

Developing Areas Responsibly in Toronto (DART)

c/o 34 Chatsworth Drive

Toronto, Ontario M4R 1R5

November 30, 2020

Carlie Turpin, Secretariat Contact
North York Civic Centre
Main floor, 5100 Yonge St.
Toronto, ON M2N 5V7
email: nycc@toronto.ca

Dear Members of North York Community Council:

North York Community Council Meeting, December 3, 2020
Agenda Item NY20.3: Request for Direction Report – Official Plan and
Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – 41 Chatsworth Drive (Ward 8)

We have reviewed the revised plans dated November 13, 2020, submitted by Chatsworth GP Inc. for the property at 41 Chatsworth Drive. We have also reviewed the Request for Direction Report dated November 18, 2020.

DART supports the recommendation of City Planning Staff to oppose the application in its current form.

After completing an exhaustive study of City of Toronto, Planning and former OMB datasets, details of which we will be presenting at the upcoming LPAT Case Management Conference in January 2021, we believe the current proposal is in effect a trojan horse which if permitted will open the flood gates for accelerated inappropriate infill development proposals across City neighbourhoods.

In support of our view we note that as recently as the 2016 OMB hearing which denied the first 41 Chatsworth Proposal, the developer was unable to present even one acceptable comparable project to support their application. Additionally, our study of the aforementioned datasets identified no approved comparable projects in the intervening period from 2016 to the present.

Given the absence of any supportable comparable projects, approval of the current application for 41 Chatsworth would establish a dangerous new precedent and provide just the kind of comparable that future infill site developers could cite in support of more bad planning proposals thereby threatening the stability of neighbourhoods across the City.

In addition to identifying no apartment/condo proposals of comparable scale proposed for infill sites located within residential neighbourhoods like the 41 Chatsworth site, our study did find two proposals that are of particular relevance, both of which were sites of former Places of Worship located within established neighbourhoods.

100 Ranleigh – a site, half the size, and zoned higher density -R2 where the developer sought a 1.8 Floor Space Index which was 3 times the 0.60 permitted under the in-force zoning (Note: the current 41 Chatsworth proposal has a proposed FSI of 1.96 or 5.6 times the 0.35 permitted under the site's existing zoning designation). Not only was this proposal turned down – the City purchased the site for \$8.5M from the developer and has converted the site to parkland. We would welcome a similar move by the City for 41 Chatsworth which in addition to ending the now seven-year effort to force a bad planning decision onto the Lytton Park neighbourhood, would greatly enhance the useability of the existing Duplex Parkette which runs parallel to the proposed 5-storey apartment building's southern border.

Another highly relevant example across the City is **37 Kecala Road** – an infill redevelopment of a former Place of Worship situated within a *Neighbourhood* comprised predominantly of single family detached residences (as is 41 Chatsworth). Interestingly, the developer of this site which at .42 hectares in area is roughly the same size as 41 Chatsworth, proposed and was granted approval to construct 7 new single family detached homes which were very much in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood. Based on our research what distinguished the Kecala proposal from the 41 Chatsworth proposal was the fact that the developer of Kecala paid \$1.5 million for the site and the developer of 41 Chatsworth paid \$8.1 million. Our view is that a loss is a loss and not a justification to destabilize a stable City Neighbourhood.

We respect and greatly appreciate City Planning's ongoing effort to see that "good planning" prevails at 41 Chatsworth. That said, we do not believe that any amount of architectural finessing in the form of setbacks, step-backs or parkland allocations can transform a proposal into "good planning", where the proposal is as out of step with the intent of the City of Toronto Official Plan and Townhouse and Low-Rise Apartment Guidelines as the current 41 Chatsworth proposal.

Having endured a poorly maintained vacant lot in the middle of our neighbourhood for seven years, we would welcome any proposal that would fit into the existing neighbourhood as opposed to the current proposal which would surely destabilize the existing residential neighbourhood.

Sincerely,



Developing Areas Responsibly in Toronto (DART)

cc: Councillor Mike Colle