

North York Community Council - 2350 - 2374 rezoning review by community council

From: Frank McCrea <frankm@procom.ca>
To: "nycc@toronto.ca" <nycc@toronto.ca>
Date: 04/07/2014 3:31 PM
Subject: 2350 - 2374 rezoning review by community council
CC: "Mike Varey (mvarey@toronto.ca)" <mvarey@toronto.ca>, "julie1(juliewalte...
Attachments: 2014-4-8 meeting - response to final plan.docx

2386 Bayview Ave.,
Toronto, ON
M2L 1A1

April 7, 2014

North York City Community Council
5100 Yonge St.,
Main Floor
Toronto, ON
M2N 5VY

Attn: Francine Adamo

RE for standing in the consideration of the request to amend the zoning By-law Application No. 13 124600
NNY 25 OZ

Please accept my apologies for this last minute communication on the above noted matter. I am only just returned from out of the country to learn of the scheduled meeting and receive a copy of the final report which is to be presented and considered.

I would appreciate the opportunity to address the Community Council and hereby asked for permission to do so.

Attached a document that I have prepared for distribution to the Community Council Members as they reviewed the Planning Committee's final report.

While, I believe that the City through the leadership of Mr. Nimrod Salamon has worked diligently to meet the needs of the neighbours, I believe that there remain a few relatively minor items to be attended to and would therefore request that Community Council redirect the parties, primarily involved in this matter, more specifically Dillon Construction and the property owners at 2386 and 23886 Bayview meet with Mr. Salamon and Councilor Robinson to address same. All parties with the exception of Dillon Construction have been contacted and expressed their willingness to participate in such a meeting.

The Community Councils consideration of this request is appreciated.

Yours truly

Frank McCrea
416-545-5215

Frank McCrea | President & CEO | Procom

T: 416.545.5215 | C: 416.518.4788 | F: 416.483.8102

Platinum Member of Canada's Best Managed Companies

This e-mail message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, proprietary, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and erase this e-mail message immediately.

Response to
2350 – 2374 Bayview Ave
Zoning By-law Amendment Application – Final Report

Orientation

The subject properties are part of a neighbourhood of 6 residential properties. The fact that we are on a major metro road is secondary to the fact that each house is set back from that road and as such forms a community separate and apart. The proposed rezoning will destroy this community.

Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and Provincial Plans

The report notes that the PPS provides policy direction in such matters

It highlights that key objectives of the PPS policy include “Building Strong Communities”.

Comment

- Permission to permit a recreational facility (or church or school) within the community, presumed that the persons using the facility would be located in the community, hence a benefit to having the recreational facility physically close its users.
- The Granite Club originally set its maximum membership at 10,000 members.
- In recent years this number was increased to 14,000
- If one assumes that discussions regarding neighborhoods and communities have some form of understanding of the geographical boundary, then there needs to be a determination of that distance (number of blocks, number of KM, number of miles)
- It is extremely doubtful that a significant percentage of the members of the Granite Club live within a reasonable distance from Granite Club so that they might claim to be part of the “Community”

Suggestion

- That the Granite Club provide city officials with a list of the postal code for all their members and that
- The city use commonly available mapping software to determine the location of members relative to the Granite Club

Financial Impact

The report states that the recommendations in this report will have no financial impact.

While I unable to comment as to financial impact on the city, I can state categorically that if the City Council passes this amendment and changes the bylaw which previously safe guarded our neighbourhood, doing so will have a very significant financial impact on the value of my home, possibly **reducing its value by an amount between \$1 million and \$ 2 million dollars.**

Mechanical Building

Orientation

1. The rezoning application proposes a mechanical building to house the inflation equipment for the new tennis bubbles to be located in the North West corner of the properties.
 - a. The existing Mechanical Building
 - i. Is a one story building (i.e. no below ground space)
 - ii. Its dimensions are approximately 6m X 15m (90 sq meters)
 - iii. It provides equipment to maintain the inflation of the two existing Tennis Bubbles.
 - b. The proposed building is being proposed as a
 - i. Two story building with dimensions of approximately 6m X 12m totaling 187 sq meters
 1. The basement area would house the inflation equipment (121 sq meters)
 2. The usage of the main floor is not clarified at this time (66 sq meters)
 - ii. The combined square footage of the proposed building required to service one tennis bubble
 1. is 187 square meters in total or
 2. 100% (2 times) larger than the square meter space currently used to service one tennis bubble
2. In an e-mail dated approximately Feb 19, 2014 Ms. Swan attempted to respond to concerns which had been previously brought to her attention
 - a. That building is described by Dillon Consulting as being required to house "inflation equipment is powered by a high efficiency natural gas furnace with electric powered fans for supply and return of air".
 - b. Concern has been expressed about the sound of the operating equipment, more specifically the fans (blades).
 - c. Dillon provided a response in the e-mail referred to above (dated Feb 19, 2014) citing the following considerations:
 - i. Inflation equipment is designed to inflate one bubble:
 1. Putting the equipment for 2 bubbles in one building would be impractical due to the increase in size of the mechanical building and
 2. The enlarged mechanical building would push the north recreational area
 - a. Further north and
 - b. Closer to Bayview.
 - d. The inflation equipment is now being proposed as being "underground and fully enclosed by a solid structure"
 - i. The equipment would be "situated the inflation equipment in order to mitigate noise levels"

- ii. "Acoustical fencing, (in keeping with existing wood fencing along Bayview) will also be installed".

Location of Proposed Mechanical Building

3. The suggestion presented to Dillon was to explore the feasibility to locating the mechanical building to the south and east of the proposed new recreational areas:
 - a. To the best of my knowledge there was never any suggestion to combine the inflation equipment for the two tennis bubbles in one building:
 - i. This was a Dillon introduced concept and
 - ii. It is understood to be non-feasible due to the location of the existing mechanical building.
4. The rationale for locating the mechanical building to the south and east of the proposed tennis courts is as follows:
 - a. Since the equipment will be underground there is no need to shift the proposed locations in any way:
 - i. There is available space in/under the berm which is located on the east side of the property separating the tennis court area from bay view Ave.
 - ii. Where above ground space is required, it too can be imbedded into the berm.
 - iii. If additional space is required for storage other than that already in place for the existing tennis courts or other, it is noted that"
 1. a one story pavilion(615 sq meters) and viewing stand is being proposed
 2. It is reasonably assumed that the incremental space which will result from this proposed structure will provide any incremental storage space which might be required for he proposed new Tennis Court incremental to that which currently exists for the operation of the existing two tennis courts and the mechanical area other purposes.
 - b. Close proximity to the new maintenance building / inflation equipment to the entrance to the Granite Club and the existing mechanical building housing similar equipment would provide added benefits:
 - i. There are presumed benefits of having the two separate maintenance buildings reasonably close together as opposed to being separated by the width of two double tennis courts.
 - ii. Reduced cost to provide utility access to the equipment
 1. Proximity to the Natural Gas feed which currently services the existing building
 2. Proximity to Electrical supply which may also service the existing mechanical building
 - iii. Enhanced physical access
 1. Access to the required mechanical building would also be enhanced by a location on the south east of the existing/proposed tennis courts.
 - a. Support personnel would enjoy the same / similar access to the new building with its inflation equipment that they have to the existing building

- b. No need to access the buildings by the adjacent property at 2378 Bayview or
- c. The challenges of now and compromised access to a building on the north west corner would be responded to
 - i. No need to access through the tennis court, possibly damaging the surfaces if equipment were needed.
 - ii. No need to walk around the tennis bubbles (South and west sides to the North West corner (Challenges of snow access in the winter)).
- iv. Reduced costs to service the equipment.

Noise Levels

It is anticipated that there will be noise generated as a result of the operation of the inflation equipment and the fans which support that operation through supply and exhaust of air.

5. Dillon Requested Solution

- a. The positioning this equipment as proposed by Dillon on the north west corner will:
 - i. Have the noise close to the neighbouring properties and
 - ii. Proximity to the Rosedale valley will increase the potential for the noise to go out into the valley.
- b. The neighbouring properties are currently
 - i. Are set back from Bayview by approximately 400 feet.
 - ii. A buffer of trees and in two instances walls currently mitigate the transmission of street noise to the residences
- c. To the best of my knowledge none of the sound tests, referenced in previous presentations by Dillon were conducted on 60% of the properties which will be negatively impacted by the position of this mechanical room and the equipment in it.

6. Proposed solution

- a. If the mechanical room were located in the south east area relative to the proposed Tennis courts:
 - i. The noise from the fans and any possible exhaust can be vented on the east side of the property
 - ii. If the required mechanical room is relocated to the south east area:
 1. The operational noise will merge with currently existing traffic noise on Bayview.
 2. Concerns about the noise from the unit spilling out into the Rose Dale valley or bothering the neighbours will have been responded to.