**Employment Lands in Toronto: A Case for Conversion in Urban Centres and in the Vicinity of
Transit Stations**

By

Sean Guenther

H.BA, York University, 2014

A Major Research Paper

Presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Planning

in

Urban Development

Toronto Ontario, 2018

©Sean Guenther, 2018

AUTHORS DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this MRP. This is a true copy of the MRP, including any required final revisions.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this MRP to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this MRP by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I understand that my MRP may be made electronically available to the public.

Employment Lands in Toronto: A Case for Conversion in Urban Centres and in the Vicinity of Transit Stations

©Sean Guenther, 2018

Master of Planning

in

Urban Development

Ryerson University

ABSTRACT

Deindustrialization and rapid population growth in the City of Toronto has resulted in greater employment land conversion pressures being placed on underutilized and vacant *Employment Areas* (Blais, 2015; Filon 2003). In 2013, City Planning Staff made recommendations to City Council for the preservation or conversion of specific employment land application requests under the City of Toronto's Municipal Comprehensive Review process (City of Toronto, 2013).

This paper will examine five employment land conversion applications in Toronto's inner suburbs, the Scarborough Urban Growth Centre and within 500 meters of the Mimico GO Station through a content analysis of City Planning Staff's recommendations along with the property owner's rationales. It was found that the five sites should be converted to better meet the Provincial and Municipal planning policy requirements that align with Smart Growth's objectives. The five sites pose minimal land use compatibility conflicts, require increases in population and employment density, and are isolated from larger *Employment Areas*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Mitch Kosny for his support, flexibility and guidance throughout the MRP process and my time at Ryerson. I have learned a great deal by being under Professor Kosny's guidance both theoretically and practically.

Special thanks to Christina Heydorn for her contributions to my research and ideology on employment lands. Christina's wealth of knowledge has been invaluable both to my learning experience during a summer internship with the City of Toronto and MRP research.

I have been fortunate to study alongside a diverse, intelligent and thought-provoking cohort of students and faculty at Ryerson's School of Regional and Urban Planning. I look forward to seeing what the future holds.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge and thank my family for their social and emotional support during my time at Ryerson - especially my Aunt Jenny and Uncle Kevin as without them none of this would have been possible.

TABLES OF CONTENTS	Page
Title Page	i
Author's Declaration	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
Glossary	ix
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Rationale of Research	4
3.0 Literature Review: Industrial Context in North America	6
3.1 Industrial Decline in the GTHA	6
3.2 Smart Growth Background	11
4.0 History of Employment Lands	14
4.1 Importance of Employment Lands	16
5.0 Policy Analysis	17
5.1 Provincial Policy Statement, 2005	17
5.2 Places to Grow Act, 2017	19
5.3 Toronto Official Plan	21
5.4 City of Toronto Employment Land Strategy	22
5.5 Secondary Plans	23
5.6 Development in Proximity to Rail Corridors	24
6.0 Case Study Etobicoke and Scarborough	25
6.1 Scarborough Centre	27
6.1.1 1001 Ellesmere Road	29
6.1.1.1 Development Applications	30

6.1.1.2	Current Context	30
6.1.1.3	Discussion	30
6.1.2	675 Progress Road	33
6.2.2.1	Development Applications	35
6.2.2.2	Current Context	36
6.2.2.3	Discussion	37
6.1.3	8-10 Golden Gate Court	38
6.1.3.1	Development Applications	40
6.1.3.2	Current Context	40
6.1.3.3	Discussion	40
6.2	Mimico GO Station	43
6.2.1	29, 49, 53-55, 69-71 & 75 Judson Street	43
6.2.1.1	Development Applications	44
6.2.1.2	Current Context	44
6.2.1.3	Discussion	44
6.2.2	Mimico Go Triangle	46
6.2.2.1	Development Applications	48
6.2.2.2	Current Context	48
6.2.1.3	Discussion	49
7.0	Conclusions	51
8.0	Final Recommendations	52
9.0	Appendix	56
9.1	City Staff Recommendation Matrix	56
9.2	Owner/Solicitor Rationale Matrix	59
10.0	References	60

LIST OF TABLES	Page
Table 1: 2017 City of Toronto Property Tax Rates.....	17
Table 2: Growth Plan for the GGH (2017) targets.....	20
Table 3: Densities in Urban Centres in 2011 and 2016.....	32

LIST OF FIGURES	Page
Figure 1: Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan Proposal, Source: City of Toronto, 2016	2
Figure 2: City of Toronto Urban Growth Centres and five site applications	2
Figure 3: 1001 Ellesmere Context Map	2
Figure 4: 675 Progress Avenue Context Map.....	2
Figure 5: 8-10 Golden Gate Court Context Map.....	2
Figure 6: Mimico GO Triangle and Judson Sites	2

GLOSSARY

Core Employment areas are areas that need to be separated from residential and other sensitive land uses due to its operations. These areas tend to include manufacturing, warehousing, transportation facilities, research and development facilities. Core areas are usually located in the interior of an *Employment area* (City of Toronto, 2013).

Employment Areas are defined as “areas designated for clusters of business and economic activities including, but not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, offices, and associated retail and ancillary facilities” (City of Toronto, 2013).

General Employment Areas permit all forms of employment uses including retail, centres, ice arenas in addition to the uses permitted in Core Employment Areas (City of Toronto, 2013).

Industrial lands, according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) industrial lands are defined in the following categories: construction, manufacturing, wholesale trade, and transportation and warehousing (Howland, 2011).

Municipal Comprehensive Review: A review of a municipalities Official Plan that must be undertaken every five years under the *PPS (2014)*.

Official Plan Amendment 231: An amendment to Toronto’s Official Plan initiated under the MCR that aims to stimulate the growth of new office space, preserve the majority of the City’s employment lands and accommodate growth in the retail and institutional sectors (City of Toronto, 2013).

Official Plan Amendment 331: An Amendment to the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan and Guidelines that is currently under appeal and proposes to convert such lands to *Mixed Use Areas* (City of Toronto, 2016).

Sensitive land uses: Usually not permitted on or near *Core Employment Areas*. Sensitive land uses can include residential and open space uses. Mitigation needs to be completed before sensitive land uses can be permitted on employment lands.

Employment Lands in Toronto: A Case for Conversion in Urban Centres and in the Vicinity of Transit Stations

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) and specifically the City of Toronto has experienced significant population and job growth in the last few decades (City of Toronto, 2017; Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012). Through planning policy, the Government of Ontario has directed growth to areas that can best accommodate it, while making the most of infrastructure investment (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017). Smart Growth is an approach that manages growth and change among other things, directing people and jobs to target areas (Blais, 2015, Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017, Filion, 2003). Urban development becomes more efficient through Smart Growth approaches while urban sprawl is minimized. Efficient development in Ontario and Toronto is and will be achieved through the application of Smart Growth objectives which include: providing access to transit, the intensification in urban centres, and the expansion of the permitted uses in urbanized settings to create communities where people can live, work and play (Blais, 2015; Filion, 2003).

The approach that Smart Growth held gained notoriety in the early 1960's and has since been implemented by Government of Ontario in the 1990's (Filion, 2003). Smart Growth can be defined in many different ways depending on how its policies are used to meet objectives in various jurisdictions. The purpose of this paper will be to interpret Smart Growth policies objectives through the lens of the Province of Ontario's and the City of Toronto's planning legislation and documents specifically the *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH)*, (2006). Policy documents that direct Smart Growth

objectives are the: *Growth Plan for the GGH (2017)*, *The Provincial Planning Statement (PPS), (2014)*, *Toronto's Official Plan (2015)* and Toronto's Employment Land Strategy.

The Province of Ontario has utilized Smart Growth approaches with their creation of Urban Growth Centres (UGC). Urban Growth Centres aim to absorb future population and job increases that are forecasted by 2031. *The Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017* identifies 25 UGCs to “to serve as high-density major employment centres that will attract provincially, nationally or internationally significant employment uses [and] to accommodate a significant share of population and employment growth” (Blais, 2015). In Toronto there are four UGCs: Scarborough Growth Centre, the North York Centre, Yonge-Eglinton Growth Centre, and the Etobicoke Centre (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017).

Employment lands are “areas designated in an Official Plan for clusters and business activities including but not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, offices and associate retail and ancillary facilities” (PPS, 2014). Toronto's employment lands are finite. They have played a major role in accommodating Toronto's economic development in past few decades (City of Toronto, 2013; Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012). While, employment lands are experiencing less employment growth in traditional sectors such as manufacturing, they provide an excellent opportunity to accommodate higher density forms of employment such as office (Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012). General employment uses include operations such as warehousing and manufacturing that would not negatively affect residential populations and could include retail, office and residential uses.

Toronto's employment lands are located either, in or near, Urban Growth Centres (UGCs) and should play a role in accommodating the City's future growth. While employment land conversions permit a broad range of uses, they may limit the type of employment use that can operate on a site. Opportunities for office spaces should be conserved along with light or general industrial uses on sites that are near transit stations or in growth areas (City of Toronto, 2013).

An evaluation of Toronto's employment land inventory was initiated under the provincial Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) in 2011 (City of Toronto, 2013). City Planning Staff received 125 conversion requests from property owners (City of Toronto, 2013). City Council Adopted Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 231 in 2013 (City of Toronto, 2013). Official Plan Amendment 231 sought to preserve the City's employment lands, promote more office space near rapid transit and encourage growth in the retail and institutional sectors (City of Toronto, 2013). In response there have been over 178 appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).

This paper will evaluate the City Planning Staff's recommendations for either the preservation or conversion of employment lands on five sites in the Scarborough Urban Growth Centre (UGC) and within 500 meters of the Mimico GO Station. The purpose of this research is to analyze Provincial and Municipal planning policies – specifically the policies that are prioritized and utilized by City Planning Staff and the solicitors and/or consultants representing the property owners in employment land conversion applications, *See Appendix 9.1*. The use of Smart Growth policies in provincial plans such as the *PPS (2014)* and *Growth Plan for the GGH (2006 & 2017)* and municipal policies in *Toronto's Official Plan (OP) (2015)* and Toronto's Employment Land Strategy

will be a central focus in this paper. A policy analysis will be applied as a potential rationale for employment land conversions.

An evaluation of Planning Staff's Recommendations will identify the policies and/or considerations that are prioritized and possibly overlooked in the MCR process.

Municipal decision makers can learn from the past MCR process. Past recommendations and the resulting designations and developments, of and near, the five subject sites can provide insight and considerations that will need to be taken into account during the next MCR process. Such considerations will be provided through recommendations in the final portion of the report for City Planning Staff, property owners, and interested parties.

2.0 RESEARCH RATIONALE

The City of Toronto has utilized Smart Growth principles provided under the *Growth Plan for the GGH (2006)* to implement policies that direct growth to Urban Growth Centres (UGC's) (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2006). An evaluation of the existing employment land stock was initiated under The Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) in 2012 (City of Toronto, 2013). The City received 125 applications to convert existing *Employment Areas* to *Mixed Use* or *Regeneration Areas* in 2012. Five applications/requests are examined in the paper. Three applications were located in the Scarborough UGC and two requests were submitted for sites located within 500 meters of the Mimico GO Station. City Planning Staff recommended that four of the five employment land sites be preserved for employment uses (City of Toronto, 2013). This

decision ultimately opposed the principles and objectives of Smart Growth based on their geographic location.

The five application examples will provide insight into the reasoning for and against employment land conversions in areas targeted for growth and intensification. The treatment of the five sites will be evaluated to better understand City Planning Staff's priorities and pattern of decision making in their recommendations. In addition, the property owner's conversion rationale will be examined to gain insight into the policy reasoning behind alternative designations. The explanations from Planning Staff and property owner's can be used as a reference for employment land conversion request recommendations in future MCR processes in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA).

There is and has been considerable pressure placed on Toronto's Planning Staff to convert employment lands into *Mixed Use Areas*. *Mixed Use Areas* allow for residential uses that would not otherwise be permitted on employment lands. Toronto's population and employment growth along with the unprecedented demand for housing throughout the City has accentuated employment land conversion pressures in the last decade (Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012). Toronto has surpassed its proposed population estimates. In 2016, the City grew to 2,876,095 which exceeded forecasts by over 11,000 people (City of Toronto, 2017). Population growth has resulted in higher residential development demand which has placed pressure on underutilized or vacant employment lands.

Toronto's high industrial property taxes in relation to other municipalities has forced many industrial firms to relocate in the suburbs. The Scarborough Urban Centre was

chosen for analysis as it was the only Urban Centre that had applicants requesting an employment land conversion in 2012 (City of Toronto, 2013). The Mimico GO Station, located near the Etobicoke UGC had two requests for conversion within 500 meters of its location (City of Toronto, 2013). While the Yonge-Eglinton and North York UGC's did not have any employment land conversion requests within its geographic boundaries or near local transit stations in 2012 (City of Toronto, 2013). The population and employment densities in both the Etobicoke and Scarborough UGC's, were and are, the lowest among Toronto's four Urban Centres (City of Toronto, 2017).

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Industrial Decline in the GTHA

In the past few decades, industrial economies in North America have been experiencing a decline in employment which has resulted in deindustrialization (Blais, 2015, Kaza, Kirk, & Lester, 2013;). In the 1990's, a resurgence in population and employment growth generated an interest in industrial lands for conversions to other land uses (Kaza, Kirk & Lester, 2013). Residential development has become more favourable and lucrative than industrial development in urban areas that are attempting to accommodate increases in population growth (Chapple, 2014). Industrial sectors which include warehousing, manufacturing, transportation and wholesale are being pressured by developers and often government officials to relocate so their lands can be converted to more profitable land uses for the development of condominiums and single-family dwellings (Chapple, 2014; Kaza, Kirk & Lester, 2013). In addition, lower industrial labour costs in countries that have less regulations have attracted manufacturing firms abroad (Howland, 2011). The redistribution of industrial and manufacturing jobs abroad due to

lower labour costs has resulted in the rise of service-orientated jobs in North America's economy (Kaza, Kirk & Lester, 2013). These service orientated positions include retail and administrative jobs that have generally provided workers with less income than the manufacturing jobs that were once available.

A general shift has pushed industrial jobs from city centres to suburban contexts in the last twenty years (Howland, 2011). Rail corridors and ferry docks in central cities were locations where industrial firms strategically chose to locate in the early 20th century (Howland, 2011). The Industrial demand for city locations changed when suburban industrialization began to flourish (Howland, 2011). The influx of highway developments led to the advancement of the trucking transportation sector and decentralization of the industrial workforce from cities (Howland, 2011). The eventual deindustrialization of the suburbs forced many manufacturing firms to relocate to areas with less regulations in the form of lower corporate and property taxes (Howland, 2011).

There are a number of factors that lead to the industrial displacement of firms from central cities to the suburbs and eventually away from North America. Kaza, Kirk and Lester (2013) identified five factors that affected industrial land displacement by evaluating industrial land changes and the industrial conversion risks in two US counties. The industrial conversion probability factors were identified as:

- 1) Location characteristics or the spatial competitiveness of a parcel determined by its location to Central Business Districts (CBD);
- 2) Neighborhood Real-Estate Dynamics which have been characterized as the relocation of industrial firms to the suburbs as land values rise;

- 3) The Establishment and Industry Dynamics - the size of industrial parcels indicating whether they can maintain industrial competitiveness over the next few decades;
 - 4) Industrial protection policies including the slowing of industrial land conversions and;
 - 5) Environmental hazards such as nearby brownfield sites or contaminated parcels.
- (Kaza, Kirk & Lester, 2013).

Kaza, Kirk & Lester's (2013) study provides evidence on how conversion factors can be used to evaluate the political, social and legislative environment that would be supportive and/or adversarial to employment land conversions. Furthermore, it provides an insight into how and why industrial firms relocate to either the suburbs, or more commonly now, to other countries that compensate workers with very low wages.

Today, industrial lands are often located near transportation routes in suburban contexts. A study was conducted to examine industrial land location in suburban Prince George County in Maryland. Local planners decided whether to retain or convert existing industrial lands as population's increased and employment opportunities grew in George County (Howland, 2011). Areas with strong economic health were categorized by low industrial vacancy rates, low demand for other uses including: office, retail, and residential, and were found to be located near critical transportation routes (Howland, 2011). These districts with high levels of industrial employment were located along interstate highway I-95 and Route 1 near the University of Maryland and the border of the Air Force Base whereas vacant and underutilized industrial sites tended to

be isolated (Howland, 2011). Although Prince George County's industrial sector was economically strong, government officials and residents thought otherwise because of the perceived changes in North American economy as a result of deindustrialization and the transition to a more service-based employment sector (Howland, 2011).

Toronto's has been experiencing unprecedented increases in population and employment growth. From 2012 to 2016, Toronto's population rose by an average of 25,890 per year (City of Toronto, 2017). Such population increases have increased the demand for condominium development as developers purchase and profit from land in the inner city, "With all these speculative activities, the supply of land for new development in the inner city diminished as Toronto developed into one of the most competitive condo markets in North America" (Lehrer and Weiditz, 2009). As urbanized land in cities becomes scarcer, greater pressures will be placed on municipal decision makers to convert employment lands.

Toronto is Canada's most populous City. A blueprint for future growth as directed by Provincial planning policy, *Toronto's OP (2006)* directs growth to areas that can accommodate increases in population and employment, known as Urban Growth Centres (City of Toronto, 2017). The Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA) has the third highest and fifth highest industrial and office commercial developments respectively in North America (Town of Milton, 2016). The Industrial market in the GTHA is comprised of 871 million square feet of industrial gross floor area (GFA) with more than half located in the Region of Peel and City of Toronto (Town of Milton, 2016). The growth of industrial building development waned after the global recession. It eventually bounced back, in 2014, the GTHA's new industrial development increased slightly.

In the period from 2006 to 2014, the City of Toronto's industrial employment sector grew by six percent, while the majority occurred in Peel Region along the Highway 401 corridor (Town of Milton, 2016). As of 2015, the GTHA contained 198 million square feet of office space, with the majority of 70 percent located in Toronto (Town of Milton, 2016). Over the next 30 years, the population in the GTHA is proposed to rise from 6.48 million (2011) to 10.31 in 2041 and add 1.4 million jobs (Town of Milton, 2016).

Deindustrialization in North America has also influenced Toronto, primarily in inner suburbs like Scarborough and Etobicoke. Toronto's downtown region has increased in manufacturing and other employment areas while areas outside of Toronto have seen a decrease in core employment uses by 12 percent and a decrease in all other employment from 2001 to 2011 (Blais, 2015). Rising land values have forced industries in *Employment Areas* to relocate to jurisdictions with lower land costs, less congestion, along with less competition from residential, retail and commercial land uses (Chapple, 2014, Howland, 2011). In Toronto, manufacturing jobs have been declining steadily, yet the future is not as bleak as in other cities and rural areas. Toronto's vacancy rate on employment lands fell to one percent in 2016 (City of Toronto, 2017). Furthermore, in 2016, Toronto had the largest portion of industrial space under construction since 2008 (City of Toronto, 2017). This statistic is tainted by a decline in manufacturing and warehousing jobs by 6.8 percent in Toronto during the decade from 2006 to 2016 (City of Toronto, 2016). The decreases in the number manufacturing jobs in Toronto for that period were matched by increases in every other sector, except retail (City of Toronto, 2016).

Toronto's employment lands are a critical part of its economic asset base, providing a significant number of jobs. In 2011, 90 percent of Toronto's wealth creation was from the Downtown region, Waterfront and Employment Districts (Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012). Toronto's Employment Districts comprised roughly a third of these jobs. Office uses tend to dominate Toronto's market share of employment positions, which was 48 percent of the market share in 2011 (Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012). Property owners and developers of employment lands have put pressure on municipal decision makers to convert employment lands over the past decade to alternative designations to accommodate Toronto's growing population and increasing retail and commercial demands (City of Toronto, 2013). Moreover, while warehouse jobs have decreased in the decade from 2006 to 2016, retail and service employment have increased significantly becoming important components of *Employment Areas*. In 2011, the largest percentage of retail-based employment was located in *Employment Areas* at 26 percent (Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012). Service employment also has a considerable portion of employment within Employment Areas. In 2011, 24 percent of service employment was located primarily on the fringes of employment districts in Toronto (Malone Given Parsons LTD, 2012).

3.2 Smart Growth

Smart Growth policies emerged in opposition to development that occurred in the post World War II period along with the "No Growth Movement" in North America (Filion, 2003). In the 1990's, Smart Growth was incepted to combat urban sprawl and revitalize urban areas. Urban sprawl is characterized as low-density development in underdeveloped areas that separated land uses in this context (Vassan, 2014; White

2016). In North America, the post war planning period created and encouraged urban sprawl through development that separated land uses from one another, such as residential from industrial or employment areas (Blais, 2015). Smart Growth is a framework that can be interpreted in different ways to achieve similar policy objectives. This paper will examine the following Smart Growth objectives through the lens of the *Growth Plan for the GGH*, (2006 and 2015) and in relation to Toronto's *Employment Areas* (Blais, 2015; Filion, 2003, Downs, 2005, Vassan, 2014):

- Directing future growth to urban centres;
- Encouraging infill development and the reuse of brownfield sites;
- Promoting compact mixed-use sites for development;
- Increasing cycling and transit use;

Ontario's Smart Growth objectives have become ostensible in planning policy yet have not necessarily led to implementation in planning practice (Filion, 2003; Hoelzel & Leigh, 2013). Ontario implemented its own version of Smart Growth in *The Growth Plan for the GGH* (2006) which was revised and updated in 2015. The *Province of Ontario's Growth Plan*, (2017) states that UGC's are areas where growth should be directed and proposed a concrete requirement for the number residents and jobs per hectare near transit stations (Places to Grow in the GGH, 2017). While Smart Growth policies have been acknowledged and introduced in both Ontario's and the City of Toronto's planning policies, they have yet to transform land-use development trends (Filion, 2003). As this is slowly changing with more retail being utilized in *Employment Areas*; many of Toronto's *Employment Areas* are isolated from other uses that could increase mobility and compact communities and office uses are segregated to office parks (Blais, 2015).

Moreover, the revisions to the *Growth Plan in the GGH (2017)* will aid the City in developing more compact mixed-use growth in the Urban Centres and within 500 meters of transit stations.

The implementation of Smart Growth objectives is occurring in Toronto yet still faces major constraints. Smart Growth encourages but does not necessarily transform land use patterns and travel behaviour attitudes (Filion, 2003). Population growth near transit stations does not cause traffic and congestion reductions in itself -- It does, however, provide transportation choice (Downs, 2005). By providing people with transportation choice and access the probability of people using transit could increase, if convenient and affordable. Secondly, funding is a large barrier to Smart Growth's implementation (Filion, 2003). New public transportation projects and environmental remediation on former employment lands can be expensive and out of the scope for many neighborhoods or cities.

Hoelzel, and Leigh (2013) identify the differences between local land use planning for industrial revitalization and Smart Growth planning. Seven cities were examined as they had significant rates of Smart Growth implementation. It was found that there were inconsistencies between industrial land use planning and Smart Growth policies. It was recommended that dialogue should be encouraged (Hoelzel & Leigh, 2013). Hoelzel and Leigh (2013) recommended that Smart Growth could help industrial firms to create innovative and sustainable communities by unlocking Smart Growth's potential for transforming industrial lands. A second recommendation was creating 'cross fertilization' between Smart Growth and industrial planning such as the promotion of mass transit. Third, Hoelzel and Leigh (2013) recommended that further research

should be conducted on industrial reuse and the costs of remediation and the industrial contribution to the cities tax base in exchange for services they receive. The overall conclusion of this study was the Smart Growth movement should incorporate a vision for urban industrial revitalization (Hoelzel, & Leigh, 2013).

It can be argued that Smart Growth creates mobile, mixed use, compact communities. The implementation of Smart Growth principles often leads to an increase in land value in urban areas through compact development by increasing the number of units built in a high demand area. Moreover, efficient compact development leads to 20 to 60 percent reductions in infrastructure and servicing costs in comparison to suburban development (Blais, 2015). Smart Growth advances the interests of homeowners who buy and sell but opposes the interests of renters and those requiring affordable housing (Filion, 2003). Lastly, political support is instrumental to Smart Growth's implementation and often inhibits it (Downs, 2005). Many areas outside of Toronto's Downtown region as experiencing job loss (Blais, 2015). It can be argued, "there is an opportunity to think of employment not just as something to be 'accommodated,' but also in terms of its economic development potential and its role in shaping the urban environment and supporting transit investments" (Blais, 2015). Municipal planners and decision makers must balance these factors when making recommendations about the potential conversion of employment lands.

4.0 HISTORY OF EMPLOYMENT LANDS IN TORONTO

Toronto's Inner suburbs contained large pockets of industrial areas that provided many people with industrial employment in the 1960's (Eavis, 2013). The inner suburbs are known as North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke. In the 1950's and 1960's half of

Toronto's population living in the inner suburbs were employed in the manufacturing or industrial sectors (Eavis, 2013). By the end of the 1960's, industrial firms began to relocate to the suburbs as they provided lands with cheaper rents and lower taxes (Eavis, 2013). The manufacturing sector reciprocated to the economic conditions causing jobs to increase slightly from the 1980's to 2003 (Eavis, 2013; Fillion, 2003). From 2003 to 2016, the manufacturing sector steadily declined whereas other sectors increased their employment proportion of jobs (City of Toronto, 2017). Toronto amalgamated the Regional Municipality of Toronto and its six constituent municipalities in 1998 (Eavis, 2013; Lehrer & Wieditz, 2009). As a result, the planning legislation that focused on Toronto's economic strategy had to be reformed. The first step was the intensification of private sector development into areas that could accommodate growth (Lehrer & Wieditz, 2009).

There have been examples of both successful and controversial examples of employment land conversions in Toronto since the 1960's. The studio district, east of the Toronto's downtown, provides an example of a move in the 1990's that was opposed by the public and led to the preservation of employment lands (Lehrer & Wieditz, 2009). The Rose Corporation sought to convert employment lands into a *Mixed-Use Area* (Akash, 2015). This case eventually went to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) as a result of Council's failure to act and make a decision (Akash, 2015). SmartCentre's purchased half of the Rose Corporations land in 2006 with the idea to the first Wal-Mart in the Downtown region (Lehrer & Wieditz, 2009). Public backlash ensued uniting academics, councillors and and grassroot associations like the East Toronto Community Coalition against the conversion of the Film Studio's lands (Lehrer

& Wieditz, 2009). The City had to take an uncomfortable position at the OMB, where they understood the cultural value of the Film Studio land but opposed community interests in favour of redeveloping the studio lands for job growth (Lehrer & Wieditz, 2009). The Toronto Studio District example is a prime example of public opposition to employment land conversions that can lead to a politically hot potato that harms both community groups and the City Planning Staff's reputations.

Another example of an employment conversion application was in the King and Spadina Area. Historically this area was a major industrial and manufacturing district. As the manufacturing sector declined and the onset of the economic recession hit in the 1990's, King and Spadina experienced further manufacturing decline (Eavis, 2013). In 1996, the City decided to designate the King and Spadina region to a *Regeneration Area* which permitted more uses and attracted investment almost immediately (Eavis, 2013). The resulting outcomes of the planning and zoning changes has led to construction of 50,000 housing units along with high employment activity at 18 percent since 1996 increased which was five points above the City average (Greenberg, 2017). This example illustrates how an employment land conversion can have positive population and job growth outputs.

4.1 Importance of Employment Lands

Employment Areas are a significant part of Toronto's economic base. Toronto's employment lands contain 30 percent of all jobs in the City (City of Toronto, 2017). *Employment Areas* contribute to 27 percent of the City's non-residential assessment and support many municipal services, *Figure 1* (City of Toronto, 2013). The City

generates higher property tax revenue from industrial lands than it does from residential, or commercial lands, *Table 1* (City of Toronto, 2017).

Table 1: City of Toronto Property Tax Information, 2017

Description	City Tax Rate (%)	Total tax Rate (%)
Residential	0.48	0.66
Residual Commercial Band 1 (Portion of assessed value below a Million)	1.20	2.34
Residual Commercial Band 2 (Proportion of Value over a Million)	1.38	2.52
Industrial	1.37	2.59

Employment lands are protected from the introduction of residential uses because of the potential for land use conflicts like the lack of buffering space and the adverse effects industry can have on sensitive land uses. Employment lands are a finite land use

commodity, once they are converted they are unlikely to be converted back (City of Toronto, 2013). Their preservation is key to maintaining Toronto's diverse economy and future job growth.

5.0 POLICY ANALYSIS

The planning policy development is a top down approach that ensures municipal policies are aligned with general provincial objectives. Municipal decision makers need to be cognizant of the revisions and updates to provincial and municipal legislation before making recommendations about the potential conversion of employment lands. The following provides context of the planning policies that need to be considered when examining employment land conversion applications in the Scarborough Urban Centre and within 500 meters of the Mimico GO Station in Etobicoke.

5.1 Provincial Policy Statement, 2014

The *Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS)* provides policy guidance for the implementation of provincial land use and development decisions. A municipalities' land use legislation is directed by the PPS in order to create efficient and resilient land use objectives through its Official Plan (PPS, 2014). The implementation of the *PPS (2014)* in relation to a planning matter must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement as per Section Three of the *Planning Act* (PPS, 2014).

Employment lands are defined in the *PPS (2014)* as “areas designated in an Official Plan for clusters and business activities including but not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, offices and associate retail and ancillary facilities” (PPS, 2014).

Employment land operators have the potential to encroach and negatively affect residential and other uses adjacent to or nearby. Section 1.2.6.1 of the *PPS (2014)* addresses land use compatibility, major facilities should be designed so the appropriate protections are provided to prevent the adverse effects such as the potential of odour, noise and other contaminants (PPS, 2014).

The *PPS (2014)* does promote Smart Growth policies as employment lands are proposed to encourage compact mixed-use development that support liveable and resilient communities (PPS, 2014). Employment land conversions can only be sought during a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) and “only where it has been demonstrated that the land is not required for employment purposes over the long term and there is a need for the conversions” (PPS, 2014: 1.3.2.2). The *PPS (2014)* provides direction and framework under which employment lands conversions can proceed.

5.2 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006 & 2017)

In Toronto, planning decisions must consider the Province's *Growth Plan for the GGH (2017)*. It forecasts future growth and directs how this will be accommodated. By 2041, the GGH is expected to grow by 13.5 million people and 6.3 million jobs (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017). The Growth Plan is an expression and implementation strategy for Smart Growth policies. Revisions to the Growth Plan were undertaken in 2017 - they have resulted in the inclusion of higher requirements for population and employment densities in UGC's and near transit stations. *The Growth Plan for the GGH (2017)* defines UGC's as areas that will accommodate and support population and employment growth. Growth will be targeted in areas with expanding transit networks and urban areas that can accommodate more residential density (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017).

One of the primary Growth Plan revisions that will influence Urban Growth Centres are the new density targets around transit stations (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017). These targets aim to support increased residential population and employment density near transit stations. Considering these targets involved greater residential intensification, they can be at odds with the majority of core employment designations that restricts the permission of sensitive uses that could otherwise provide greater densities (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017). Section 2.2.4 of the *Growth Plan (2017)* states that major transit areas on priority transit or subway lines will be planned for a minimum target of 200 residents and jobs combined per hectare for areas served by subways and 160 residents and jobs per hectare for those areas served by light rail transit, *Table 2* (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017). In the case that a municipality cannot reach the density objective around transit or UGC's, the municipality's council would have to

request an exemption through an MCR if development is prohibited by provincial policy (Growth Plan in the GGH, 2017).

Table 2: Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017 Targets

Growth Plan, 2017 Policy Description	Requirement (per hectare)	Another objective of the <i>Growth Plan, 2017</i> is to direct major office development towards UGC's and other areas services by transit (Growth
Intensification around Priority Transit Areas or Subway lines	Minimum 200 people and jobs	
Intensification around Areas served by Light Rail Transit	Minimum 160 people and jobs	

Plan in the GGH, 2017). *The Growth Plan in the GGH, 2017* builds on the *PPS (2014)* employment land objectives. Section 2.2.5.9 states that the conversion of employment lands to non-employment uses are only permitted through a MCR that demonstrates:

- There is a need for conversion
- The lands are not needed for future employment purposes
- The municipality has protected sufficient employment lands to accommodate future growth
- The future uses would not adversely affect the employment area or achievement of employment and density targets
- There is infrastructure developed to accommodate the new permitted uses

A key difference in the revised *Growth Plan for the GGH (2017)* is the exclusion of policy Section 2.2.6.9 which was a key rationale for why employment land conversions were rejected by City Staff in 2013. This section in the *Growth Plan for the GGH, (2006)* specifies that:

“Municipalities are encouraged to designate and preserve lands within settlement areas in the vicinity of existing or major highways interchanges, ports, railyards and airports for manufacturing, warehousing and associated retail, office and ancillary facilities, where appropriate” (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2006: 2.2.6.9).

This has been adjusted in the *Growth Plan in the GGH, 2017* to encourage complete communities by intensifying on lands that are suitably zoned for intensification and redevelopment. The following policies will be used to evaluate the employment land conversion potential of five sites in Toronto.

5.3 City of Toronto Official Plan, 2006

Toronto’s Official Plan (2006) is a blueprint for growth management and dispersion in the City. It aligns with the policy goals set out in the *PPS (2014)* and *Growth Plan (2017)*.

Under Section 2.2 future growth will be directed towards areas that are well served by transit, an existing road network and have development potential (City of Toronto OP, 2006). As the City’s population is forecasted to grow by 20 percent and employment will increase by 30 percent by 2031, it will be directed toward the *Centres* (City of Toronto, 2006). The City will direct growth to areas with compact growth, mobility hubs and areas connected to transit networks (City of Toronto OP, 2015: 2.1). Both the Etobicoke and Scarborough *Urban Centres* are indicated as important areas to accommodate future growth and development.

Employment Areas are vital to meeting Toronto’s future needs for economic development (City of Toronto OP, 2006). New development must consider and support

their economic functions by: avoiding excessive traffic, providing adequate parking standards, mitigating adverse affects including noise, vibration and odours that would be harmful to surrounding areas (City of Toronto OP, 2006). The City will protect employment districts in order to grow the City's tax base, provide a range of employment opportunities that are accessible to multiple modes of transportation and create well paid and sustainable employment for Torontonians (City of Toronto OP, 2006). The City aims to create a number of uses on employment lands to maximize economic growth but will consider new development near employment areas that will need to be buffered from sensitive uses to ensure safety to mitigate adverse affects (City of Toronto OP, 2006). According to the growth strategy, employment lands are stable places of businesses and will be protected (City of Toronto OP, 2015). Furthermore, the *City of Toronto's OP (2006)* states that new office development will be promoted in employment areas within 500 meters of existing or approved and funded subway, light rail transit or GO Stations (City of Toronto OP 3.5.1, 2015).

5.4 City of Toronto Employment Lands Strategy

The City of Toronto commenced an Official Plan review in 2011. The Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) of employment lands was initiated in 2013. The City of Toronto's City Planning Staff recommended an Official Plan Amendment that was later passed by Council in December 2013. Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 231 seeks amend Official Plan policies for economic health, employment and land use designations (City of Toronto, 2014). The key components of the OPA 231 were the maintenance and stimulation of office spaces near transit, preserving the City's existing *Employment Areas*, and accommodating the increasing growth of retail and institutional

sectors in order to serve a growing population (City of Toronto, 2013). In 2013, it was estimated that the City of Toronto would meet both its population and employment forecasts allocated by the Growth Plan for the GGH, 2006 by 2031 (City of Toronto, 2013).

5.5 Secondary Plans

The Scarborough Secondary Plan came into effect in 2013 (Scarborough Secondary Plan, 2013). Three of the sites in the following analysis are located in the Scarborough Secondary Plan. Section 4.6 states that higher densities will be encouraged on new sites adjacent to transit stations (Scarborough Secondary Plan, 2013). There are four different precincts or sections in the Scarborough Secondary Plan. Two of the sites are located in two different precincts or sections. The site at 675 Progress Avenue is located in the McCowan Precinct which states that employment uses are an important feature which are predominately office use, hotels, community services and retail (Scarborough Secondary Plan, 2013). The McCowan Precinct supports the development of mixed-use community while keeping employment uses secure (Scarborough Secondary Plan, 2013). Future residential development will incorporate a minimum of 13,000 square meters of office space at 675 Progress Avenue (Scarborough Secondary Plan, 2013). The other site, 8-10 Golden Gate Court is located inside the Brimley Precinct. This Precinct is also a mixed-use area in the Scarborough Centre that focuses on both residential and employment uses (Scarborough Secondary Plan, 2013). New residential development is targeted towards the Brimley SRT station along the corridor.

Figure 1: Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan Proposal

Source: City of Toronto, 2016

(OPA) 331 (City of Toronto, 2016). This plan is currently under appeal at the OMB, *Figure 1* (City of Toronto, 2016).

5.6 Development in Proximity to Rail Operations

There have been increasing concerns about rail safety specifically for residential uses around and proposed to be development near rail corridors. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) and Railway Association of Canada (RAC) legislated the Railway Safety Act in 2003 (City of Toronto, 2017). The Railway Safety Act was used by the City of Toronto for their interim report, Land Use study on Development in Proximity to Railways in 2017 (City of Toronto, 2017). The FCM/RCM guidelines propose that a 30-meter setback be the standard setback for new sensitive developments near rail lines as it will provide a buffer from the railways operations (City of Toronto, 2017).

The Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan was passed in 2016 and encompasses two of the sites in Etobicoke (City of Toronto, 2016). It proposed to convert the two sites from *Regeneration* to *Mixed Use Areas* through Official Plan Amendment

6.0 CASE STUDY

The following case study will examine five employment land conversion applications. Three applications are located in the Scarborough Urban Centre and two are located within two kilometers of the Etobicoke Urban Centre. The subject sites were chosen based on their geographic location, either inside the Scarborough Urban Growth Centres or within the vicinity of the Mimico GO Station. Moreover, the population densities in both the Scarborough and Etobicoke Urban Centres were significantly lower than those in the Downtown and North York Urban Centres as of 2016, *Figure 2*. The five sites were selected for this analysis because there were no employment land conversion requests in Toronto's other two other Urban Centres. Applications within 500 meters of the Mimico GO Station were selected because of the application address and access to transit. Furthermore, the Mimico GO Station is less than two kilometers from the Etobicoke Urban Centre, a region that needs more population and employment

density.

Figure 2: City of Toronto Urban Growth Centres and five site applications.

Source: Ryerson Geospatial and GIS Data, City of Toronto Urban Structure Map 2 and City of Toronto (2013) Attachment 2

In 2017, the Province of Ontario updated its density requirements in the *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH)*, (2017). One critical revision was areas within 500 meters of priority transit or subways must have 200 residents per hectare and 160 residents and jobs per hectare for areas near light

near rail transit by 2031 (Growth Plan in the GGH, 2017). *The Growth Plan's (2017)* requirement for 400 residents and jobs per hectare in *Urban Centres* remained unchanged in the recent revisions (Growth Plan in the GGH, 2017). Both the Scarborough and areas surrounding the Etobicoke UGC have current densities that are below the *Growth Plan's* requirements yet have large areas of employment lands that could be potentially converted to accommodate higher density uses.

The following analysis will evaluate City Planning Staff's recommendations to either preserve or convert the five employment lands sites requested in 2013. This paper will assess City Planning Staff's recommendations by evaluating the policies used in their descriptions, *Appendix 9.1*. Furthermore, it will consider the present-day context of these application sites as most of the planning rationales were not heard by Toronto's City Council and thus were appealed to the OMB (City of Toronto, 2013). The present-day context will examine recent developments near the application areas, updated population and employment densities, and recent planning policy updates. This analysis will aid in the formulation of recommendations for future employment land assessments in or around UGC's and near major transit nodes.

6.1 Scarborough Centre

6.1.1 1001 Ellesmere Road

Located in the Scarborough Centre, 1001 Ellesmere Road is on the southeast side of Kennedy and Ellesmere Road, *Figure 3*. The City Planning Division recommended that this site should not be converted to a *Mixed-Use Area* but instead be designated as a *General Employment Area* (City of Toronto, 2013). The building on the site is currently

vacant and was formerly a stamping plant. The subject building is surrounded by employment to the south. Immediately south of the site is an industrial building that currently has a number of tenants including: All Canadian Self-Storage, a furniture

Figure 3: 1001 Ellesmere Context Map

Source: Ryerson Geospatial Data and GIS, City of Toronto Property Data Maps, 2013.

residential neighborhoods further west. To the east of the CNR Rail Corridor is a larger *Employment Area* that is adjacent to a *Mixed-Use Area*. It was Planning Staff's sentiment that the introduction of residential uses would lead to land use incompatibilities (City of Toronto, 2013). The lands south of the subject building along Nantucket Road have outdoor operations, such as outdoor storage, that could be negatively affected by a land use conversion. Planning Staff rationalized that a *General Employment* designation would broaden the permitted uses on the site and would thus

store, Extreme Fitness and Canuck Stuff Team Uniforms. To the north is a *Mixed-Use Area* across Ellesmere Road where a nursing home is located west of the rail line. Beyond the initial *Mixed-Use Area* are additional employment lands. Ellesmere Scarborough Regional Transit (SRT) station is located less than 200 meters north-west of the site. There is a *Mixed-Use Area* to the west of the site that is surrounded by low scale

retain the existing employment land area - keeping it safe from land use incompatibles (City of Toronto, 2013). Furthermore, Planning Staff indicated that the existing and planned community facilities could support residential populations yet duly noted that the Ellesmere Road would limit access to these facilities and services (City of Toronto, 2013).

Transit development will be a critical factor in decisions concerning Scarborough employment land conversions. The future of the Scarborough SRT line was sealed when City Council approved a budget for the new Scarborough Subway Extension (SSE) (City of Toronto, February 2017). This made logistical sense as the Scarborough SRT was, and now more so, is well beyond its upgrade/renewal date. The City of Toronto has decided that the SRT line will be replaced by a one-stop subway extension connecting Kennedy Station to the Scarborough Centre at McCowan and Ellesmere Road (City of Toronto, 2017). A Transit Project Assessment Process (TRAP) is currently being performed to study the environmental conditions and impacts of this new large-scale development on residents and infrastructure (City of Toronto, 2018). SmartTrack proposes to invest in five new GO Stations in the City – One of the five is proposed to be built in Scarborough at Lawrence and Kennedy Road. (Keenan, 2017).

6.1.1.2 Recent Developments Applications

A development application is currently under review for the site south west of the site at 1296 Kennedy Road that is currently vacant. The owner is proposing to add 69 townhouse units and nine commercial units with 95 underground parking spaces. This development is located across the road in a *Mixed-Use Area adjacent* to the *Employment Area* to the east. This proposal could result in increased density in the

Scarborough Urban Centre. The addition of sensitive land uses could force industrial firms to adjust their operations to mitigate adverse effects or may force them to relocate elsewhere.

6.1.1.3 Current Context

In 2013 City Council under the recommendation of the Planning and Growth Management Committee adopted the motion to re-designate the eastern half of the subject lands to *Mixed Use Areas* but to retain the other lands as *Employment Areas* (City of Toronto, 2015). In July 2014, the Minister of Municipal Affairs of Housing issued a decision on OPA 231 following suit with Council's decision (City of Toronto, 2015). The owner appealed this decision to the OMB (City of Toronto, 2015). This decision is still before the Board.

6.1.1.4 Discussion

Smart Growth policies can encourage healthier communities that provide transportation options to reduce sprawl and congestion (Filion, 2003; Vassan, 2014). A conversion of the site at 1001 Ellesmere Road to a *Mixed-Use Area* would satisfy Smart Growth objectives such as: access to transit, intensification near transit, and the promotion of a diversity of land uses on this site. The Ellesmere SRT station is in proximity to the site; however, this station will soon be removed in favour of the Scarborough Subway Extension. Without access to transit, the introduction of a *Mixed-Use Area* could fall short of meeting Ontario's Smart Growth objectives. However, one way that the objectives could be met is through the introduction of SmartTrack which a proposed transit solution to better connect the inner suburbs with the downtown core (Keenan,

2017). One of SmartTrack's goal is to construct a new GO Station at Lawrence and Ellesmere Road, which is located within a kilometer and a half from the site (Keenan, 2017). Currently, public consultations are being undertaken for the new GO station. This would be an important development as it was reported that 28.3 percent of people in the site census tract (CT) used public transit, cycled or walked to work in 2011 (Stats Canada, 2017). It should be noted, that this was significantly higher than the average among all census tracts in Toronto of 11.8 percent suggesting that more people use transit in this area than in the rest of Toronto (Stats Canada, 2017).

The densities in the Scarborough Centre are below the average for UGC's in Toronto, *Table 2*. In 2011, densities were estimated for 2016, the population densities in the other four Urban Centres, were nearly twice as high as those in the Scarborough Centre (City of Toronto, 2017). While the population densities are low in the Scarborough Centre, the estimated employment changes from 2011 to 2016 is high compared to the other Urban Centres in the inner suburbs (City of Toronto, 2017). It can be inferred that the greatest opportunity to achieve density targets would be by increasing residential populations by either intensifying or permitting more residential development within its boundaries.

Table 3: Densities in Toronto Urban Centres in 2011 and 2016, City of Toronto Employment Survey 2017

Urban Growth Centre	2011 Density of People and Jobs Per Hectare	Estimated Population Change 2016 (Low Count)	Employment Change 2002- 2016 (%)
Etobicoke Centre	144	161	-11
Scarborough Centre	138	177	57
Average of Four Suburban Urban Centres	331	357	22.5

The ambiguous future of the Scarborough Subway Extension that will eventually make the current Ellesmere SRT Station obsolete adds another layer to this analysis. The Scarborough subway has not yet been approved but will likely have two stops, one at the existing Kennedy Station and another at McCowan and Ellesmere Roads. Despite, the subject site being located outside of the 500-meter buffer of the proposed subway station, it will still be located within the borders of the Scarborough UGC as mentioned in the applicant's rationale for the conversion of the site to a *Mixed-Use Area* (City of Toronto, 2013). The subject area is part of a larger *Employment Area* that runs further south. To the east of the site is a similar *Employment Area* strip. The land bordering Ellesmere Road between Midland and the CNR rail corridor is designated as a *Mixed-Use Area*, which would also be feasible for the portion along Ellesmere from the rail line and Kennedy Road. A conversion of the site would permit residential development in the vicinity of transit, and potential residential development. Considering this, there would have to be better access points to the community services and facilities in the area across major arterial roads.

Planning Staff argued that the site's conversion to a *Mixed-Use Area* would potentially lead to compatibility issues with the existing industrial uses on the site (City of Toronto, 2013). While this is a compelling argument, sensitive land uses already exist in proximity to the site including a nursing home and retail land uses. These sensitive land uses attract people which force industries mitigate the adverse affects of their operations such as noise, vibrations, and odour (City of Toronto, 2013). Lastly, the former *Employment Area* to the east was recently converted to a *Mixed-Use Area* in order to take advantage of the access to both transit and Ellesmere arterial road (City of Toronto, 2016). Introducing a new residential land use would be beneficial considering there are enough community facilities and services to support a higher population density. Furthermore, more economic opportunity could be supported with greater densities on the site. The linking of zoning and land use to industrial and economic strategies would be something that could benefit the economic output in the Scarborough UGC (Chapple, 2014). Although a portion of the site is designated as a *Mixed-Use Area*, an entire conversion of this site would meet the policy goals of Smart Growth, increasing density in the area, potentially intensifying and expanding the diversity of uses to curb sprawl.

6.1.2 675 Progress Road

Located east of McCowan Road on the south side of Progress Road, is 675 Progress Road, a former metal stamping plant, *Figure 4*. A proposal was submitted in 2010 to convert the employment lands on this site to *Mixed Use Areas*. The site was surrounded by *Mixed-Use Areas* in 2012. To the north were office, light industrial uses and highway 401. East of the site were light industrial and commercial uses. The McCowan SRT

Station is located to the south along with a Toronto Transit Corporation (TTC) storage facility. To the west, adjacent to the site is a five storey Royal Bank Centre and south the Bank Centre is a TTC parking lot.

Figure 4: 675 Progress Avenue Context Map

Source: Ryerson Geospatial Data and GIS, City of Toronto Property Data Maps, 2013.

adverse effects on residential populations as greater than converting the land use.

Planning staff also rationalized that the existing and proposed infrastructure could support an increase in population as the site was in proximity to the McCowan SRT

City Planning Staff recommended that the site be converted to a *Mixed-Use Area* (City of Toronto, 2013). It was noted, that it was not necessary to convert the lands to meet the 2031 growth targets, yet a number of reasons were submitted in favour of the conversion. First, the site was surrounded by *Mixed Use Areas* to the east, west and south. The location of this site within a *Mixed-Use Area* did not make sense for most of the industrial firms. The risks of combabilities with the surrounding sites could be high. Planning Staff evaluated the risks of the

station (City of Toronto, 2013). The future construction of a school (which is now complete) and the location of a park adjacent to the site, provided additional evidence in favour of a conversion.

The possible effects of an employment land conversion to other surrounding areas was determined to be minimal as the site was distanced and isolated from other *Employment Areas* (City of Toronto, 2013). Ultimately, City Staff proposed that 13,000 square meters of office space should be created along with a Feasibility Assessment (City of Toronto, 2013). Given, that there was a greater risk of keeping the site's *Employment Area* designation as opposed to converting it, Planning Staff held the view that a conversion would limit risk.

6.1.2.1 Development Applications

Three different development proposals to construct seven condominium towers and twelve townhouses have been submitted in the past year. A Draft Plan of Subdivision and Rezoning is proposed at 670, 680 and 690 Progress Avenue. The proposed condominium towers will range from 14 to 48 storeys and twelve four-storey back to back townhouse blocks for a total of 2,245 residential units (City of Toronto, 2018). The purpose of this is to create an atmosphere that will be supportive of residential development in the near future.

A Rezoning application has been approved for Phase 1 and Sub Division Application to permit a mixed-use development on the site that will include residential, office/commercial and retail (City of Toronto, 2018). The entire site is subject to a subdivision application. Buildings from 33 to 49 storeys are proposed along with a public

park (City of Toronto, 2018). The Owner previously submitted an application which is under review under OPA 331 to convert the employment lands to *Mixed Use Areas*.

City Council passed the Zoning By-law Amendment By-law for 675 Progress Avenue in 2015 to permit 1,371 units, 13,900 square meters of office space and a public park (City of Toronto, 2015). In return, the City asked for Section 37 contributions for increased height and density. The proposals that passed at Council are dependent on OPA 231 decision at the OMB which is currently appeal.

Site Plan approval is underway for *1744 Ellesmere Road* south the of the site at Ellesmere Road and Grangeway Avenue (City of Toronto, 2018). The Rezoning and Official Plan Amendment have already been approved for a new thirteen storey building which will contain 150 affordable housing units. These proposals indicate the changing atmosphere within the Scarborough Centre and more importantly in the general area of this employment site. These applications illustrate that Smart Growth objectives are being utilized in the Scarborough Urban Centre by promoting more *Mixed-Use Areas* in former *Employment Areas*.

6.1.2.2 Current Context

City Council passed the Zoning By-law Amendment By-law for 675 Progress Avenue in 2015 to permit 1,371 units, 13,900 square meters of office space and a 0.203-hectare public park (City of Toronto, 2015). In return, the City asked for Section 37 contributions for increased height and density (City of Toronto, 2015). The proposals that passed at Council are dependent on OPA 231 decision at the OMB which is currently appeal.

6.1.2.3 Discussion

The disadvantages of converting this site's *Employment Area* into a *Mixed-Use Area* are the potential decline of industry and decreased access to employment opportunities for the growing population. The introduction of residential and other sensitive land uses, such as office and retail may decrease the light industrial operations that would be permitted. Business owners may not want to invest in property where they could be forced to mitigate for adverse affects, such as noise or vibrations. Moreover, converting the site to an *Mixed-Use Area* would undermine access to Highway 401 that is less than 500 meters away from the site. This is ideal for deliveries and other operations that depend on the transport of goods or services. *Employment Areas* are ideally located near highways and rail corridors as it allows for deliveries of goods to be more accessible (Howland, 2011).

The conversion of the lands at 675 Progress Road would satisfy the increasing densities in the Scarborough Urban Centres. Smart Growth espouses policies that direct population and employment growth to UGC's. The site is located in an UGC that has strategically accrued more jobs in the past couple years but would benefit under the *Growth Plan for the GGH (2017)* targets from attracting greater population densities. The site's position within 450 meters of the McCowan SRT station would provide residential populations with good access to transit.

The Scarborough Urban Centre needs to achieve a higher population density as it has the lowest rates among UGC's (City of Toronto, 2017). An opportunity would be to permit more residential population through the conversion of *Employment Areas* and subsequent intensification. Secondly, the one-stop SSE will replace the McCowan SRT

station in the next decade (Keenan, 2017). Despite the fact that the new subway station location is not confirmed, it will be in the general vicinity of the site. In 2011, 22 percent of trips to work in the Census Tract (CT) were completed by either public transit, walking, or cycling (Stats Canada, 2016). This was eleven percent higher than the City of Toronto's average (Stats Canada, 2016). Smart Growth's policy objectives would be better achieved if sensitive land uses were permitted on this site. Given the McCowan and future SSE will be within 500 meters of the site, this site could increasingly meet Smart Growth's objectives. By converting the site to a *Mixed-Use Area*, it would allow residential populations access to transit while those driving would also have direct access to Highway 401. While, access to a highway is important for the prosperity of industrial firms, it is also a vital component that influences residential transportation patterns (Howland, 2011). The recommendation made by planning staff would meet Smart Growth's objectives of providing greater transportation options, increasing the density in the Scarborough Centre and increase the permitted uses in the area while conserving the employment uses. Nearby developments in the area would further promote Smart Growth's policy objective of greater intensification in Urban Growth Centres.

6.1.3 8-10 Golden Gate

The subject site is located within the Scarborough Centre on the west side of Brimley road and Golden Gate Court at 8 – 10 Golden Gate Court, *Figure 5*. A proposal was submitted in 2009 to convert western side of the site to a *Mixed-Use Area*. Planning Staff recommended that the site be retained as employment lands proposing a *Core Employment Area* designation. *Employment Areas* are located to the north and west of

the site. A paper mill is located north of the site and includes storage and recycling while a packaging plant is located to the west. At the time of this application, the eastern and southern borders of the site were designated *Employment Areas*. Sensitive land uses are located on the southern and western portions of the site. A place of worship is west of the site and various industrial operations are located to the south. The subject site is located between two existing SRT stops, Midland (559 meters away) and the Scarborough Centre (660 meters away) stations.

Figure 5: 8-10 Golden Gate Court Context Map

Source: Ryerson Geospatial Data and GIS, City of Toronto Property Data Maps, 2013.

the general vicinity, on and around, Golden Gate Court, specifically the existing paper mill to the north (City of Toronto, 2013). Although there is a *Mixed-Use Area* adjacent to this site, Planning Staff suggested that the employment area west of Brimley road had significant job growth from 2001 to 2011 (City of Toronto, 2013). Planning Staff

Planning staff based their recommendation on the premise that that the current supply of *Employment Areas* in Toronto is sufficient to meet the 2031 employment forecasts that were set out in the *Growth Plan, 2006* (City of Toronto, 2013). They argued that *Mixed Use Area* conversion would have negative impacts on employment lands in

rationalized that 8-10 Golden Gate Crescent was located on a cul de sac without sidewalks limiting pedestrian access. Golden Gate Court is an important and fairly isolated street that provided access to 16 industrial properties and their operations. Furthermore, they noted that there was a large volume of delivery trucks that travelled to the industrial buildings on Golden Gate Court City Staff concluded that a *Core Employment Area* designation should be implemented (City of Toronto, 2013).

6.1.3.1 Development Applications:

There is one development application in proximity to the site. The site is south of 8-10 Golden Gate Court on the northeast side Brimley and Ellesmere Road, 1560 Brimley Road. The proposed Rezoning Amendment and Site Plan approval are under review (City of Toronto, 2018). A 15-storey mixed use residential building that has retail at grade is proposed. It will contain 262 residential units and 256 parking spots (City of Toronto, 2018). Although only one building is currently proposed it illustrates that more residential development could be existent in the Scarborough Urban Centre as it is an area that should accommodate greater population densities.

6.1.3.2 Current Context

As of 2018, this area is still designated as an *Employment Area* in Toronto's Official Plan.

6.1.3.3 Discussion

The implementation or approval of an employment land conversion on this site would be support Smart Growth's objectives. Implementing Smart Growth policies would be instrumental in increasing the density of the site and Scarborough Urban Centre,

creating a diversity of land uses and intensifying the lands at 8-10 Golden Gate Court. The disadvantage of converting the site to a *Mixed-Use Area* would be more congestion in an employment area and the cost of enhancing residential streets for pedestrian use. The site is located on a cul de sac that is isolated from other areas. Limited pedestrian access in *Employment Areas* can provide trucks with access to the site and provides industrial businesses the liberty to operate heavy machinery without having to modify their operations (City of Toronto, 2013). A conversion may affect the industry in the area and negatively impact some of the businesses, however, there is an opportunity to expand the permitted land uses on the site at Golden Gate Court. Once the Scarborough Subway Extension is constructed and the Midland and McCowan SRT stations are obsolete, transit access within 500 meters of the site will be lost. Lastly, there are no sidewalks on Golden Gate Court. If a conversion is approved, the roads would have to be repurposed to accommodate residential populations.

Forest Paper Mill is north of the site on an elevated piece of land above the industrial properties on Golden Gate Court. Planning staff indicated that the Paper Mill and operations may have adverse effects on future residential populations in their Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). As the SRT line will soon be non-operational it could act as a buffer mitigating the adverse effects of the Paper Mill, if residential uses were introduced. Noise, odour and vibrations from the industrial firms could be mitigated by constructing a wall along this property.

The subject site is located in the Scarborough Urban Centre which has densities below the *Growth Plan for the GGH (2017)* targets. To achieve these targets more residential developments will need to be built in the Scarborough Urban Centre. Most of the lands

in the Scarborough Centre are currently designated as a *Mixed-Use Area*, while the subject site also located in this Centre is an *Employment Area*. A conversion of the site would have little impact on the surrounding *Employment Area* to the north and west as the site is located on a cul de sac that is isolated. A temple and larger park would provide a buffer between a newly designated *Mixed-Use Area* and the surrounding *Employment Areas* to the west.

A mix of uses could be beneficial as business would be better served by increases in population. There are two 51 and 43 storey condominiums that have been in proximity to the site since the 1990's. The Omni Condos are on the east side of Kennedy and Golden Gate Court adjacent to the site. These two condos at 115 -117 Omni Drive provide evidence that residential uses have not been negatively impacted by the industrial operations across the street on Golden Gate Crt. Furthermore, it shows that residential development can coexist in close relation to this *Employment Area*.

There is an opportunity for this site to better meet Smart Growth's objectives. The conversion of the site would allow for more residential development, thus increasing the densities on the site. Intensification would aid Scarborough Centre in meeting its Growth Plan density requirements. Access to transit may be nonexistent in a couple of years. However, bus service is frequent along Brimley Road and the new SSE would potentially be in the vicinity allowing residential populations access. Currently, this site is an isolated industrial site that has fallen short of implementing Smart Growth objectives. Moreover, urban environments play a large role in economic growth and competition (Blais, 2015). A conversion could leverage the businesses in the area by increasing the population density on the site and therefore could increase employment opportunities.

The lands at Golden Gate Court should be converted to a *Mixed-Use Area* to meet the Growth Plan, 2017 density requirements and abide by Toronto's Official Plan guidelines for UGC's.

6.2 Mimico GO Station

6.2.1 29, 49, 53-55, 69-71 & 75 Judson Street

The City Councillor of Ward 6 proposed that the properties at 29, 49, 53-55, 69-71 & 75 along Judson Road between Royal York and Islington Roads be reviewed in 2012, (City of Toronto, 2013). Planning staff recommended that the sites along Judson Street be designated as *Core Employment Lands* (City of Toronto, 2013). The subject sites are surrounded by a *Neighborhood Area* comprised of low rise residential uses to the north, the Mimico GO Station and a new condominium development to the east of Royal York Road. South of the site is the Metrolinx Lakeshore West/VIA rail corridor. Further south is an *Employment Areas* that comprises a GO Transit and Via Rail storage and maintenance facility. West of the site is another *Employment Area* and GO/VIA Transit facilities.

Planning Staff recommended that this whole site be designated as a *Core Employment Area* with Site-Specific policy to reflect the need for compatibility with the surrounding employment lands (City of Toronto, 2013). The site abuts important employment uses, such as the Willowbrooke GO Transit and a VIA Rail maintenance facility that would be negatively impacted by the introduction of sensitive land uses (City of Toronto, 2013).

The required railway setbacks of 30 meters from the CNR rail corridor would consume over half of the sites area at 29 Judson Street (CMF, 2013). This is a constraint and would limit the development potential on this site.

6.2.1.1 Development Applications:

A development application at 49, 53 and 55 Judson Street for Rezoning, an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Site Plan approval was submitted in 2017 (City of Toronto, 2017). The applicant is proposing to build 72 four-storey townhouses and a three-storey commercial building with 24 units on the south side of Judson Street (City of Toronto, 2017).

6.2.1.2 Current Context

After the Municipal Comprehensive Review was initiated, Council approved OPA 231 in 2014. One of the stipulations under OPA 231 is that the lands along Judson Street would be converted to *Regeneration Areas* (City of Toronto, 2014). The sites are currently under appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board under Official Plan Amendment 331 of the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan. Official Plan Amendment 331 proposes to convert the sites to a *Mixed-Use Area*, if approved.

6.2.1.3 Discussion

Land Use compatibility issues would be evident on this site with the introduction of sensitive land uses. Recommended setbacks under The Railway Safety Act would restrict redevelopment unless a Zoning By-law Amendment was approved (City of Toronto & IBI, 2017). Residential or sensitive land uses should be at least 30-meters away from a rail corridor (Mimico-Judson Urban Design Guidelines, 2016). The site at

29 Judson Street is ten meters away from the CNR rail corridor. Furthermore, Planning staff opined that the Willowbrooke Rail Yard operations needs to be protected as it provides over 500 jobs (Mimico-Judson Design Guidelines, 2016). Planning Staff undertook consultations with business and property owners of the Judson sites in preparation of converting the lands from *Employment* to *Regeneration Areas*. A key constraint listed in the public consultations was the inability for trucks to service the site (City of Toronto, 2013). During the consultations, property owners posed that delivery vehicles has difficulties servicing the area and access to the Gardiner Expressway acted as a constraint inhibiting the movement of goods (City of Toronto, 2013).

The Judson sites were located in *Employment Areas* in 2012. *Neighborhoods* are categorized as low rise residential areas are located north across the street along Judson Street (City of Toronto, 2013). Industrial firms thus have to had to be cognizant and mitigate any adverse affects on this section of the population. Judson Street is a small road that does not have the width of an arterial road. Moreover, industrial firms are located closed to the road on the south side forcing industrial firms to also be aware of the adverse affects that can impact nearby residential populations.

The *Employment Area* that is comprised of the Judson sites is on a parcel that is smaller than the larger *Employment Area* located south of the CNR rail corridor. Converting these lands would not have a lasting influence on the employment jobs available in Etobicoke as a larger portion of employment lands are located south of the rail line and buffered by Royal York Road -- an arterial road separating the uses safely.

The conversion of the employment lands on Judson Street would align with Smart Growth objectives as residential uses would be located with a 500-meter buffer of the

Mimico GO Station. It would further allow for intensification on the site. Residential development could be permitted along with the existing employment uses such as the maintenance and storage facilities. Efficient development would have the potential of lowering infrastructure and service costs (Blais, 2015). Lower utility rates, user fees and property taxes would be the result of compact mixed use efficient development with the introduction of residential development on the site (Blais, 2015). This decision to convert these lands to include residential uses would optimize the density targets set by the *Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017* of 200 people and jobs per hectare near GO Stations (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017).

6.2.2 Mimico GO Triangle

In 2012, the Councillor of Ward 6 motioned that the employment lands in the Mimico Go Triangle should be reviewed during the Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) Process. During the MCR process, City Planning Staff recommended that these lands be retained as *General Employment Areas*. The Mimico GO Triangle is bounded by Windsor Street to the west, Portland Street to the north, Grand Avenue to the West and the CNR track to the South, *Figure 8*. To the north there is a small scale two-storey semi-detached dwelling in a *Neighborhood Area*. Directly south of the site, bounded by Royal York Road are apartments on the corner. The height of the buildings decreases southwest of the site to smaller scale residential semi-detached dwellings. West of the site is parkland and an *Apartment Neighborhood Area* to the northwest. To the east, is a large *Employment Area* surrounded by residential uses both on the north and south side of the site.

Planning Staff recommended that the site be converted to a *Core Employment Area* and contain site specific policies. They argued that these lands were separated from the larger Employment Area west of Royal York, however, contained a significant portion of employees (228) and establishments (35) (City of Toronto, 2013).

Figure 6: Mimico GO Triangle and Judson Sites

Source: Source: Ryerson Geospatial Data and GIS, City of Toronto Property Data Maps, 2013.

rationalized that Council's decision to designate the Triangle as a *Regeneration Area* would lead to land use incompatibilities with the existing *Employment Area*. The introduction of sensitive land uses could potentially interfere with core employment uses in the interior of the site and could possibly force businesses to relocate (City of

Planning staff stated that land uses in the Triangle had expanded in the past few decades, to incorporate more than just food production and light manufacturing (City of Toronto, 2013). Consultations were undertaken with landowners within the Triangle, who revealed that *Mixed-Use Area's* designations would be beneficial to business growth and the reinvestment in the properties building stock (City of Toronto, 2013). Planning staff

Toronto, 2013). Also, new buildings would have to be constructed to meet the employment numbers on these lands. VIA Rail has a long-term lease on the Willowbrooke rail yard and are concerned about noise complaints with the introduction of residential uses on the site (IBI, 2017). Furthermore, VIA is considering an eventual electrification of the rail line, however it does not own the rail corridor (IBI, 2017). Therefore, this may be negotiated with the rail corridor owners in the future (IBI, 2017).

Lastly, two additional barriers were addressed, the required rail setbacks and appropriate building height transitions from the established low-scale residential community to the north (City of Toronto, 2013). Planning Staff recommended that the General Manager of Economic Development and Cultural Division in consultation with the Chief Planner undertake a Revitalization Study to encourage growth and greater use of the Mimico GO Triangle (City of Toronto, 2013).

6.2.2.1 Current Context

Under OPA 231, Council approved the site as a *Regeneration Area*. As a result of this designation, Council undertook a Secondary Plan and Guidelines in 2013 (City of Toronto, 2016). The Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan was adopted by Council in 2016 (City of Toronto, 2018). Additional amendments are required under OPA 331 to implement the entirety of the secondary plan. One of the amendments is to convert the *Regeneration Areas* to *Mixed Use Areas* (City of Toronto, 2016).

6.2.2.2 Development Applications

In 2016, the City approved a Site Plan to permit the construction of a 27-storey condominium at 23 Buckingham Street, called On-The-GO Mimico (Quesada, 2017).

This site is located on the eastern part of the Mimico Triangle in former Employment Area. It will consist of 242 units and will have 554-underground parking spaces (Quesada, 2017). On-the-GO Mimico is currently under construction.

Further west past the Mimico GO triangle, three condominiums are proposed to be built on the south west side of Windsor and Newcastle Street at 39 Newcastle Street. The proposal includes the construction of two towers at 28 and 30 storeys in height respectively (Dunpar, 2017). The Rezoning and Official Plan Amendments are currently under review. The developments in the area illustrate the increase in residential development and possible intensification that are occurring around the Mimico GO Station. Residential intensification near transit stations has been a policy goal that the Province has been targeting. Thus, with the introduction of the residential uses the *Regeneration Area* should be converted to a *Mixed-Use Area*.

6.2.2.3 Discussion

The site allows for access to the Gardiner Expressway which is an important criterion for *Employment Areas*. However, there is poor access to the Gardiner Expressway which impedes access to the site (City of Toronto, 2013). According to *Growth Plan for the GGH, 2006* policy 2.2.6.9 municipalities are encouraged to designate and preserve employment lands in the vicinity of highway interchanges, ports, rail yards, and airports as areas for manufacturing warehousing and associated retail, office and ancillary facilities, where appropriate (Growth Plan for the GGH, 2006).

The recommended rail setbacks of 30 meters from the CRN rail corridor would be a major constraint limiting residential development. Furthermore, a transition of height

would be required from the low rise residential *Neighborhood Area* to the north of Portland Road (City of Toronto OP, 2015). New developments would be inhibited by this transition in height unless an amendment was approved.

The site is already exposed to residential uses to the north and west sides. Portland Street acts as a buffer between the employment lands and residential area to the north. In order to permit residential uses on the site there would have to be buffers mitigating the adverse effects that employment industries may have on residential populations. The edge of the western portion of the site along Royal York contains semi-detached two storey dwellings. Planning Staff's compatibility argument is hard to digest as there are residential single storey dwellings along Royal York Road inside the Triangle. The only buffer that provides a transition from this residential pocket to the larger *Employment Area* to the east are residential backyards. Furthermore, this is not an ideal location for an *Employment Area* as operations are often affected by the sites location to residential development, especially *Core Employment Areas*. The transition could be met by building mid-rise condominiums close to the residential neighborhoods or developing larger condominiums closer to the rail corridor.

This site should be converted to a *Mixed-Use Area* to permit residential uses. Smart Growth objectives would be served by a conversion as the Triangle is meters away from the Mimico GO Station, it has residential uses already surrounding the site, and would provide a diverse array of uses for people living nearby. Many industries, businesses and finance firms tend to locate in a dense, mixed-use accessible urban areas, such as Downtown Toronto (Blais, 2015). By permitting such Smart Growth objectives, this area

could intensify and attract skilled workers by adding more office and residential land uses which would add to the density in the Etobicoke UGC.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

Smart Growth objectives have been introduced into provincial and municipal planning policy. However, the five sites examined lacked the implementation of these Smart Growth objectives. There is a need to preserve large pockets of employment land areas, yet smaller areas that are isolated from these larger pockets should be considered for conversions that permit residential development. Smart Growth policy objectives can act as a tool to guide employment land conversion applications in areas that are located within 500 meters of transit stations or in UGC's.

Furthermore, Smart Growth policies apply a lens which magnify the importance of market conditions, and other factors that supplement growth in Urban Growth Centres and/or within 500 meters of existing and future transit stations. The Province has invested in public transportation to ensure that they can achieve greater intensification and minimize sprawl (Blais, 2015). Although each site has its own specific considerations, it can be argued that generally, lands near transit stations should be converted unless factors such as railway setbacks and/or compatibility issues would negatively affect the land uses.

Property owners are generally interested in achieving the highest and best use on their lands to maximizing a return on investment. Two out of the three rationales utilized Smart Growth language in their applications, while the other two applications could not be obtained (City of Toronto, 2013). City of Toronto Planners were concerned with the

employment land stock as it provided a substantial part of Toronto's economic output and revenues to the City through property taxes in 2013 (City of Toronto, 2013; City of Toronto, 2018). A key policy that was illustrated in all the applications was that the existing supply of *Employment Areas* is sufficient to meet the employment forecasts under the *Growth Plan for the GGH, 2006*, however multiple conversions may affect this outcome (City of Toronto, 2013). Five conversion recommendations on sites that are isolated from large employment pockets would have little influence on the larger *Employment Area* inventory. Therefore, based on the research, growth can and should be targeted on underutilized and vacant employment lands near UGC's - especially in smaller pockets that would not affect larger employment areas. The following recommendations will provide insights into the key factors that Planning Staff and property owners should consider before submitting employment land conversion applications and when making recommendations for either the preservation or conversions of employment lands near transit stations and/or within the UGC's.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been generally argued throughout the paper that employment lands should be converted in Urban Growth Centres or within 500 meters of transit stations. An analysis of the City of Toronto's Planning Staff's recommendations and applicant rationales has indicated that Smart Growth is mentioned but not a sole focus in conversion applications. The following recommendations could be utilized under the next Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR):

1. *Sites with Employment Area designations located either in Urban Centres and/or within 500 Meters of Transit Stations should prioritize and consider Smart Growth objectives when considering an employment land conversion.*

Planning Staff assessing employment land sites located in UGC's or within 500 meters of transit should prioritize Smart Growth objectives in their recommendations. Smart Growth policies objectives of intensification, access to transit and diversifying land uses should play a large role in conversion decisions. Smart Growth objectives are required in provincial and municipal planning policy, however they have yet to be completely realized and implemented in practice on the five sites examined. UGC's can accommodate greater population densities and should be inclusive of all land uses not isolated ones. Furthermore, sites within the 500 meter buffer of transit stations can include residential and office uses as this would optimize transportation access.

The limitations of these suggestions would be site specific policies. Sites located near rail lines would require studies and possible buffers before conversion recommendations are made. Furthermore, the existing industrial uses on a site are important to consider. For example, if a site contains a Maintenance and Storage Facility that backs onto the road, it would be difficult to mitigate the effects that it would have on a residential population and vice versa.

2. *Compatibility with the Surrounding Area*

Compatibility was a central argument that was utilized in City Planning Staff's recommendations for preserving employment lands on four of the five sites. Smart Growth objectives are often at odds with compatibility arguments. Sites

with a mix of land uses is a primary Smart Growth objective as it is efficient from a population and economic standpoint (Blais, 2015). A diversity of land uses allows for increased employment growth and provides access to different types of employment, residential and recreational spaces geographically located in one area.

Planning staff examined whether the introduction of Mixed Use Areas would be compatible with the existing land uses and argued that they had to be consistent and not have adverse affects on one another. For example, if a small *Employment Area* is surrounded by *Mixed-Use Areas* it should be converted, as in 1001 Ellesmere (City of Toronto, 2013). Yet, if an *Employment Area* surrounds a site and residential uses are introduced, this could have adverse impacts on the employment uses forcing them to relocate.

3. *Increasing Population Density and Intensifying*

The revisions in *Growth Plan for the GGH, 2017* call for increased density around transit stations and held the same requirements for UGC's. Smart Growth aims to intensify in areas that can accommodate growth. The Scarborough Urban Centre and sites in proximity to the Mimico GO Station have not met these targets. The *Employment Area* designation may limit opportunities for land uses that yield higher densities.

4. *The Inclusion of Market Considerations*

As there is a high demand for housing near Urban Centres and/or transit stations, market considerations need to be considered. The development industry can make a return and thus play a role in increasing density, access to

transit and creating diverse developments where people can live, work, and play. There is no shortage of residential development in Toronto. Land use planning needs to be completed in conjunction with economic development strategies to create new synergies (Chapple, 2014; Filon, 2003). Urban Growth Centres and buffered areas near transit stations are targets for increased intensification. Municipal decision makers need to acknowledge and internalize these targets in their Official Plans in the near future. In the case that development would start to wane, the conversion of employment lands could be a viable option to provide more residential supply or additional office spaces needed outside of the downtown core.

9.0 APPENDIX

9.1 City Staff Recommendation Application Matrix

Application Address	Site Intersection	Distance from Urban Centre/Transit Station	Existing Official Plan Designation and Zoning By-law	Proposed Official Plan Designation	City Planning Division Rationale and Recommendation
1001 Ellesmere Road	Kennedy Rd and Ellesmere Rd	Located 198.7 meters from the Ellesmere SRT Station	OP: Employment District Former Scarborough By-law 24982 zones the property as Industrial (M)	Mixed Use Area Conversion. A Site-Specific Policy was requested to permit employment uses.	There is no need to convert the following lands to meet the 2031 Provincial population forecast in Toronto according to the Growth Plan for the GGH (2006). Concern about the liability new residential buildings would create for the existing employment and warehousing currently on the site. The area should be designated as a <i>General Employment</i> to allow for a range of uses but still residential would not be permitted. City Council ruled that the eastern half of the lands should be designated as Mixed-Use Areas.
675 Progress Ave	McCowan Rd and Progress Ave	In Scarborough Centre inside site specific policy area number 9 Located 450 meters from McGowan SRT station.	OP: Employment District Scarborough by-law industrial	Mixed-Use Area	There is no need to convert the following lands to meet the 2031 Provincial population forecast in Toronto according to the Growth Plan for the GGH (2006). The site be redeveloped to include residential and employment uses based on policies such as the <i>Growth Plan for the GGH (2006)</i> , <i>Provincial Policy Statement (2014)</i> , and

					<p><i>the City of Toronto's Official Plan (2006).</i></p> <p>The site is located at a distance from larger <i>Employment Areas</i>. A conversion would not have a negative affect in the general area.</p>
8-10 Golden Gate Court	Brimley Rd and Golden Gate Crt	<p>Inside the Scarborough Urban Centre.</p> <p>Located 550 metres from the Midland SRT Station</p>	<p>OP: Employment District</p> <p>Scarborough By-law: Industrial (M)</p>	Mixed Use Area. To include employment lands in the Scarborough Secondary Plan to allow for residential and other sensitive uses to be developed on the site.	<p>The site should be retained as a <i>Core Employment Area</i>.</p> <p>The site is located in a well-established employment area. There is a mixed-use area to the west of the site that can be expanded for development. However, the area west of Brimley where the site is located is expanding the number of jobs and should not be converted.</p>
29, 49, 53-55, 69-71 & 75 Judson Street	Judson and Royal York Road	29 Judson: Located 302.06 meters away from the Mimico GO Station	<p>OP: Employment district</p> <p>Former Etobicoke ZBL IC.2 Zoning By-law 569-2013 is currently under appeal and zones the property E1.0 (x54) to a maximum 1.0 times density.</p> <p>Zoning By-law 339-2012 will prevail in a circumstance of conflict.</p>	Multiple property Owners have requested that a land review be undertaken within the context of an MCR	<p>The site should be designated as a <i>Core Employment Area</i>.</p> <p>There is no need to convert the following lands to meet the 2031 Provincial population forecast in Toronto.</p> <p>The introduction of sensitive land uses on the site would impact essential public transportation and employment uses because of the noise and vibration. The Willowbrook GO Train Maintenance Facility is located here and could be expanded along with a VIA Rail maintenance facility.</p> <p>City Council voted to re-designate this to a</p>

					Regeneration Area (this did not pass)
Mimico GO Triangle	Lands bounded by Royal York Road – Portland Street – Grande Avenue – the CNR Rail Corridor	Located 20 meters meters from the southern tip of the site	OP: Employment Area Former Etobicoke By-law IC.1 By-law 569-2013 zone the lands as E1.0 Employment Industrial	Multiple property Owners have requested that a land review be undertaken within the context of an MCR to designate the lands as a <i>Regeneration</i> or <i>Mixed-Use</i> Area.	<p>The site be retained as <i>Core Employment Area</i>.</p> <p>There is no need to convert the following lands to meet the 2031 Provincial population forecast in Toronto according to the Growth Plan for the GGH (2006).</p> <p>They had reviewed designating the lands to <i>Regeneration Areas</i>, however this would lead to compatibility conflicts with the existing industry and the proposed residential uses. Employment firms could thus be displaced and would not be able to be replaced as there are no office uses on the site.</p> <p>The rail setbacks and height transitions would limit redevelopment on the site.</p> <p>Site and Area specific policies should be introduced for computability and to allow for retail and small-scale restaurants to take advantage of the Mimico GO Station.</p>

Source: City of Toronto, 2013

9.2 Owner and Representative Planning Rationale

Property	Communications	Planning Justification for Conversions	Leveraging Smart Growth Policies
675 Progress Ave	Solicitor: Aird & Berlis LLP, Kim M. Kovar	<p>Ultimately supported City Staff's recommendation to make this a mixed-use site while retaining employment uses including office floor area.</p> <p>The Property owners wanted to amend the minimum square meters of office space required in Phase 1 from 13,000 to 6,500 meters squared.</p>	Yes
1001 Ellesmere Rd	Solicitor: Dentons Canada LLP, Jason Park	<p>City Staff's recommendation to designate the lands as <i>General Employment</i> is inappropriate as they are in close proximity to transit, the Ellesmere SRT station.</p> <p>The employment lands are in proximity to residential uses such as 1051 Ellesmere and finally the site's proximity to two arterial roads, Ellesmere and Kennedy roads.</p>	Yes
29, Judson Street	Solicitor: Davies Howe Partners LLP, John Alati	<p>The prohibition of concrete batching use on the site does not represent good planning.</p> <p>Other sites allow the use to be permissible until the existing use ceases, which then allows for <i>Mixed Use Areas</i> to be permitted (City of Toronto, 2013).</p>	No

Source: City of Toronto Attachment 2, 2013

10.0 REFERENCES

Akash, Halal. (2015). Disturbing the Balance: Exploring the Implications of Employment Land Conversion in Toronto. York University Master Thesis. 1-62.

Blais, Pamela. (2015). Planning for Prosperity. Neptis Foundation. Retrieved from:
http://www.neptis.org/sites/default/files/planning4prosperity/p4p_neptis_report_nov19_2015.pdf

Chapple, Karen. (2014). The Highest and Best Use? Urban Industrial Land and Job Creation. Economic Development Quarterly Vol 28(4). 300-313.

City of Toronto. (2006). Long Term Strategy for Retaining Employment Lands and Stimulating New Investment and Job Creation. Economic Development and Toronto Economic Development. Retrieved from:
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2006/agendas/committees/edp/edp060504/it010.pdf>

City Council. (2013). Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Reviews: Amendments to the Official Plan for Economic Health and Employment Lands Policies and Designations and Recommendations on Conversion Requests. Retrieved from:
<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2013.PG28.2>

City of Toronto. (2013). Attachment 2: Final Assessment of Requests To Convert Employment Lands. Retrieved from:
<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2013/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-63575.pdf>

City of Toronto. (2016). Toronto Employment Survey. Retrieved from:
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-99543.pdf>

City of Toronto. (2017). Interim Report: Land Use Study Developments in Proximity to Rail Operations. Prepared by IBI Group. 1-29. Retrieved from:

https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/979a-City_Wide_Land_Use_Study_Main_Report_08302017.pdf

City of Toronto. (2017). Next Steps on the Scarborough Subway Extension. Staff Report. Retrieved from:

<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-101444.pdf>

City of Toronto. (2017). Profile Toronto: How Does the City Grow. Retrieved from:

<https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/9773-How-Does-the-City-Grow-April-2017.pdf>

City of Toronto. (2017). 49, 53, 55 Judson Street: Official Plan and Zoning Amendment Applications – Request for Direction. Retrieved from:

<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/cc/bgrd/backgroundfile-109543.pdf>

City of Toronto. (2018). Development Applications: 1560 Brimley Road Ward 37.

Retrieved from:

<http://app.toronto.ca/DevelopmentApplications/associatedApplicationsList.do?action=init&folderRsn=4274677&isCofASearch=false&isTlabSearch=false>

City of Toronto. (2018). 670, 680, 690 Progress Avenue – Zoning Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications Preliminary Report. Retrieved from:

<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2018/sc/bgrd/backgroundfile-112387.pdf>

City of Toronto. (2018). 2017 Property Tax Rates and Fees. Retrieved from:
<https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/property-taxes-utilities/property-tax/property-tax-rates-and-fees/2017-property-tax-rates/>

City of Toronto. (2015). City of Toronto Official Plan: Chapters 1-5. Retrieved from:
<https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/official-plan-guidelines/official-plan/>

City of Toronto. (2017). Next Steps on the Scarborough Subway Extension. Staff Report. Retrieved from:
<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-101444.pdf>

Cogliano, David. (2014). Punching Out: Exploring Justifications for Employment Land Conversions in the GTA. Ryerson University: Master of Planning Major Research Paper. Retrieved from:

Downs, Anthony. (2005). Smart Growth: Why we discuss It More Than We Do It. Journal of the American Planning Association. 71:4, 376-378.

Dunpar Associates. (2017). Planning Rationale for 39 Newcastle Street. Retrieved from:
<http://app.toronto.ca/DevelopmentApplications/viewSupportingDocs.do?action=viewSupportingDocPdf&attachmentRsn=6074885>

Eavis, Melissa. (2013). Unbalance Growth in Downtown Toronto: Maintaining Employment Uses in Toronto's Core. Ryerson University: Masters of Planning Major Research Paper. Retrieved from:
<http://digital.library.ryerson.ca/islandora/object/RULA:2118/datastream/OBJ/download/U>

[Unbalanced Growth in Downtown Toronto Maintaining Employment Uses in Toronto's Downtown Core.pdf](#)

Filion, Pierre. (2003). Towards Smart Growth? The Difficult Implementation of Alternatives to Urban Dispersion. Canadian Journal of Urban Research. Winnipeg: Vol 12:1. 48 -70.

Greenberg, Ken. (2017). More than a desk and a parking spot: Tapping into the Region's Employment lands. Ryerson City Building Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.citybuildinginstitute.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/FINAL-POLICY-PAPER-Greenberg-5Dec17-3pm.pdf>

Hoelzel, Nathanael Z., Leigh, Nancey Green. (2013). Sustainable Cities Need Industrial Land." Journal of American Planning, 78:1. 87-103.

Howland, Marie. (2011). Planning for Industry in a Post-Industrial World. Journal of the American Planning Association, 77 (1). IL: Chicago. 39-53.

Kaza, Nikhil., Kirk, Sarah., Lester, Thomas K. (2013). Making Room for Manufacturing. Journal of the American Planning Association. Vol 79 (4). Chicago: 295-313.

Keenan, Edward. (2017). Here's to make the Lawrence East SmartTrack station a success: Keenan. Toronto Star. Retrieved from: <https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2017/10/17/heres-how-to-make-the-lawrence-east-smarttrack-station-a-success-keenan.html>

Lehrer, Ute., & Wieditz, Thorben. (2009). Gentrification and the Loss of Employment Lands: Toronto's studio district. Critical Planning. 139 – 161. Retrieved from:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ute_Lehrer/publication/304627852_Gentrification_and_the_Loss_of_Employment_Lands_Toronto%27s_Studio_District/links/5a52ed47aca2725638c7b8f9/Gentrification-and-the-Loss-of-Employment-Lands-Torontos-Studio-District.pdf

Malone Given Parsons LTD. (2012). Sustainable Competitive Advantage & prosperity – Planning for Employment Uses in the City of Toronto Executive Summary. In Association with Cushman and Wakefield. Retrieved from: https://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/sipa/files/pdf/sustainable_competitive_advantage_and_prosperity.pdf

Metro Vancouver. (2013). Summary Report: Opportunities for the Intensive Use of Industrial Land. 1- 27. Retrieved from: <http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/OpportunitiesForIndustrialLandsIntensification-Feb2013RevisedFinalTitle.pdf>

Quesada, Jorge. (2017). Multi-tower Development Proposed in Mimico- Judson Triangle. Urban Toronto. Retrieved from: <http://urbantoronto.ca/news/2017/11/multi-tower-development-proposed-mimico-judson-triangle>

Province of Ontario. (2014). Provincial Policy Statement.

Province of Ontario. (2006). Places to Grow: Better Choices, Brighter Future Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Province of Ontario. (2017). Places to Grow: Better Choices, Brighter Future Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Stats Canada. (2016). Toronto – Percentage of the Employment Labour Force Using Public Transit, Walking or bicycling to get to work in 2011 by 2011 Census Tract.

Retried from: http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/map-carte/thematic_download-thematiques_telecharger-eng.cfm?SERIES=9&GEOCODE=535

Toronto Transit Commission. (2018). About the Scarborough Subway Extension: Current Work. City of Toronto. <http://www.scarboroughsubwayextension.ca/current-work.html>

Town of Milton. (2016). Employment Lands Needs Assessment Phase 1 Report.

Watson and Associates. <https://www.milton.ca/en/build/resources/Appendix-2DRAFT-Milton-Employment-LNA-Phase-2-Report-REVISED-Oct-14.pdf>

Urban Toronto. (2017). City, Metrolinx Reveal Early Plans for 6 SmartTrack Stations.

Retrieved from: <http://urbantoronto.ca/news/2017/10/city-metrolinx-reveal-early-plans-6-smarttrack-stations>

Vassan, Paramvir Singh. (2014). Background Paper on Smart Growth. Prepared for the Ontario Smart Growth Network. 1 – 42. Retrieved from: http://www.ohcc-ccso.ca/en/webfm_send/624

White, Richard. (2016). Planning Toronto: The Planners, The Plans, Their Legacies, 1940 – 1980. Vancouver: UBC Press.