

## TOPCA Deputation - March 6, 2023

Both TOPCA and the residents of Port Credit have, over the years, enjoyed a strong, collaborative relationship with area developers. While we may not have always agreed with their applications or pursuit of intensification that sometimes went above and beyond the Port Credit Local Area Plan (PCLAP), there was always a respect for public input and a common goal of building a better village. One that would provide housing, employment, and ultimately draw tourism dollars to area businesses. This development falls short on not only the collaborative front but also what it brings to the table in terms of benefit to the community.

Further, while the City's recently announced housing strategy [ [Growing Mississauga: An Action Plan for New Housing](#) ] delivers improved efficiencies and innovative approaches to maximizing land use, it also makes clear that 1) developments located at major transit stations (MTSAs) must include **affordable** housing units, and 2) that the City will work with the Province to protect and expand **rental** housing. This proposal supports neither objective.

In fact, this particular application takes the old-school tactic of building as much height as can possibly be squeezed in, as economically as possible (note the lack of underground parking levels) and to simply pay lip service to the community and the City itself through their Planning Justification Report. [Posted with application documents at: [https://www.mississauga.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/21092222/W2\\_30\\_Planning\\_Justification\\_Report\\_April\\_2022.pdf](https://www.mississauga.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/21092222/W2_30_Planning_Justification_Report_April_2022.pdf) ]

While times *may* be changing, good planning has not and collectively we're pushing back on this application for the following reasons:

- It fails to respect the heights prescribed in the Official Plan, and Port Credit's Local Area Plan, which is provincially-approved and still in place. These twin towers are each nearly twice the height of anything in the area and nearly twice what Metrolinx included in their prospectus for the sudden, unexpected sale of their Southeast parking lot in April 2021. As recently as February 21, at a Community Meeting about another Port Credit development application [ *70 Park St E* ], Planning Dept staff answered a question about whether height policies at MTSAs had changed. Their answer was that there are indeed "**political announcements**" and "mixed messages" from the provincial level, but there has been no **policy** follow-up - which is needed for municipal implementation.
- Despite requesting more time to come back with an application that revisited the egregious size and scale of these towers (following the concern expressed at the PDC meeting in July 2022), Edenshaw went directly to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) last Fall without any further public consultation or redesign.
- This application also fails to provide sufficient parking for even 50% of the units planned. While we are quick to support a model that encourages transit, the catalyst behind this might also be construed as avoiding the need to dig down multiple levels due to the exceedingly small footprint. This site is simply not suited to the ancillary needs of the intensification this developer is trying to make work on this 0.59-hectare (1.47 acre) site.

- Unfortunately, due to the Metrolinx sale, the area parking deficit is compounded with removal of a much-needed GO transit parking lot, almost certainly meaning that commuters heading into Toronto will resort to street parking and area parking lots that are in place to support local main street retail. Specifically, parking lots located by the Port Credit Library, the Port Credit Arena and residential side streets will be under increased pressure. Previous meetings with Metrolinx saw them fully committed to a substantial increase in the number of parking spaces on this site due to what they insisted would be a dramatic increase in need within the very near future. A community benefit in this case could have been additional public parking provided under the buildings, but as pointed out above, the site is rendered too small.
- It also fails to deliver affordable housing that, per existing Provincial [ [Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 | ontario.ca](#) ] and Municipal [ [Inclusionary Zoning for Affordable Housing Study – City of Mississauga](#) ] housing Policies, requires a mix of housing types to accommodate a diverse range of incomes and household sizes. Since 71% of the units are proposed to be either one bedroom (41%) or one-bedroom plus den (30%), it is clear this is NOT a family-oriented development. The “affordability” they’re creating is only accomplished through lower square footage that cuts families out. Given the location, larger units could not possibly be considered affordable to young families, and even investors will not be interested in purchasing these – they’ll prefer smaller units for short-term rentals and private leases.
- We were advised in early discussions that this would be a residential/office/retail hub, however, there seems to be much less emphasis on the office/retail component now – so, is this really mixed use? Or is it simply vertical sprawl? How does it meaningfully contribute to Port Credit’s PPJ targets (as the applicant claims) from a jobs perspective?

Intensification needs to happen. It keeps our schools populated and our businesses alive. And while we can all agree that intensification in higher-order transit zones makes perfect sense, no one building can be considered in isolation of the applications already approved and/or currently under construction in this six-block precinct. These two skyscrapers are suited to a city centre and designated urban growth areas [ [Mississauga Urban Growth Centre Boundary.doc](#) ] where planning for such extreme levels of intensification already exists.

Residents understood the need to revisit heights on this site and want to see caps in the 25-storey range. We appreciate the Planning Department’s decision to not support the heights being proposed and hope that Council will agree to challenging this application at the OLT.

Thank you on behalf of,

**Town of Port Credit Association**