinion that the proposal does not conform to the Urban Design Guidelines of the KSP 2004.

#### 4.5 Urban and Architectural Guidelines – KSP 2023

The Urban and Architectural Guidelines supporting the KSP 2023 are focused more on built form and types of space (e.g. roads, parks, building typologies etc.) rather than on specific geographic development areas or designations as do the guidelines supporting the KSP 2004. As it relates to the subject applications, the guidelines relating to Mid-Rise and High-Rise Buildings are most instructive.

In Section 3.4.5 Height and Massing, the guidelines establish that these buildings are multi-storey structures that contribute to complete communities, provide a mix of housing and activity, and are built at densities that improve the viability of transit. Mid- and high-rise buildings may include commercial and office uses at grade and multi-unit residential above or behind. Relevant principles to the subject applications include:

- Design ground floors to be appealing to pedestrians and include uses that are more active in terms of pedestrian traffic, such as commercial / retail, personal service, and restaurant type uses on the ground floor.
- Utilize podium and liner townhouses as a residential veneer to create a 'street' or 'ground-related' façade to enhance the pedestrian realm of mid- and high-rise buildings.
- Design underground/above ground parking ramps and service entrances as part of the building façade.
- Avoid blank or long expansive elevations which are exposed to the public view. Where unavoidable, consider art or special wall treatments (i.e., screens, living walls, metallic or wooden textures).
- To animate the public realm and promote safe environments encourage active uses at grade based on the street character (i.e., retail, commercial uses, day-care facilities, townhouses, etc.).

- Mitigate the actual and perceived impacts of mid- and high-rise buildings by breaking up the mass both vertically and horizontally through the creative incorporation of changes in materials, balcony and floor plate design, architectural features, and amenity locations.
- Articulate large walls visible from the street through various treatments such as offsets in massing, façade, and fenestration treatments.

A central component of the proposed development is a building that establishes an exceptionally long physical mass associated with the podium that stretches approximately 195 metres across the northern portion of the site with an unanimated and inactive blank wall associated with multiple levels of above grade parking garage. Without active uses or visibility, the building creates a stark, uninteresting and potentially unsafe environment.

If the project were to be constructed the historic and naturalized view of the shoreline north and south of the residential complex will be obstructed and altered by the elongated mass of the proposed building creating a visual barrier to views and sunlight. This can be visualized from the perspectives and elevations in Attachment 5 and is discussed further below in Section 4.6.

Staff are of the opinion that the proposal does not conform to the Urban and Architectural Guidelines of the KSP 2023.

#### 4.6 Height, Massing and Urban Design

##### Urban Design Peer Review – Brook McIlroy

As part of the application review, the firm Brook McIlroy were retained by the Town to provide an urban design peer review of the subject applications (Refer to Attachment 12.). The comments in the Urban Design Peer Review are organized in 5 categories and are paraphrased as follows:

##### Building Length

The linear length of a building is important in relation to maintaining human scale, access to sunlight and views on site, pedestrian site access and circulation, and mitigating shadowing. Generally speaking for any non-industrial building, a maximum building length of 60 to 75 metres is recommended, with sufficient space in between to provide circulation, sunlight penetration, and views to the sky at adequate intervals. Limiting the length of buildings contributes to walkability and human scale. The length of the proposed residential building is approximately 195 metres, equivalent to the length of nearly two full football fields, and significantly exceeds the maximum generally recommended building length by a factor of 2.6.

##### Tower Height and Area

The inclusion of a tower component as part of the proposed development is a contrast to the existing neighbourhood context. If sited and massed appropriately, a tower's negative impacts can be adequately mitigated. The limiting of the tower floor plate area is important in limiting visual and shadowing impacts on neighbouring lots and public spaces. Many municipalities limit the floor area of residential towers for these reasons. The industry accepted standard for maximum residential tower floor plates is 750 square metres, and this has been adopted by many municipalities across Canada as a benchmark for good urban design.

The proposed tower's 900-square-metre floor plate exceeds this benchmark by 20% and results in shadowing effects on neighbouring lots that are longer in duration, and limits sky views from the surrounding area due to the bulk of the tower.

The positioning of the 20-storey tower in proximity to the residential uses to the north of the site will impact the privacy of residential neighbours to the north. Shadow studies illustrate that at the critical spring and fall equinox test dates, three neighbouring lots at 220, 226, and 228 Cameron Crescent will be impacted by significant shadowing from the proposed tower. An appropriately scaled tower component could be acceptable through its relocation at a greater distance from low-rise residential neighbours.

#### Ground-Level Building Activation

The proposed parking has been located above grade, and includes 490 vehicle parking spaces with 402 spaces located in the proposed 2.5-storey above-grade parking garage. Below-grade parking is recommended for large-scale developments to allow for active building uses, including residential unit frontages, common amenity spaces, lobbies, and commercial retail units, to line the ground floor of the building. These uses create activity along the building's edge which in turn increases safety, security, and connections for residents and visitors. Geotechnical and/or hydrogeological conditions may preclude the provision of below-grade parking on this site. However, the proposed 2.5-storey parking garage, considered an inactive use, along with other inactive uses (storage, lockers, loading, electrical/mechanical, garbage) lines around 435 metres, or 90% of the approximately 484-metre-long building perimeter at grade.

The lack of active uses at grade around the building's perimeter creates significant safety concerns in addition to concerns about quality of space in proximity to the extensive non-active building façades. A lack of activity, visibility, and casual surveillance (actual and perceived) will prevent people from being seen and observed, particularly in the nighttime hours when activity and pedestrian volumes are lower. This will result in an intimidating condition around the building that lacks friendliness, interest, and potential for interaction.

#### Pathway Connections

The pedestrian pathway network on the site is divided into publicly-accessible and private sections. Public pedestrian circulation around the southern portion of the site leads to a lookout pier, beyond which the pathway is private, secured by a fence and gate. Public access around the north side of the building from the east similarly ends at a private fence and gate west of the emergency fire access lane. The private portion of the pathway provides access to a private beach and terrace for residents. The separation of public and private sections of pathways, and the resulting dead-end conditions and single direction egress routes within the publicly-accessible portions present security concerns. These concerns could be partly mitigated by creating a continuous publicly-accessible pathway that fully encircles the building, creating bi-directional egress paths from all locations, providing options for direction of travel in case of perceived danger or unsafe conditions. This is of particular importance due to the lack of visibility and activity. Private access to beach and terrace amenity space could be secured by way of a fence and gate between the pathway and the amenity space.

#### Elevation and Berming at Building Perimeter

Although proposed spot elevations have not been provided on the submitted landscape design drawings, the ground level elevation of the parking garage will be significantly higher than the surrounding grade, particularly along the western portion of the site. This results in steep berm landscaping around the perimeter of the building and deep exterior stairwell exits from the parking garage. Given these conditions, concerns expressed around lack of casual surveillance and active uses at the ground level are further exacerbated by the fact that the 2.5-storey parking garage sits at a significant height above natural surrounding grade at certain portions of the site. This results in a non-active façade that is more than 3 storeys tall at surveillance from residential windows and private terraces.

### 4.7 Transportation Planning Issues

#### Transportation Peer Review – Strik Baldinelli Moniz

The Town's Transportation Peer Reviewer Strik Baldinelli Moniz (SBM) comments dated November 9, 2023 are discussed in the December 13, 2023, public meeting report and were responded to by the applicant through the project Transportation consultants – Burnside and Associates (Burnside) in the February 12, 2024 submission and further responded to in the March 2024 SBM report (Refer to Attachment 13).

In general, SBM has noted that issues surrounding vehicle manoeuvring and geometrics / dimensions in the parking garage and turning radii for emergency vehicles have been satisfactorily addressed. These are matters that would generally be addressed at the Site Plan approval stage if the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are approved.

#### Modal Split – Trip Generation



The Burnside Report utilized a non-auto modal split of 24% (i.e. trip generation calculations assumed that 24% of trips were made through other means than automobile, such as transit, cycling, walking etc. SBM concluded that although the general non-auto modal split may have been overestimated, trip reductions for internal capture between the proposed residential and commercial uses were not applied and concluded, on an overall basis, that the trip generation estimates for the site are adequate.

The Region of York in its comments indicated that the mode split reduction is not satisfactory as the Region's Official Plan transit modal split target is not representative of empirical data and cannot be applied as justification or a conclusion that the assumed rate is conservative. The Region ultimately acknowledged the turn-lane analyses at Cameron Crescent/Riveredge Drive/The Queensway South (South Leg), including the warranted exclusive northbound left turn lane preliminary finding based on the Burnside analysis. The Region recommends that potential turn lanes be considered as part of any possible future Regional road improvement in the area instead when the existing southerly bridge may also be widened to help accommodate the extra lanes. The Region did not require that a left hand turn lane into the site from The Queensway South be made a condition of approval of the proposed development at this time.

#### Existing Parking Requirements - Resident and Visitor

The general provisions of Zoning By-law 500 require a minimum of 1.75 parking spaces per apartment dwelling unit, while the site specific zoning implemented as part of the previous development proposal on the subject property requires a minimum of 1.5 parking spaces per apartment dwelling unit.

The current Zoning By-law requirement for the site of 1.5 parking spaces per apartment dwelling unit is a blended rate, representing the required parking for residents and visitors combined. The Applicant is proposing a reduced blended parking rate of 1.14 spaces per unit, justified in part by indicating that the abutting commercial parking area may be used as overflow visitor parking during peak hours in a blended or shared parking arrangement. The adjacent commercial parking area includes a total of 57 spaces, accessed via a separate entrance on Cameron Crescent.

#### Proposed Parking Supply

The proposed development accommodates 402 parking spaces for the 380 residential units, resulting in a parking supply of 1.06 spaces per unit.

A total of 31 dedicated visitor parking spaces are proposed outside of the podium/parking garage within an at-grade parking area, resulting in the provision of

0.08 visitor parking spaces per unit. The blended (resident / visitor) dedicated parking rate is 1.14 spaces per unit.

Burnside as well as SBM have suggested that this is a reasonable amount of residential parking considering the additional visitor parking and the ability to overflow into the commercial parking lot during times of peak residential demand that offset with the peak of commercial uses.

Given the existing local context and the limited level of available public transit services to the site and Keswick in general, Staff are concerned that the proposed parking rates per unit are too low. There are no comparable local examples of similar projects by which to calibrate the correct parking ratio presented in the study materials and no specific proxy sites or examples of developed projects operating in a similar context relative to transit and the GTA housing / economic market have been provided. Additionally, there are no accommodations or assumptions made in the study materials about the level of general public access and parking demand that will be generated by the access provided to this site and the Lake Simcoe waterfront in general. During the peak season / summer months this demand could be considerable. Given the context and isolated nature of the site west of The Queensway South, there is very limited opportunity for occasional on-street parking and any overflow parking demand would inevitably lead to parking pressure on Cameron Crescent. This is clearly a matter of concern.

### Cameron Crescent

The south and west sections of Cameron Crescent have a 20-metre right-of-way (ROW) with an approximate pavement width of 6 metres. The development proposal contemplates an expansion of and improvements to the southern leg of Cameron Crescent to accommodate an 8.5-metre paved surface curb to curb with a 1.5 metre sidewalk from the site to The Queensway. The Town's peer review consultant has suggested that this is an appropriate standard to accommodate the development as proposed.

The north section of Cameron Crescent has a ROW width for the north leg of Cameron Crescent that varies between 11 to 14.7 metres, however the existing pavement width is approximately 5 metres.

The Burnside report suggests the installation of "Local Residents Only" (i.e. Cameron Crescent residents) signage on Cameron Crescent immediately north of the western site access in order to prohibit site traffic from using the northern leg of Cameron Crescent. It is uncertain how effective this signage will be since enforcement may be difficult, but also since the main site traffic may be attracted to using the north leg of Cameron Crescent as it is a signalized intersection at The Queensway.

SBM has further indicated that some of the residential site traffic uses the north leg of Cameron Crescent for trips to/from the north, particularly in the longer term as

traffic continues to increase on The Queensway South and left turn movements from the south leg of Cameron Crescent become more difficult during peak hours (i.e. more benefit to using the signals at the north leg of Cameron Crescent). SBM has further suggested that the Town may wish to consider allowing the proposed residential traffic to use the north leg of Cameron Crescent (would be a small amount of traffic to/from the north) and upgrade the north leg to a minimum of 6.0 metre pavement width to better accommodate two-way traffic.

The applicant is not proposing any improvements to or widening of the north leg of Cameron Crescent, despite its substandard nature and some increase in traffic being anticipated as a result of the proposed development.

Further, the Burnside report suggests that warrants are not met by the development for the signalization of the south leg of Cameron Crescent at The Queensway. This conclusion is supported by SBM. Signals in this location would otherwise be problematic given the location of the existing signals at the northern leg of Cameron Crescent.

The applicant has not provided any additional information concerning the capacity to expand the north leg of Cameron Crescent to ensure a minimum 6-metre pavement width. Both the north and south sections of Cameron Crescent have been identified by the Town as needing full depth removal and resurfacing, however these works are not planned until 2027 and beyond at this time.

The previously approved 2014 proposal contemplated the north leg of Cameron Crescent to be terminated in a cul-de-sac generally at the current bend to the south leg of the crescent. The cul-de-sac would restrict general vehicular access between the northern and southern sections of Cameron Crescent, while providing for emergency vehicle access to the proposed development and between both legs of Cameron Crescent through the inclusion of knock-down bollards. Primary site traffic would be oriented to the south leg of Cameron Crescent. The current access to the site will be primarily from the south leg of Cameron Crescent but does not restrict access to and from the north leg. While estimates for site traffic along the north leg of Cameron to access the signals are minimal (i.e. Burnside estimate of 5%), there will be additional traffic and the current road is not designed to accommodate it. If the applications were to be approved as proposed by the applicant, a significant upgrade of the north leg of Cameron Crescent would be required to establish an appropriate pavement width of at least 6 metres to accommodate two-way traffic.

#### 4.8 Sanitary Sewer and Water Servicing Allocation

Previously, the Town's Sanitary Sewer and Water Servicing Allocation program allocated 198 persons equivalent (p.e.) to support the previous development proposal on the subject site, in addition to a credit of 122 p.e. from York Region's

Sustainable Development through LEED Program for a total of 320 p.e. This was based on an occupancy factor of 2 p.e. per apartment unit.

Based on the Region's current servicing allocation factors, apartment dwelling units now require 2.08 p.e. of servicing allocation each. A total of 790.4 p.e equivalent of allocation is required to support the proposed development of which 198 p.e. have been previously allocated by Council to the site for a total additional required allocation of 592.4 p.e.

The Region of York has indicated that going forward up to 30% of the required allocation (237.12 p.e.) can be credited under York Region's Sustainable Development through LEED program requiring construction in accordance with the LEED Gold standard. The Applicant has not indicated whether they will be participating in this program, and would be ineligible for credits otherwise.

In this regard, there is currently insufficient servicing allocation available for Major Development within the Built Area remaining to accommodate the proposed development at this time.

#### 4.9 Wetland and Environmental Issues

A number of issues were raised in the December 13, 2023 public meeting report concerning shoreline environmental issues and the existing on-site wetland. In particular, confirmation was sought from as to whether the existing wetland had been reclassified the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) in a manner that would permit development or site alteration. Development is prohibited in Provincially Significant Wetlands.

On December 22, 2022, the MNRF updated the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System, permitting for the reassessment of wetland units previously considered part of larger wetland complexes. The revised Provincial Standard manual states that "with the exception of closely grouped wetlands, single wetland units that are part of a previously evaluated wetland complex can be re-evaluated (re-scored and re-mapped) without requiring a complete re-evaluation of all units in the existing wetland complex".

The subject wetland unit on the site is located on the southern extent of the Maskinonge River Provincially Significant Wetland Complex and has been re-evaluated as an individual wetland, as it is approximately 300 metres away from the closest mapped wetland unit. The applicant's environmental consultant Dillon has provided an evaluation scoring as part of the application process which establishes that the wetland does not meet the criteria (by points) to be classified as Provincially Significant. Under the new classification system, the onus is on the local municipality to advance an application to the MNRF to reclassify the wetland.

As per the KSP, passive recreation uses such as trails, walkways and bicycle paths are permitted uses in EP areas. The Applicant is proposing a raised wooden

boardwalk and will maintain the existing vegetation community within the wetland (will not occupy wetland footprint), so negative impacts to the wetland are not anticipated.

Discussions with the Applicant and the LSRCA have established that limited encroachment of non-intrusive uses such as trails and walkways would be permissible in the 15-metre buffer setback so long as there is no impairment of ecological function and provided no buildings or structures are located in the setback.

As noted in Section 3.7 of this report, the LSRCA has provided comments and indicated no objection to the proposed OPA, and has indicated verification on the proposed zoning schedules by the applicant. If the applications were to be approved it would be necessary for the Town to conclude its review of the wetland assessment and submit it to the MNRF so the wetland unit on the subject site could be declassified and removed from the Maskinonge River Provincially Significant Wetland Complex.

In accordance with the Town's Tree Preservation and Compensation Policy, if the proposal were to be approved, all trees that applicable health trees that are proposed to be removed would be required to be replaced on site as appropriate or subject to compensation payment.

**5. RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This Report addresses the following Town of Georgina Corporate Strategic Goal: Ensuring Balanced Growth.

**6. FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY IMPACT:**

There are no direct financial concerns or budgetary impacts on the Town as a result of the recommendations in this report. Should the applications ultimately be appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), there will be a further draw on staff and financial resources to attend the proceedings.

**7. CONCLUSION:**

The subject applications propose a form and scale of development that is a significant departure from the applicable policy direction in the KSP 2004 under which the applications were made and the emerging direction of the KSP 2023. The KSP 2023 represents the Town's vision for the long term growth and development of Keswick at an appropriate, manageable and sustainable scale in accordance with Regional and Provincial policy.

Staff have met with the applicant and their consultants to develop an understanding of the program and approach to repurposing the previously approved and partially commenced development. The applicant has indicated that the current applications

reflect an approach to utilizing the existing piles installed on the site to minimize cost and disruption. Further, the applicant has suggested that the proposed form and density of the proposal reflects an economically feasible and marketable approach to advancing the development of the site.

Staff appreciate the importance of economic viability in order for a project to proceed to construction. Notwithstanding, staff have not been presented with any data or other potential alternative development scenarios that may also be viable, nor does private market financial feasibility override established planning policy or good planning.

The KSP 2023 generally maintains permitted residential densities and building heights along The Queensway in the Mixed Use Corridor I designation and reduces them in the Maskinonge Urban Centre by eliminating the permissibility of high density residential development. This reflects the specific growth management directive to establish the Mixed Use Corridor II designation along the Woodbine Avenue corridor as the preferred location for higher density residential / mixed use forms of development where larger unconstrained sites are available to meet the long term needs of the community for higher density residential uses.

The subject applications seek an approval that is significantly out of scale and conformity to the KSP 2004 and KSP 2023 in physical form, density and concentration of units. In so doing, it represents a proposed change to the future direction and focus of the Town's growth management objectives, ultimately requiring the redeployment of scarce and finite sanitary sewer and water servicing allocation that would no longer be available to implement the KSP 2023. In this respect, Staff are of the opinion that the subject applications do not conform with the overall purpose and intent of both the PPS and Growth Plan.

From a design perspective, the proposed development is fundamentally based upon a residential building complex that would create an exceptionally long and monolithic physical mass associated with the podium that stretches 195 metres across the northern portion of the site with an unanimated and inactive wall associated with the parking garage. Without active uses or visibility, the building creates a stark and potentially unsafe environment on the site.

The overall program for the development creates a residential building complex that looks inwardly onto itself as a compound and does not address the public policy objectives reflected in the KSP to promote buildings that address the street, promoting active uses at grade and contributing to the overall planned structure of the municipality.

The proposed height and massing of the project, particularly the 7-storey podium and its elongated mass would, if constructed, obstruct the historic and naturalized view of the shoreline to the north and south of the residential complex. The building would further create significant shadowing impacts on properties to the north.

Staff are of the opinion that the proposal does not conform to the Urban Design Guidelines of the KSP 2004 and Urban and Architectural Guidelines of the KSP 2023.

Staff are of the opinion that given the extent of outstanding issues and concerns raised in this report, the submitted OPA / ZBA applications to permit the proposed development do not represent good planning or good urban design and are not supportable.

The applicant has not revised the proposed OPA, ZBA, number of dwelling units or floor space, site plan or building elevations to address these concerns, many of which were identified in the December 13, 2023 public meeting report and comments from the public.

Staff recognize the severity of the current housing crisis and the strong thrust of provincial policy to address it as evidenced by the Ontario Housing Supply Action Plan and the suite of initiatives which have been advanced to implement it. Despite this, there is no policy direction or merit to disregarding fundamental land use planning principles to increase the supply of housing on this or any other site in the Town.

On this basis, staff recommend that the submitted OPA and ZBA applications be refused by Council.

## **APPROVALS**

Prepared by: Alan Drozd, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Planning Policy

Recommended by: Denis Beaulieu, MCIP, RPP  
Director of Development Services

Approved by: Ryan Cronsberry  
Chief Administrative Officer

### ***Attachments:***

*Attachment 1 - Context Map*  
*Attachment 2 - Key Map*  
*Attachment 3 - Location Map*  
*Attachment 4 - Site Photos*  
*Attachment 5 - Development Concept, Elevations and Perspectives*  
*Attachment 6 - Proposed OPA*  
*Attachment 7 - Proposed Zoning By-law*  
*Attachment 8 - Previous Proposal - 2014*

*Attachment 9 – Copies of Redacted Public Comments*

*Attachment 10 - External Agency and Town Department Comments - Second Submission*

*Attachment 11 - Shadow Study Diagrams*

*Attachment 12 - Urban Design Peer Review – March 27, 2024*

*Attachment 13 - Transportation Peer Review – March 7, 2024*