



April 4, 2019

Luisa Galli, Manager
Community Planning, Etobicoke York District
Etobicoke Civic Centre
2 Civic Centre Court, 3rd Floor
Toronto, Ontario M9C 5A3

Dear Ms. Galli:

Re: *Community Services & Facilities Study – Addendum Letter*
File No. 18 150932 WET 04 OZ
250 Wincott Drive & 4620 Eglinton Avenue West

1.0 OVERVIEW

In April 2018, on behalf of Montrin Richview GP Inc. and Build Toronto Inc. (the “owners”), we submitted a Community Services and Facilities (“CS&F”) Study in support of a Zoning By-law Amendment application for the property municipally known as 250 Wincott Drive & 4620 Eglinton Avenue West (the “subject site”). The boundaries for the CS&F Study were generally defined by Highway 401 to the north, Scarlett Road to the east, Dundas Street West and Burnhamthorpe Road to the south and Highway 401/427 to the west (the “Study Area”). The demographic profile included in our initial CSF Study was based on the Willowridge-Martingrove-Richview Neighbourhood Profile as prepared by the City of Toronto.

The proposal, which has been revised from the initial submission in response to staff comments, contemplates two mixed-use buildings: the West Building (Building A) and the East Building (Building B, Building C, and Building E) that include street-related retail uses and residential units above. Additionally, the majority of the existing commercial plaza (Building D) is proposed to remain. A new public park is now proposed adjacent along the westerly portion of the Eglinton Avenue West frontage, with a contiguous publicly accessible privately owned open space area (“POPS”) providing pedestrian access to the new and existing retail elements of the proposal. Overall, a total of 773 residential units are proposed, along with approximately 9,469 square metres of new retail space and 3,940 square metres of existing, retained retail space.

On June 25, 2018, staff from the Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis (“SIPA”), Community Policy Unit provided comments on our April 2018 CS&F Study. These comments indicated that additional analysis and outreach was required with respect to the schools, child care, library and recreation service sectors. In addition, we are in receipt of meeting minutes from a May 11, 2018 meeting between the owners and Friends of Silver Creek. These minutes provide comments and request clarification regarding several elements of our CS&F Study. This letter is intended to act as an addendum to our initial CS&F Study and provides additional information as requested by SIPA staff, and responds to the comments from the Friends of Silver Creek.

2.0 SCHOOL BOARDS

Our April 2018 CS&F Study identified some moderate accommodation concerns with respect to the elementary and secondary schools providing service to the subject site, in both the public (TDSB) and Catholic (TCDSB) school boards. In order to provide an accurate depiction of these accommodation issues, and in recognition of the fact that school enrolments fluctuate from year-to-year, updated enrolment and utilization data was requested from each school board as part of the preparation of this CS&F Addendum. In addition, each school board was asked to provide details regarding their plans to address accommodation concerns in this area of the City.

2.1 Toronto District School Board

Table 1 below provides a summary of the capacities, enrolments and utilization rates of the TDSB schools with catchment areas inclusive of the subject site. This data was provided by the TDSB on March 12, 2019.

Table 1 – Toronto District School Board Data

School	Capacity	Full-Time Enrolment	Utilization Rate
Westway Junior School <i>JK to Grade 5</i>	251	232	92.43%
Dixon Grove Junior Middle School <i>Grades 6 to 8</i>	868	962	79.72%
Richview Collegiate Institute <i>Grades 9 to 12</i>	855	964	112.75%

In addition to the information presented in Table 1, TDSB staff provided the following pupil yield factors:

- Elementary: 0.07 pupils/unit
- Secondary: 0.04 pupils/unit

Based on this pupil yield information and the proposal's revised unit count, it is anticipated that 54 elementary students and 31 secondary students will be generated by the proposal and require accommodation with the public schools serving the subject site.

As recognized in our initial CS&F Study, the elementary schools serving this site have limited capacity to accommodate new students and the secondary school is already operating over its designed capacity. Notwithstanding these capacity issues, the TDSB has indicated that there are no plans for a new school or expansions to existing schools in this catchment area and no information is available regarding potential future accommodation reviews. Should accommodation issues persist, any planned changes would be subject to the TDSB's Annual Long-Term Program & Accommodation Strategy.

2.2 Toronto Catholic District School Board

Table 2 below provides a summary of the capacities, enrolments and utilization rates of the TCDSB schools with catchment areas inclusive of the subject site. This data was provided by the TCDSB on March 19, 2019.

Table 2 – Toronto Catholic District School Board Data

School	Capacity	Full-Time Enrolment	Utilization Rate
Father Serra <i>JK to Grade 8</i>	536 (1 portable)	538	100.4%
Michael Power/St. Joseph <i>Grades 9 to 12 – Mixed Gender</i>	1,644 (6 portables)	1,917	116.6%
Monsignor Percy Johnson <i>Grades 9 to 12, Mixed Gender</i>	909	992	109.1%

In addition to the information presented in Table 1, TCDSB staff provided updated pupil yields based on the proposal's revised unit count. They anticipate that 29 elementary students and 20 secondary students will be generated by the proposal and require accommodation with the Catholic schools serving the subject site.

The findings of this additional consultation with the TCDSB confirmed that findings of our initial CS&F Study, in that both the elementary and secondary Catholic schools

serving the subject site are already operating over their designed capacity. TCDSB staff indicated that any details regarding planned expansions or other efforts to address school accommodation issues in this area would be provided as part of their formal circulation comments on the rezoning application. It is noted that no comments from TCDSB were provided on the initial rezoning submission.

2.3 Analysis

Based on the updated information from the school boards as presented above, it appears that the school accommodation concerns noted in our initial CS&F Study have not been resolved and may result in accommodation issues for students resulting from the proposed development.

Based on our experience with development approvals in areas where school accommodation is a concern, we anticipate that, at a later point in the development review process, both the TDSB and TCDSB may request conditions of approval that requires warning clauses regarding school accommodation be posted on-site and/or be included in agreements of purchase and sale. The intent of these warning clauses is to convey to potential purchasers and the existing community that children from the new development will not displace existing students at local schools and that students may be accommodated in schools outside this area until space in local schools becomes available. It is anticipated that further information with respect to possible warning clauses will be provided by the school boards as part of their formal comments to the City on the rezoning application or on a future Site Plan application. As such, on-going consultation with the school boards during the rezoning and future Site Plan review processes will ensure that adequate notice is provided to future residents and the existing community regarding any potential accommodation issues.

3.0 CHILD CARE

As identified in our April 2018 CS&F Study, there are currently 36 licensed Child Care Centres providing service in the Study Area, 22 of which provide subsidized spaces when available. At the request of SIPA staff, additional outreach was undertaken with staff from Children's Services' Service System Planning & Policy Development division. The purpose of this additional outreach was to better understand the state of the child care service sector in this area of the City, and to obtain additional information regarding the status and service provisions of new child care centres planned within the Study Area.

3.1 Planned Child Care Facilities

Through this additional consultation it was determined that 6 new child care centres are currently planned to serve the Study Area. Overall, these facilities will introduce an additional 450 child care spaces to the Study Area by the end of 2020. Details on each of these new facilities is provided in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Children’s Services New Capital Facilities

Location	Occupancy	Capacity by Age-Group			
		Infant	Toddler	Preschool	Total
Dixon Grove JMS 315 The Westway	2020 Q4	10	30	48	88
Father Serra CS 111 Sun Row Drive	2020 Q2	10	15	24	49
Kipling CI 380 The Westway	2019 Q3	10	30	48	88
Villeyfield JS 35 Saskatoon Drive	2020 Q4	10	30	48	88
Kingsview Village JS 1 York Road	2020 Q4	10	30	48	88
St. Maurice CS 45 Kingsview	Complete	10	15	24	49

In addition to the planned facilities identified in Table 3, and as noted in our initial CS&F report, there is also a new child care facility planned as part of the under-construction senior’s development to the immediate west of the subject site (4650 Eglinton Avenue West). This facility, which is anticipated to accommodate approximately 35 children, will be fully operational prior to the occupancy of the proposed development.

In October 2017, a report from the General Manager of Children’s Services was considered by Council that provided an update on the implementation of Phase One (2017-2019) of the Toronto Licenced Child Care Growth Strategy. Within this report, the Willowridge-Martingrove-Richview Neighbourhood was identified as one of the highest priority neighbourhoods for new child care centres, as the number of early years child care spaces planned and in operation had the capacity to accommodate only 10 to 20 percent of the 2016 child population (4 years and younger). The goal of the Child Care Growth Strategy was to have enough early years spaces to serve 50 percent of the child population.

Through our initial contact with child care centres in the Study Area in the preparation of our initial CS&F Study, the service gap identified in the Child Care

Growth Strategy was confirmed, as the majority of child care spaces identified were for school age children and children in full-time kindergarten. While this imbalanced distribution can result in significant difficulties obtaining child care for early years children, our further consultation with Children’s Services staff revealed that the 6 planned child care facilities will largely address this service gap through significantly increasing the number of early years child care spaces in the Study Area.

3.2 Analysis

Based on the above, it is our opinion that the gap in the child care sector service be sufficiently addressed through the introduction of the planned new facilities, all of which are anticipated to be operational prior to occupation of the proposed development. Although the resulting population increase from the proposal will undoubtedly add to the demands on this sector, Children’s Services staff have confirmed that a new child care facility within the proposal will not be necessary to address the child care needs of new or existing residents.

4.0 TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARY

Our April 2018 CS&F Study identified one public library branch within the boundaries of the Study Area (Richview District Branch) and one additional branch immediately adjacent to the Study Area (Eatonville Neighbourhood Branch). At the request of SIPA staff, additional research and outreach with Toronto Public Library (“TPL”) Policy, Planning and Performance Management staff was completed in order to determine if library facility improvements to these branches may be required to support the population growth anticipated to be generated by the proposal.

4.1 Toronto Public Library Facilities Master Plan

At its meeting on January 21, 2019, the Toronto Public Library Board approved the Toronto Public Library Facilities Master Plan (the “TPL FMP”), including the recommendations contained in the report. The Facilities Master Plan was developed to assist TPL staff in making capital planning decisions as part of the capital budget and planning process. In this respect, the TPL FMP identifies and prioritizes investments in TPL facilities over the short, medium and long-term, providing a planning framework to be employed on an on-going basis to determine investment priorities over time. An implementation plan, which will identify strategies to implement the recommendations of the TPL FMP, is currently being developed by TPL staff.

As part of the TPL FMP process, a prioritization framework was developed as a decision-making tool to assist in equitable decision making at the branch level. The criteria of this framework (including operational, investment and market alignment sub-criteria) were used to score and rank each branch within the TPL's portfolio, with the exception of the two reference libraries. Higher scores resulting from this analysis indicated priorities for capital investment- it is noted that neither of the branches providing service to the Study Area were included in the "Top 10" scores for district and neighbourhood branches.

The TPL FMP also employed a Facility Condition Index ("FCI") assessment to assist in informed decision making about the appropriate level of investment in existing assets. This value is calculated as the ratio of total repairs and capital replacements required against that full cost of replacement for the building at that same point in time. The resulting FCI values were then used to classify each branch from "Good" to "Critical". The Richview Branch achieved an FCI score of 6% (or "Fair") and the Eatonville Branch achieved an ECI score of 1% (or "Good").

In combining the results of the prioritization framework ranking and FCI assessment, among other evaluation factors, an "Investment Roadmap" was developed. One of the key elements of this roadmap was the identification of priority branches for major capital projects ("Named Projects"), which were then categorized into a series of capital project typologies, including "Revitalize", "Expand" and "New Construction/Reconstruction" among others. The Richview Branch was one of the Named Projects in the revitalize category, and was noted as being board approved and capital funded. The Eatonville Branch was not identified as a Named Project.

4.1.2 Capital Improvements and Investments – Richview District Branch

As noted in our initial CS&F Study, the Richview Branch recently underwent renovations, and was partially closed between October 2017 and May 2018. This renovation to the second floor of the branch, included a new Digital Innovation Hub and Audio Visual Room, additional program space, laptop bar seating and increased seating for collaborative and individual study. Previous to this renovation, the branch's lower level was renovated in 2015.

Despite these recent improvements and modernization of the branch's interior space, there are a number of capital improvements to the Richview Branch which are necessary to address building systems that are in poor condition. This work, as confirmed by TPL Policy, Planning and Performance Management staff, includes upgrades to the building envelope to address water penetration, spalling brick work,

and replacement of windows, doors, plumbing and lighting. There is a concern that further deterioration of the building could compromise the recent interior renovations.

4.1.3 Capital Improvements and Investments – Eatonville Neighbourhood Branch

The Eatonville Branch also underwent recent renovations, including a complete rebuild in 2001, new floors and millwork in 2013 and renovations to the foyer and community room in 2014. As recognized in the TPL FMP and confirmed by TPL Policy, Planning and Performance Management staff, there is no capital plan for renovation or expansion to the Eatonville Branch at this time. Notwithstanding, staff indicated that, with continued heavy use, it would be beneficial for the branch to introduce interactive spaces for children aged 6 to 12 and digital innovation services.

4.4 Analysis

Based on our review of the now-approved TPL Facilities Master Plan and additional consultation undertaken with TPL staff, it appears that there is no need for additional TPL facilities within the Study Area at this time. The necessary capital improvements for the Richview Branch, as detailed above, have been allocated funding through the TPL's capital budget and no improvements are required for the Eatonville Branch at this time. Therefore, there is no immediate need for additional funding to improve or enhance library service within the Study Area. However, it may be beneficial for ongoing consultation to take place between City Planning and TPL staff to ensure that future discussions regarding Section 37 contributions in association with the proposal consider the evolving needs of the library service sector.

5.0 RECREATION

While our initial CS&F Report identified four recreation facilities within the Study Area Boundary, SIPA staff noted that three or the four centres are clustered within the south-west quadrant of the study area and are located between 2.4 and 3.4 kilometres from the subject site. It was also identified that there are no large, stand-alone community recreation facilities in the Study Area. As such, additional research and consultation with Parks, Forestry and Recreation ("PFR") staff was undertaken to understand if there are existing service gaps in the recreation service sector and what, if any, plans exist to address service gaps.

5.1 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

In November 2017, City Council adopted the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan (the “P&R FMP”) for 2019-2038. The P&R FMP is intended to act as a guide for investment in parks and recreation facilities in order to improve the ability of the City to align availability and access to facilities with measured need and demand across the City.

Community Recreation Centres (“CRCs”), are recognized in the P&R FMP as prominent community destinations that accommodate a wide variety of registered and drop-in City programming, spontaneous use and bookings, permits and events that reflect the specific needs of area residents. As such, CRC’s act as the “backbone” of Toronto’s public recreation system. The City’s current target for the provision of CRC’s is one centre per 34,000 residents, based on a service radius of 2.0 kilometres for mid-size facilities and 2.5 kilometres for large multi-component facilities.

While this provision level is achieved in many areas of the City, there are gaps that exist in locations across the City. In particular, Central Etobicoke (in which the subject site is located) is identified as not having adequate access to recreation facilities to serve the existing population. As such, a new CRC is recommended for this area and is identified as a priority. The P&R FMP further recommends that, based on existing service levels, an indoor pool should be considered for development in combination with the new CRC for Central Etobicoke.

While SIPA staff did not request any specific additional information be provided with respect to the recreation service sector, outreach with PFR’s Policy and System Planning staff was completed. Staff re-iterated the need for a new CRC with indoor pool in Central Etobicoke and noted that an implementation report in relation to the P&R FMP will be brought to City Council for adoption in June 2019. This report will include recommendations for implementing the P&R FMP, including project prioritization, timing and funding strategies.

With respect to the new Central Etobicoke CRC, staff noted that, as one of only two areas of the City in the “without adequate access to facilities” category, the timing of this project would be towards the front end of the 20-year horizon of the P&R FMP. Site selection for the new Central Etobicoke CRC, along with the other recommended facilities, would occur after the approval of the implementation report. It is unlikely that the subject site would be considered in this site selection process; however, as the proposal is located within this gap area, staff recognize this as an opportunity for potential Section 37 contributions from the proposal to be directed towards the new CRC facility.

5.2. *Analysis*

Based on the above, it is our opinion that it would be appropriate for ongoing communications to take place between City Planning and PFR staff to ensure that once discussions regarding Section 37 contributions from the proposed development begin, the funding needs of the new Central Etobicoke CRC be considered as a priority.

5.0 FRIENDS OF SILVER CREEK COMMENTS

In the minutes from the May 11, 2018 meeting between the owners and the Friends of Silver Creek (“FSC”), a number of questions and comments were made with respect to various elements of our April 2018 CS&F Study. The FSC comments that are still pertinent in light of the revised proposal have been reproduced below (in italics), with our responses immediately following.

- *Why is the demographic section limited to WMR and not the whole of the study area?*

The demographic section of our CS&F Study is based on the Neighbourhood Profile for the Willowridge-Martingrove-Richview Neighbourhood as prepared by the City’s Social Policy Analysis & Research Unit. The demographic profile is intended to demonstrate the existing demographics of the community where the proposal is located, as new residents resulting from this development will presumably require similar services to the existing population. While other neighbourhoods that fall wholly or partially within the Study Area may have different demographics, it is our opinion that the most representative way to illustrate the service needs of the future residents of this development, is to assume that their demographics will be similar to those of the immediate surrounding community. Notwithstanding, the larger Study Area was employed for the CS&F inventory as residents of the development will presumably travel beyond their immediate neighbourhood to access services.

- *Bousfields analysis omitted 10 schools from WMR neighbourhood, 2 outdoor pools, and location of 2 food banks;*

The information provided in our CS&F Study with respect to schools was based only on the catchment area schools for students residing within the proposed development. While a number of other school facilities are located within the Willowridge-Martingrove-Richview Neighbourhood and the Study

Area, the majority of students resulting from this proposal would likely attend the catchment area school (out-of-catchment permission may be required to attend other schools in the area as identified by FSC). Notwithstanding, the additional school accommodation analysis provided in this CS&F Addendum indicates that some students from the proposal may require accommodation at out-of-catchment schools. In this respect, it is helpful to recognize that there are a number of other school facilities in the immediate surrounding community.

With respect to the outdoor pools, it is noted that the Richview Gardens Pool was identified in our CS&F Study, however, it was listed under “Silver Creek Park” due to the co-location of these facilities. The outdoor pool at Westgrove Park was not identified in our initial CS&F Study- this was an oversight on our part.

The two food bank locations mentioned in FSC comments were also mistakenly left out of our initial CS&F Study. We believe that the two locations identified by FSC were the Foodshare Food Bank (8 Templar Drive, within Westway United Church) and the Westway Community Food Bank (6 Kilburn Place, within Westway Christian Church). While both of these places of worship were identified in our CS&F Study, neither was identified as providing food bank services.

- *Majority of dwellings in WMR located within apartment buildings greater than 5 storeys (44%) are area of low income and locations of child poverty. Supports need for green space and service provision space – even more so when current developments are increasingly denser.*

The need for additional green open space was also identified by City staff. As such, the revised proposal now incorporates a new park, which will be dedicated to the City as public parkland. The revised proposal also provides a POPS space directly adjacent to the new public park, further increasing the provision of open space on the subject site.

- *Local Parkland Provision 2006- dated document does not reflect current, nor adequately address, ratio for projected population. An updated measurement methodology for parkland provision exists but awaits approval by Council.*

We are unaware of a new measurement methodology for parkland provision and therefore cannot provide a response to this comment. Notwithstanding,

as noted above, a new public park is now included in the proposal and will contribute to an increase in the provision of local parkland in this community once complete.

- *Silver Creek Park incorrectly identified as unified green space but portion owned by province and may not always be a green space. If sold by province in future, green space further diminished.*

The portion of Silver Creek Park identified in our CS&F Study (3.9 hectares), represents only the portion of this open space which is owned and managed by the City of Toronto. The adjacent open space and former TDSB school building (2.43 hectares) were not included in our analysis of parkland provision in this community.

Beyond the above, there are a number of other questions and comments provided by the FSC in the minutes of the May 11, 2018 meeting that relate to built form, traffic, noise, wind and other elements of the proposal. These elements have been addressed in the other supporting submission materials for the revised proposal, including a Planning Addendum Letter by Bousfields Inc. and an Addendum to the Pedestrian Level Wind Study by Gradient Wind Engineering Inc., among others.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

The overall intent of this CS&F Addendum is to provide additional information and analysis regarding several service sectors in the Study Area which were identified as potential areas of concern in our initial CS&F Study and the resulting comments from SIPA staff. Through the additional outreach conducted in the preparation of this CS&F Addendum the following service sector conclusions have been made:

- Schools: while utilization rates at the TDSB and TCDSB schools in in the Study Area remain high, school board staff have indicated no significant concerns regarding accommodation issues and there are no capital projects planned to address accommodation at the schools serving the subject site.
- Child care: previous concerns regarding the availability of child care spaces in the Study Area have been addressed through the planned construction of 6 new child care facilities in this area (450 spaces) which will be completed by the end of 2020.
- Libraries: despite recently completed renovations, the Toronto Public Library Facilities Master Plan identifies additional capital improvements to the Richview Branch which have been board approved and are funded through

the capital budget. The Eatonville Branch does not require any repairs or improvements at this time, but may benefit from program-specific renovations in the future.

- Recreation: the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan identified the need for a new community recreation centre with indoor swimming pool in Central Etobicoke. This project is anticipated to be a priority project under the implementation plan to be released in June 2019.

Based on the above, it is our opinion that the recreation service sector is the primary CS&F priority in this community and efforts are required to address the recreation needs in this area for both the existing residential population and future population growth as a result of new developments. As a secondary priority, the library service sector may require additional support in the future, in order to address facility improvements associated with increased usage.

Future consultation between the proponent, City staff and the local Ward Councillor will determine how to address these service gaps, including funding through possible Section 37 contributions. As service levels and community service demands are constantly fluctuating, it is acknowledged that ongoing discussions between various divisions at the City will be required prior to any decisions being made regarding the application of these funds.

We trust that the foregoing is satisfactory for your purposes. However, should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned or Jordan Kemp of our office.

Yours very truly,

Bousfields Inc.



Peter Smith, MCIP, RPP