

1960-1962 Queen Street East - Review of Avenues & Midrise Guidelines

Count	Standard #	Description	Staff Say:	Applicable?	Met?	Explanation
1	Performance Standard #1	Maximum Allowable Height		Yes	No	20m maximum height is violated. Drawings show 20.15m to the pavement on the roof - however, the architectural trim/parapets exceed this.
2	Performance Standard #2	Minimum Building Height		N/A	N/A (Yes)	As-of-right height would not require a rezoning - this is not applicable/enforceable until Harmonised Zoning Bylaw is passed again.
3	Performance Standard #3	Minimum Ground Floor Height		Yes	Yes	Drawings show Ground Floor height of 4.5m.
4	Performance Standard #4A	Front Façade: Angular Plane		Yes	No	The issue of the planes is not just about shadows but is also of making the building appear to be less massive or imposing, and so that people see more of the sky instead of a street that is like a narrow tunnel.
5	Performance Standard #4B	Front Façade: Pedestrian Perception Step-back		No	N/A	Not applicable on a 20m Right-of-way - but then that is because buildings higher than 20m are not anticipated. However, for buildings taller than 23m the study lists this something that "may" be required.
6	Performance Standard #4C	Front Façade: Alignment		Yes	Yes	This appears to have been met.
7	Performance Standard #5A	Rear Transition to Neighbourhoods: Deep Properties		Yes	No/No	1. 45 degree angular plane from the far side of the right-of-way/laneway, and 2. Windows from Principal Rooms cannot be within 10m of the rear lot line. None of these criteria have been met. The rear angular plane on the drawing is incorrect for a Deep Lot and should be 3.0m lower than shown.
8	Performance Standard #5B	Rear Transition to Neighbourhoods: Shallow Properties		No	N/A	Only one of 5A or 5B can apply - as the Staff Report indicates that the property is about 47.52m deep, and thus is greater than 32.6m in depth, 5A applies & not 5B - the wrong standard has been used by the applicant.
9	Performance Standards #5A & 5B (See Note)	Shadow Testing		Yes	No	This requirement applies to both 5A and 5B, which ever is required. The project is on the north side of the street. However, the guidelines are predicated on neighbouring properties on the south side also being built to a similar height and form. Because this design violates the height, setbacks and angular planes, it will cast long shadows on residential properties to the north - though this needs to be confirmed
10	Performance Standard #5C:	Rear Transition to Employment Areas		No	N/A	Adjacent area is not an Employment Area
11	Performance Standard #5D	Rear Transition to Apartment Neighbourhoods		No	N/A	Adjacent area is not an Apartment Neighbourhood
12	Performance Standard #6:	Corner Sites: Heights & Angular Planes		Yes	No	Angular planes are also violated on the sidestreet (Kenilworth)
13	Performance Standard #7A:	Minimum Sidewalk Zones		Yes	No	The drawings indicate a sidewalk of 3.8m in width, whereas the Guideline calls for 4.8m. However, if this Guideline were to be met, then Guideline #4C would be violated unless the "setback" line were used, resulting in this building being the only one on this section of queen that is set back from the street.
14	Performance Standard #7B:	Streetscapes		N/A	N/A	This mainly deals with the sidewalks, which are not under the control of the developer - can never apply.

Count	Standard #	Description	Staff Say:	Applicable?	Met?	Explanation
15	Performance Standard #8A:	Side Property Line: Continuous Street Walls		Yes	Yes	Built to the property line on the east.
16	Performance Standard #8B:	Side Property Line: Limiting Blank Side Walls		Yes	No	There will be a blank sidewall visible to the full 20m height, with only the bottom portion (1 storey) obscured - leaving 5 storeys exposed. The Segment Study indicates that the neighbouring properties are unlikely be redeveloped, and so this is not a temporary condition.
17	Performance Standard #8C:	Side Property Line: Step-backs at Upper Storeys		Yes	No	The blank sidewall on the east side might only be temporary, except that the Segment Study indicates that the neighbouring property is an unlikely redevelopment site.
18	Performance Standard #8D	Side Property Line: Existing Side Windows		No	N/A	Neighbouring properties to the east is built close to the lot line - no side windows.
19	Performance Standard #8E:	Side Property Line: Side Street Setbacks		Yes	No	Only applies where buildings on the sidestreet are setback - which is true in this case. There has been no attempt made to soften the transition to the house to the north, which is set back approximately 7.0m from the lot line on Kenilworth
20	Performance Standard #9	Building Width: Maximum Width		No	N/A	Only applies where the building frontage is 60m or wider. This is only 36.78m wide.
21	Performance Standard #10	At-Grade Uses: Residential		No	N/A	The proposal does not include any at grade residential facing the Avenue
22	Performance Standard #11:	Setbacks for Civic Spaces		No	N/A	This is not a site where a public plaza is appropriate or required.
23	Performance Standard #12	Balconies & Projections		Yes	No	Balconies on the rear of the building are not to be less than 10m from the rear lot line (or possibly the far side of the laneway) - this has not been met. Balconies are also not allowed to violate the angular planes or required setbacks - clearly they violate the angular plane as it is shown on the drawings.
24	Performance Standard #13:	Roofs & Roofscapes		Yes	No	Only a mechanical room is allowed above the 20m height, and it cannot violate the angular planes.
25	Performance Standard #14	Exterior Building Materials		Yes	Yes	I lack sufficient information about the exterior materials, and I can only note that the black or charcoal coloured cladding in the advertisements and segment study looks inappropriate in this context.
26	Performance Standard #15	Façade Design & Articulation		Yes	Yes	I have not examined this issue in detail, and so am relying on the Planners & Urban Designers opinions that this has been met.
27	Performance Standard #16A:	Vehicular Access		Yes	No	Access is from the rear lane. However, the guideline does indicate that a 2-way lane is what is intended through the use of the 7.5m rear setback, and not just 3.7m, the approximate width of the Right-of-Way. The existing laneways are not plowed, so a narrow Right-of-Way could be problematic in winter given that it is used for retail, servicing, parking, and for use by the neighbours to the east. In addition, by not providing a full 6.0m laneway that has been conveyed to the city, this might permanently preclude redevelopment of the property to the east and mean that the blank side wall is in fact permanent.
28	Performance Standard #16B	Mid-Block Vehicular Access for Constrained Sites		Yes	No	As noted above, while this is not a mid-block site, failure to create a 6.0m laneway has an impact on the neighbouring mid-block property.

Count	Standard #	Description	Staff Say:	Applicable?	Met?	Explanation
29	Performance Standard #17:	Loading & Servicing		Yes	No	Because the neighbouring property to the north is set back 7.0m, and Kenilworth jogs to the east, the rear of 1960 Queen will be a prominent part of the view looking south on Kenilworth for pedestrians and motorists, who will see the visitors parking area.
30	Performance Standard #18:	Design Quality		Yes	Yes	I have not examined this issue in detail, and so am relying on the Planners & Urban Designers to ensure that this will be met.
31	Performance Standard #19A	Heritage & Character Areas		Yes	No	Queen Street is a Potential Heritage Conservation district under Bylaw 1118-2008, which calls for "appropriate infill" instead of reurbanisation using the Avenues Guidelines.
32	Performance Standard #19B	Development in a Heritage Conservation District		No	N/A	Not currently in an HCD, though this is potentially an HCD
33	Performance Standard #19C:	Development Adjacent to Heritage Properties		No	N/A	Not adjacent to a heritage building, in the strictest sense of "adjacent" , even though the buildings across the street to the west and south are heritage properties.
34	Performance Standard #19D:	Character Area: Fine Grain Fabric		Yes	No	The façade is typical of a modernist building and lacks any modulation that attempts to blend in with the existing "Fine Grain" character of narrower buildings
35	Performance Standard #19E	Character Area: Consistent Cornice Line		Yes	No	The street wall (lower part of the façade) on Queen makes no attempt to have a cornice at a 1 to 3 storey level of nearby or neighbouring buildings.
36	Performance Standard #19F:	Character Area: Vertical Additions		No	N/A	Not an vertical addition to an existing building.
37	Performance Standard #19G:	Character Area: Other Considerations		Yes	No	Poor choice of materials, architectural style and lack of setbacks (on the east side) or other features to make the building fit in better with the existing context. This is a building which screams "look at me!" instead of being one that enhances the existing urban fabric or is a has a built form that is likely to be repeated nearby, at least not for many years.

Yes	24	6
No		18
No	11	
Other	2	13
Total	37	37

Note: Planning Staff do not count Item 9 as one of the 36 guidelines