

MINUTES



LAKEVIEW LOCAL ADVISORY PANEL

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA

www.mississauga.ca/lakeviewportcreditreview

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2011

LAKEVIEW GOLF COURSE
(1190 Dixie Road)

Members Present

Jim Tovey, Chair
Lucy Cameron, Recording Secretary
Junie Ang
Alex Banks
Professor John Danahy
Jim Judge
John McKenna
Jamie Pugh
Raya Shadursky

Members Absent

Charles Sousa, MPP
Andre Lill
Bill Logar
Mark Tutton

Staff Present

Susan Tanabe, Manager, Community Planning, Policy Division
Karin Phuong, Planner, Community Planning, Policy Division
Sharon Mittmann, Development and Design
Ray Poitras, Development and Design, Manager South
John Hardcastle, Development and Design

1. Introductions

Councillor Jim Tovey welcomed the group

2. Infill Housing

- a. Staff noted the following regarding the two school sites in Lakeview: Byngmount Beach Public School remains closed, Neil C. Matheson will stay open until a new school at Hartsdale is opened.
 - i. Both school sites are designated Residential Low Density II, which permits detached, semi detached, duplex, triplex and street townhouse dwellings and both are zoned R3. An official plan amendment and rezoning would be required for seniors housing in an apartment form.
- b. Staff provided handouts of Infill Townhouse development examples
 - i. Cawthra and Atwater (2002) – 3-storey towns bordering on a railway track (condominium ownership with private roads)
 - ii. Atwater and West Shore – freehold example
 - iii. QEW and Northmount – includes singles on street frontage with condominium townhouses at two storeys and wide layouts. OPA and rezoning was required to allow the townhouses. The application was appealed to the OMB and the applicant won. Staff supported the development and the developer worked with the community and staff.
 - iv. Port Credit project (former St. Lawrence Starch site) – 3 storey townhouses with wider layouts and underground parking – a more expensive product
 - v. Lakeshore and Hydro Corridor – 2.5 storeys with surface parking and one row of units, with one way in and out
 - vi. Other examples in Toronto
 1. Prince Edward and Berry Road – former retail site
 2. Van Dusen and Islington – high density townhouses at three storeys
 3. Dundas and Kipling – condominium townhouses at three storeys
 4. Rathburn Road (at Mississauga border)
- c. The Panel Members provided comments and concerns regarding infill housing of townhouse development:

- i. Parking – surface parking dominates; underground parking is preferred
- ii. Many townhouse projects appear to be cheaply constructed – although it was noted that some projects are attractive
- iii. Limited public realm – there are generally no front porches, gardens are not usable
- iv. Steps can be an issue, with grade adjustments
- v. Building to the maximum density is common – it was noted that example #3 (QEW and Northmount) was preferred given the transition using singles
- vi. Condominium project examples – staff described success stories working with developers, particularly on sites located on the boundary of stable neighbourhoods
- vii. Haig example – large impact given floodplain issue and the raising of the townhouse buildings to address the floodplain

A member on the panel commented that townhouses are often associated with a negative feel, and the image of them is of a negative perception. Another panel member felt that development is good for Lakeview and ratepayers have supported development in the past, as long as the new development respects the values of the community. Also, townhouses should be limited to the external boundaries along major roads. A streetscape dominated by garages is an issue for the community generally in a higher density housing form, such as townhouses.

- d. Staff and members of the panel provided options to address concerns:
 - i. Maximum height of 2 storeys for townhouses in neighbourhoods
 - ii. Townhouse units should be wider, e.g. minimum width of 5.5 m to 6.0 m
 - iii. Limit number of townhouse units to 6-8 consecutive units
 - iv. Garages should not project, can be located e.g. at the rear
 - v. Minimize surface parking by accommodating parking underneath the unit, or behind
 - vi. Maximum number of stairs of 3 to 5, additional stairs should be internal
 - vii. Sites should provide suitable areas for landscaping to create a mature canopy
 - viii. Forestry plan – new tree bylaw is under consideration

- ix. Infill residential policies for detached homes in Mineola etc. address replacement housing standards. In Lakeview, there is an opportunity to address standards for infill
- x. Consideration could be made for bioswales on streets

3. Overview of the Draft Lakeview Local Area Plan

a. Presentation

- i. The structure of the proposed plan follows the principal Official Plan. It was noted that local area plan policies prevail in the event of a conflict with the principal Official Plan.
 - 1. Historical context of Lakeview – agricultural; manufacturing; rifle range; aerodrome; heritage sites
 - 2. Urban Structure Elements: Community Node, Neighbourhood, Employment Area. Precincts have been further divided for each of the urban structure elements.
 - 3. Current context – 1,150 ha, with 22,690 population and 5,330 jobs
 - 4. Vision Statement – Based on the guiding principles (reconnection to waterfront, distinct neighbourhoods, complete communities, community health, social well being, sustainability), the following vision statement has been developed:
 - a. *A connection of neighbourhoods with views to the lake and public access to the shores of the lake with a network of connected parks and open spaces, a node as a focus, an attractive main street and variety of housing choices. Change will occur with appropriate transitions to the existing stable neighbourhood while preserving character of existing development*
 - 5. Community concept – the community includes three major corridors, including Lakeshore, Cawthra and Dixie Roads; a green system that follows the creeks, the golf courses, woods, parks, arsenal lands; a community node character area; a neighbourhood character area; an employment area

6. Lakeview Community Node Precincts, three precincts, including Cooksville Creek; Cawthra; and the Lakeshore corridor – each has a different set of guidelines. Density for the node is 75 ppj/ha, with 1.8 : 1 ppj ratio currently, 2,180 population, 1,200 employment, it was noted that jobs will increase significantly, however, residential will also increase to reach a targeted range of 2 : 1. A panel member noted that cultural jobs may not be included in the employment numbers. It was also noted that home based employment is about 31 jobs per 1,000 people for the Lakeview district.
7. Directing growth – there are opportunities for modest infilling within the neighbourhood. Redevelopment opportunities may be available at existing shopping centres, such as Applewood and Dixie Outlet Mall and on sites with depth (e.g. at Dixie and Lakeshore). There was a desire to achieve development that is compatible with the built form and scale of surrounding existing development.
8. Value the environment – it was suggested that a policy for water quality and urban hydrology should be added to the Official Plan.
9. Complete communities – with attention to housing; cultural heritage; community infrastructure; cultural infrastructure; distinct identity, with the Lake Ontario waterfront
10. Multi modal City – to be informed by the Lakeshore Road Transportation Review Study and the Lakeview Parking Study
11. Desirable urban form – a guideline document will form an appendix to the area plan outlining the built form guidelines for the three structural elements: the Lakeview community node, neighbourhood areas, and employment areas
 - a. Heights range from 4 to 10 storeys (even though there are existing buildings 14 storeys in height, they would approx. 10 storeys in today’s standards) – there was a discussion about setting out height in metres as well as storeys

- b. Density expressed in FSI terms is not proposed in the Lakeview plan
- c. Angular plane and skyview issues (135 degree span of skyview or 22.5 degree angular plane based on the Lakeview Legacy Project) – this is a design issue not a shadow issue as raised by the resident representatives; it was recommended by a panel member that a 30 degree plane should be applied rather than a 45 degree plane; the alternative suggestion is to incorporate alternative design goals for the 45 degree plane. Staff clarified that a 45 degree angular plane is applied to the rear yard and not from the street line.

12. Strong Economy – lands designated business employment will allow for the continued operation of employment uses, pockets of industrial uses along the rail tracks with residential designations are intended to be redeveloped to the residential designation

13. Land use Designations – Exempt sites – eg. lands along the railway tracks – to be redeveloped to the underlying designations

14. Site Specific Policies will be incorporated as needed in the Lakeview plan

b. Questions/Discussion

- i. Community engagement – a question was raised whether the Planning Act changes require more substantive stakeholder input. It was noted by staff that public engagement has always been part of the process but it has been more specifically outlined in the new Official Plan to include upfront consultation before policies are formulated to address the vision of the local community. It was also noted that five year reviews are not possible for all local area plans, and not necessary when there are no issues affecting the area. In this case, the node has been identified along Lakeshore rather than centred on Cawthra based on the public engagement that has occurred to date. Further consultation will also occur, with likely more input and other views will no doubt be brought forward.
- ii. Timing – no public consultation will occur in the summer. The goal is to bring the draft policies forward in September 2011, with open houses, facilitated

sessions (eg. infill housing). The corporate report on the Plan will address the consultation process.

4. Other Matters

- a. Minutes of previous meeting – November 18, 2010 (*note: this item was missed and will be brought to the panel for approval at the next advisory panel meeting*)
- b. Future meeting dates and location
 - i. Thursday, May 26, 2011, 7 to 9 pm; Lakeview Library Meeting Room (Parking recommendations to be discussed)
 - ii. Tuesday June 7, 2011, 7 to 9 pm; Mississauga Civic Centre Committee Room A (Joint meeting of the Lakeview and the Port Credit Advisory Panels – for feedback from the panels)
- c. Inspiration Lakeview presentation will occur at the Planning and Development Committee meeting on the 18th of April, 2011