NYZ0.35.96

# North York Community Council - 100 Ranleigh North York Community Council Item 19.24-Comments of the Bedford Wanless Ratepayers Association

From:

"Paul Johnston" < johnston@planners.to>

To: Date:

<nycc@toronto.ca> 11/5/2012 2:39 PM

Subject:

100 Ranleigh North York Community Council Item 19.24- Comments of the Bedford

Wanless Ratepayers Association

CC:

"'Stavrakos, Konstantine J.'" <kstavrakos@foglers.com>, "'Hugh Mansfield'" <hugh@mcipr.com>, "'Hugh Mansfield'" <hughmansfield1@icloud.com>

Attachments: Community Council 100 Ranleigh Nov 5 2012.pdf

Dear Sir Madam,

Please find attached our correspondence. Further to my earlier email, I wish to address Community Council on this matter. Please acknowledge receipt and provide copies of this correspondence to Council members. Thank you.

Paul E. Johnston, MCIP, RPP Johnston Litavski Ltd. **Planning Consultants** 185 Carlton Street Toronto, Ontario M5A 2K7

p: (416) 323 1444 x222 f: (416) 323 0388 c: (416) 346 5068

e: johnston@planners.to

w: www.planners.to



# By email nycc@toronto.ca

5 November 2012

Chair and Members North York Community Council North York Community Centre 5100 Yonge Street, Toronto M2N 5V7

Dear Sir /Madam,

# RE: 100 Ranleigh Avenue – Zoning By-law Amendment Application- Item NY 19.24

We are planning consultants to the Bedford -Wanless Ratepayers Association in this matter. I am writing to provide our comments on this application. In our view, the current proposal does not represent good planning and should not be approved as it is out of keeping with the physical character of the neighbourhood, and does not conform to important Official Plan policies intended to protect neighbourhood character and stability.

The Association opposes the current design, particularly the massing, density, lot coverage and height of the application, and is committed to finding a solution for this site which allows a seniors housing project and/or place of worship to be developed on the site, with a design which fits with the neighbourhood.

## The Proposal

This application would permit a 60-unit four storey seniors apartment building (with community/ office space) with 5100 sq. m. of gross floor area at a density of 1.97x the area of the lot. 55% of the lot would be covered with building. The building has a depth of approximately 43 meters. Access to all floors will be via elevator. The original Bedford Park United Church building on the site has been demolished and the property is currently vacant.



#### Reasons for the application

The lands are designated **Neighbourhoods Area** in the Official Plan, and zoned **R2 Z0.6**. A height limit of 10 meters applies to the site. An area specific zoning exception removes permission for apartment buildings for the neighbourhood, including the subject site.

#### The application is required because:

- apartment buildings, and places of worship (other than those originally constructed for the purpose), are not permitted on the site or in the neighbourhood
- the proposed building height (13 m. to main building, 16.1 m. to the
  penthouse, 18.1 m. to portion of mechanical penthouse) will be exceed the
  maximum 10 metre height for the site and area
- the proposed 1.97 FSI exceeds the permitted maximum 0.6 FSI density permitted.
- the proposed maximum building depth of approximately 43 m. exceeds the permitted 14 m.
- the proposed 38% landscape area does not meet the minimum 50% required.

#### Official Plan

The subject site is designated "Neighbourhoods" in the Official Plan, and is within the interior of a well established stable neighbourhood. Interspersed walk up apartments no higher than 4 stories are a permitted use. Places of worship, daycare, seniors and nursing homes, among other uses, are permitted use. (policy 4.1.1)

As Council is aware, the Official Plan provides that Neighbourhoods are physically stable areas. Development in Neighbourhoods will respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood. Among the measures of physical character are height, massing, scale, setbacks, and prevailing pattern of rear and side yard setbacks and landscape open space. (policy 4.1.5)

Proposals for intensification of land on major streets in Neighbourhoods are not encouraged by the Plan. (policy 4.1.7) It follows that such proposal are also not encouraged on other streets in Neighbourhoods. Zoning standards for such matters as



building type, height, density setbacks, landscaped open space and other matters ensure that new development will be compatible with the physical character of neighbourhoods. These standards implement the Official Plan policies, therefore. (policy 4.1.8)

Infill development on properties that vary from the local pattern in terms of lot size (as in this instance) will have heights, massing and scale <u>appropriate for the site and compatible with that permitted by the zoning for adjacent and nearby properties</u>, and provide adequate privacy, sunlight and sky views for residents. (policy 4.1.9)

Where development is proposed on a site with an existing apartment building in Neighbourhoods the new development <u>must</u> be grade related. (policy 4.1.10)

## Official Plan Conformity

Protection of Neighbourhood stability and physical character is a fundamental tenet of the Official Plan. These policies for Neighbourhood protection are implemented through, among other means, the numeric standards in the Zoning Bylaw (policy 4.1.8). In our opinion, the proposal bears no relation to the most important such standards, as follows:

- Max. FSI- Proposed 1.97- Permitted 0.6
- Max. Height- Proposed up to 18.1 m. Permitted 10 m.
- Max. Building Depth Proposed 43 m. Permitted 14 m.
- Min. Landscaped area Proposed 38% Required 50%.

Furthermore, we are not aware of Minor Variances in the neighbourhood which approach this proposal in terms of height, density, massing, or building depth.

Attachment 10- Development Standards in the Final Planning Report provides a helpful summary of these standards. (Copy attached)

In addition, elevator (i.e. non walk up) apartments are not permitted in the Official Plan, and apartments are not a permitted use in the zoning bylaw.

In our opinion, and without reference to many other relevant policies of the Plan, the proposal does not conform to the Official Plan. The proposal should either be denied or



compatible proposal.	
Yours very truly,	
Paul E. Johnston, MCIP, RPP Principal Johnston Litavski	
cc: Bedford -Wanless Ratepayers Association	

deferred to permit further review with the neighbourhood in order to arrive at a more

Community Council November 5 2012 05/11/2012 2:34 PM



# Attachment 10: Development Standards Table

Project Element	Zoning By-law 438-86 "R2 Z0.6"	Proposed Development
Site Area		2,595 sq.m.
Gross Floor Area		2, 272 99.10.
Non-res GFA		386 80 sq.m.
Residential GFA		45.74.14 sq.m.
TOTAL GFA	1,557 sq.m.	5 222 24
Site Density FAR	0.60	5,099,96 sq.m. 1,97
Total Senior's Dwelling Units		60
Height		
Excluding mechanical pontherise	10 m.	13 m*
Including mechanical penthouse	35 m.	16.1 m* (+ 2m for certain building elements)
Setbacks		
Front (average)	7.65 m	£3
Side (east) with openings (for spartments)	3.2m	6.1 m to 9.1 m
Side (west) with openings (for spartments)	1.2 m	4.5 m to 5.5 m 1.5 to 4.3 m
Rear (north)	7.50 m	7.5 m
Building Dorth	14 mairs:	43 mores
Residential Amenity Area		to meres
Indoor	2 sq.m./unit = 120 sq.m.	4.2 sq.m./szát = 256 sq.m.
Curdour	2 sq.m. umit = 120 sq.m.	Sterne Throne to 175 day
		Fixed Porch = 13 47 sq at Walkway amund building
		= 18707 sq m
		Soft Landscape = 427 61 sq m
1-1-0-0		Total = 648 15 10 sq. m une:
Landscape Open Space	1297.5 sq m.	944 sq.m.
Required Provided (spartment)	150%	

# Notes:

"measured from vertical distance between the 166.17 average elevation of natural level of the ground along the side lot line to the top of the parapet, which is the highest point of the roof, consistent with the calculation of height in Zoning By-law No. 438-86.