

Leaside Property Owners Association Incorporated

**1601 Bayview Avenue, P.O. Box 43582
Toronto ON M4G 3B0**

June 9, 2016

North York Community Council
North York Civic Centre
Main Floor, 5100 Yonge St.
Toronto, ON M2N 5V7
Attention: Francine Adamo
E-mail:nycc@toronto.ca

Re: NY15.49 660 Eglinton Ave East - Zoning Amendment Application – Request for Direction Report - Reference # 14 267342 NNY 26 OZ

Dear Councillor Augimeri and Members of Community Council:

The Leaside Property Owners Association (LPOA) provides this correspondence regarding the planning application for a Zoning By-law Amendment of the property at 660 Eglinton Avenue East (Sunnybrook Plaza) to permit a 19-storey (66 metre) and a 12-storey (46 metre) apartment building with retail at grade (2,121m²). The two buildings would contain a total of 408 dwelling units and 410 parking spaces with 395 located in a 2-level below grade parking garage and 15 surface spaces. A continuous driveway is proposed along the northern boundary of the site providing access to Eglinton Avenue East and Bayview Avenue. The existing commercial plaza would be demolished.

The LPOA supports Planning Staff's recommendation that:

“City Council direct the City Solicitor, together with City Planning staff and any other City staff as appropriate, to attend the Ontario Municipal Board hearing to oppose the Zoning By-law Amendment application in its current form”.

The LPOA also supports the concerns raised by Planning Staff in the “COMMENTS” section of their Request for Direction Report, particularly those presented in the sub-sections dealing with: Land Use; Site Organization, Ground Floor and Setbacks, Built Form and Height; Angular Planes and Transition; Sun and Shadow; Development Engineering; Transportation; Schools; Toronto Private Tree By-law and City Street Trees; Ravine By-law and Natural Heritage System; Amenity Space; and Section 37.

Our key concerns including those expressed by the Community include:

- The subject property is not within a Centre nor an area identified as an “Avenue” in the Official Plan and hence is not appropriate for major intensification particularly in the form of tall buildings;
- The Official Plan's tall building policies clearly indicate that most intensification in the City is to occur in the form of mid-rise or lower buildings;

- The proposed development fails to provide a gradual transition to adjacent “Neighbourhood” lands – it is too high, too massive and is a poor fit within its existing context;
- The proposal poses significant land use compatibility issues with the abutting residential development – noise from deliveries, resident and retail traffic, air conditioners, and service vehicles; exhaust from underground parking; loss of privacy; negative impact on boundary trees; light pollution; odours from refuse and garbage disposal; and shadowing;
- It makes little sense to consider input from the Design Review Panel until the principle of development has been established. Why ask the Design Review Panel to examine the design of proposed tall buildings if such buildings are not permitted on the site? The proposed design and materials do not fit in with the Leaside community’s character.
- The existing non-residential gross floor area on the site is proposed to be reduced by approximately 50% significantly reducing the employment opportunities associated with the site;
- The impact the subject proposal and similar proposals will have on the area’s community services, over-crowded schools and parks and open space needs to be fully addressed;
- Traffic studies to date have focused on the site and have failed to consider the cumulative effects of future development in the vicinity and the likelihood of traffic diverting to local streets to avoid the Bayview-Eglinton intersection;
- the seriousness of the traffic issues with respect to pedestrian safety
- Lack of meaningful community involvement in establishing detailed policies for the Bayview Focus Area. Proposed Official Plan Amendment 253 came out of the Eglinton Connects Planning Work and deals with a variety of matters along the Eglinton corridor. The policies it contains for Site and Area Specific Policy 478 were not broadly disseminated in the community and many affected property owners are not aware of their existence and hence have not had a meaningful opportunity for providing input.
- The LPOA and Councillor Jon Burnside’s office recently undertook a community survey to gain a better understanding of Leaside residents’ views on appropriate development for 939 Eglinton Ave East and the Laird Focus Area. Only 5.49% of the 2,161 Leaside Residents who responded believed high-rise buildings (over 11 storeys) were appropriate for the 939 Eglinton East site. It is highly likely that similar findings would be found if residents were asked for their views on what was appropriate for the 660 Eglinton East site.
- Given the history of pedestrian injuries and deaths at the Bayview-Eglinton intersection, the fact that the intersection is a transfer point for many going to institutional uses to the north (CNIB, Sunnybrook Hospital, Hugh MacMillan, etc), and given the number of pedestrian crossings which will be required to reach the LRT stations at the northwest and southeast corners of the intersection, there is concern that any redesign of the Bayview-Eglinton intersection and adjacent uses ensure pedestrian safety.
- While it is appreciated that the development will be on the Eglinton Crosstown LRT and that some residents may use the LRT, there is concern that any overspill parking will gravitate to Craig Crescent and Bessborough Drive as there are few other options nearby other than the Metro store parking lot which is private property. All parking needs generated by the development should be accommodated on site.
- A failure to address the schooling issue -- busing children to school is not an efficient solution in the best interest of families

- The site includes a treed ravine slope on the north east side, which forms part of the Walmsley Brook sub-watershed. The proposal is to completely remove the ravine and replace with a retaining wall. The applicant has failed to provide a natural heritage report in response to the expressed concerns in regard to the proposed loss of this ecological and aesthetic asset.
- Related to the proposed removal of the ravine and replacement with a retaining wall are unacceptable risks to life and property for neighbouring residents on Bessborough Drive whose properties extend to the ravine.

A copy of our most recent detailed comments (dated May 26, 2016) on the revised Application is attached should you wish further information on the LPOA/Community's concerns.

LPOA Recommendations to Council:

1. That Council direct the City Solicitor, together with City Planning staff and any other City staff as appropriate, to attend the Ontario Municipal Board hearing to oppose the Zoning By-law Amendment application in its current form.
2. That the concerns raised by Planning Staff in the "COMMENTS" section of their report, particularly those presented in the sub-sections dealing with Land Use; Site Organization, Ground Floor and Setbacks, Built Form and Height; Angular Planes and Transition; Sun and Shadow; Development Engineering; Transportation; Schools; Toronto Private Tree By-law and City Street Trees; Ravine By-law and Natural Heritage System; Amenity Space; and Section 37 form the basis of the City's presentation before the OMB.
3. As other proposals similar to this are likely to emerge within the Bayview Focus Area and along Eglinton Avenue East, Council take a strong stand against the introduction of tall buildings into this area - a position both in keeping with the policies of the Official Plan and the wishes of the Leaside Community as reflected in a recent massive survey of Leaside residents.

The LPOA appreciates your consideration of our comments.

Yours truly,

Geoff Kettel for

Geoff Kettel and Carol Burtin-Fripp
Co-Presidents

Attachment

c.c. Councillor Jon Burnside
Joe Nanos, Director, Community Planning, North York District
John Andreevski, Senior Planner, North York District