

From: Yvonne Davies
To: SCC staff
Date: 2/25/2014 8:08 am
Subject: Fwd: Item SC 30.24. 1355 Neilson Road, response to letter from Lakeshore group

for item 24

>>> "Michael Mestyan" <michaelm@goldmangroup.com> 2014-02-24 11:27 PM >>>

Willie,

After having read the letter filed by Mr. Stephen Gardiner of the Lakeshore Group to Scarborough Community Council and yourself this afternoon, I have been forced to respond to numerous factual errors contained within the letter which do not provide any assistance to council nor aid in making their decision. I will respond in bullet form to a number of these grave errors. While the author states they have reviewed various material submitted to the City, it is uncertain if they have actually reviewed what is being recommended for approval by City staff.

Land use compatibility

-The author repeatedly states "concern" and "conflict" arising from a residential use adjacent to their office/commercial use, yet this is a situation which is prevalent across the city and is also often encouraged. The development will not generate undue hardship on the neighbouring properties, it will not generate noise, odour, shadows, overlook, privacy nor any other negative impact.

In fact the existing condition today is one which is less safe from a pedestrian perspective, these long deep properties have very little or no passive surveillance on the driveway and adjacent park. The proposal will introduce "eyes on the street" and result in a safer environment.

- The author also fails to mention that the underlying Official Plan designation is "Mixed Use" which encourages both residential and office uses.

As you are aware, a residential use, as proposed, is a permitted use. We are not seeking to amend the Official Plan.

Residential living environment and site design

- the author eludes that 30 units will only have views of the parking lot to the south, this is factually incorrect. All units (save and except those fronting onto Neilson Road) will have views in two directions.

- we are unaware of the negative impact of looking onto a parking lot.

- a "concern" over unsubstantiated complaints regarding noise, lighting and exhaust. The distance from the proposed residential unit to parking spaces located on the neighbouring property will be approximately 35 feet away. The typical setback for the average home from the street to the front door is approximately 20 feet. The "concern" that the author is claiming is not practical.

Parking supply

-the author states that "the proposed (our) Development must supply its own parking and not rely on the adjacent lands". We meet and exceed the zoning bylaw requirement and the visitor requirement totalling 111 parking spaces while we require 106. We will not rely on the adjacent lands for parking.

-The author states that "project resident and visitors should not use their (1333 Neilson) parking areas". 1333 Neilson Road's parking areas are gated and operate as a paid commercial lot.

Loading and access

-the author states "concern" over the location to the underground garage, yet doesn't recognize that it is a shared facility, nor offers any other suggestion as to where access should be provided. City transportation staff have reviewed its location and are satisfied.

The author eludes that conflicts will occur with their unscreened outdoor garbage location adjacent to the shared drive, in close proximity and visible to Neilson Road, whereas the proposed garage for our site will be stored underground until pickup when it will be collected from within a screened in area not visible from Neilson Road.

Underground parking

- the author suggests that the draft bylaw should require all parking be located underground. This is in fact the case, all parking is proposed to be underground. It is clear that Mr. Gardiner erred believing parking will be located at grade.

Recommendation

-the Lakeshore group recommends deferral and suggested time is needed to work through these issues. The rezoning and site plan application has been active for nearly 1 year. Two large information signs identifying the proposal directly face Neilson Road and the public park to the rear. A community meeting with extended notice was sent out last summer soliciting comments(only 5 people attended, none representing 1333 Neilson Rd). No feedback was ever provided from our neighbours suggesting these conflicts. No calls were made seeking additional information, yet the property owner at 1333 Neilson Road is seeking a deferral which is not warranted.

We would respectfully recommend that given the positive staff report , the lack of concern from the community and the merits of the project, community council should deal with the application and approve the proposed development.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,
Mike Mestyan, Director of Planning
The Goldman Group