From: "Wm. J. Dolan" <wdolan1027@rogers.com>
To: "nycc@toronto.ca" <nycc@toronto.ca>
Date: 08/12/2014 12:52 PM
Subject: 200 Ridley Boulevard - Opposition to Apartment Development Scheme
CC: Karen Stintz <councillor_stintz@toronto.ca>
Attachments: 200 Ridley Boulevard - Dolan’s Brief to Community Council.doc; 200 Ridley Boulevard - Dolan’s August 12th Written Brief to Community Council.docx

Jennifer Pitt
City Clerk's Office
North York Community Council

Hi Jennifer:

As attachments hereto, please find two (2) submissions prepared by myself in opposition to the proposed development scheme for 200 Ridley Boulevard. The first submission is dated June 16th., and the second dated today, August 12th.

Would you please ensure that all North York Community Council members receive a copy of this communication in advance of their meeting scheduled for today.

Thanking you in advance and I would appreciate receiving confirmation that my above request has been implemented.

Bill Dolan
June 16, 2014

Chairperson and Council Members
North District Community Council
North York Civic Centre
5100 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario

Dear Chairperson and Council Members:

Re: 200 RIDLEY BOULEVARD, TORONTO
PROPOSED APARTMENT BUILDING

My name is Bill Dolan and have lived at 166 Ridley Boulevard for over 30 years. Our home is one (1) block east of the subject property. By profession, I am a professional land use Planner and real estate development consultant. I have practiced my chosen profession for in excess of 40 years. I will be unavailable to attend and personally address Community Council on this subject matter, hence this written brief.

OFFICIAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS

The City’s Official Plan contains statements of Council’s intent and policy directives on how the City is to evolve over time from a development perspective. The Official Plan contains two (2) residential designations, Neighbourhoods and Apartment Neighbourhoods. By policy directive, the former designation is considered as being physically stable areas made up of residential uses in low scale building. Policy directives recognize that Neighbourhoods might contain some interspersed walk-up apartment constructed previously under a different planning regime. Those apartments are permitted in Neighbourhoods. The latter designation, Apartment Neighbourhoods, are, as the title implies, for apartments. The subject property at 200 Ridley Boulevard, together with the greater environs are designated as Neighbourhoods to support low scale, low intensity residential buildings. During the preparation of the Official Plan, Council chose NOT to designate the subject property nor similar properties along the northerly parts of the Avenue Road corridor and the local section of Wilson Avenue as Apartment Neighbourhoods, albeit there are several walk-up apartments located on those major arterial roadways. I think Council intended to send a clear land use planning message in this regard!

PREVAILING RESIDENTIAL BUILDING TYPE

The subject property and greater environs are known as Armour Heights. The predominant building type in the Armour Heights area are detached single family. There are some walk-up apartments and other non-residential use fronting onto the major arterial roadways, being Avenue Road and Wilson Avenue. Those are on the exterior or periphery of the neighbourhood. The subject property represents an abnormality in that the existing apartment building fronts
onto a local road, Ridley Boulevard, is physically in the interior of the neighbourhood and is the only apartment in proximity south of Wilson Avenue and east of Avenue Road to do so. To permit an additional 30 unit apartment on the interior subject site does not respect, reinforce nor "fit" the existing low density, detached dwelling type physical character, height, massing setbacks and other physical characteristics that are representative of the greater Armour Heights area. It is relevant to note that policy directive 4.1(6) of the Official Plan effectively EXCLUDES more intense forms of residential development on major streets when determining prevailing building type. Therefore, those apartments along Avenue Road and Wilson are excluded. Section 4.1(6) reads as follows:

Where a more intense form of development than the prevailing building type has been approved on a major street in a Neighbourhood, it will not be considered when reviewing prevailing building type(s) in the assessment of development proposals in the interior of the Neighbourhood.

EXISTING APARTMENT SITE – GRADE-RELATED INTENSIFICATION

A site within a Neighbourhoods designation containing an existing apartment building may be considered for intensification provided the new development is grade-related and complies with policy directives for infill development in the Apartment Residential designation. The proposed apartment, albeit there will be some grade-related units, the building, in the main, is otherwise.

The proposed new 4-storey apartment building does not provide for a gradual physical transition, especially height, between the existing on-site apartment and the 2-storey, detached dwellings south and east of the 200 Ridley Boulevard property.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development scheme represents the introduction of a apartment building residential intensification scheme that is insensitive to the long-term established character of the neighbourhood, does not "fit" the community structure nor does it reinforce or respect the pattern of development of the Neighbourhood. The Zoning By-law amendment ought to be refused by the Community Council and that refusal be upheld by Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Wm. J. Dolan, B.A.
August 12, 2014

Chairperson and Council Members
North District Community Council
North York Civic Centre
5100 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario

Dear Chairperson and Council Members

Re: 200 RIDLEY BOULEVARD, TORONTO
PROPOSED APARTMENT BUILDING

Duped, deceived and disenchanted! At least that’s how I feel personally regarding the Zoning By-law Amendment process leading to the current, proposed 30 unit apartment under Community Council’s consideration for property municipally known as 200 Ridley Boulevard.

My name is Bill Dolan and I, together with my family, have resided at 166 Ridley Boulevard, one block East of the subject property, for over 30 years. My chosen profession is that of a land use Planner and real estate development consultant. Over 40 years of experience gives me a level of expertise to comment on the proposed scheme from the land use planning perspective.

I am on the speakers list to address the Community Council during the continuation of the public hearing scheduled for August 12th. I will be unable to attend, hence I am submitting the written brief. Please note that I previously submitted my opinion inputs in a written submission dated June 16, 2014. A copy of same is attached hereto.

A 1947 aerial photograph of the greater Armour Heights area clearly demonstrates that the subject site, as well as both sides of Ridley Boulevard in vicinity, were vacant. It is my understanding that the apartment building at 200 Ridley Boulevard predates the otherwise development of the predominant detached dwellings along the street frontage. In fact, the subject front lawn of the property consists of five (5) residential lots intended for detached dwellings to continue the established character of the neighbourhood and to an extent visually frame the apartment from view from the public realm. The referenced five (5) residential lots are currently zoned Residential Density (R3). That Zone classification limits development to detached dwellings! The long standing Zone classification provided a meaningful level of comfort to the greater neighbourhood that it would not be going through the disturbing, current day exercise!

There is a meaningful and substantive public reliance on the policy directives contained in the City’s Official Plan. The subject site and greater environs are designated in the Official Plan as Neighbourhoods. Development within Neighbourhoods is intended to respect and reinforce the existing, physical character of the greater area of influence, including the type of dwellings.
If the Council of the day that adopted the Official Plan intended for the subject site to be further developed with apartment units, the Council would have designated the property in the Apartment Neighbourhoods designation. Council opted not to do that! The in-force Neighbourhoods designation provided a meaningful level of comfort to the greater neighbourhood that it would not be going through the disturbing, current day exercise! Albeit there is an obscure policy statement contained within the within the Neighbourhoods permitting consideration of further apartment development on a site already developed with an apartment building, that is not, in my view, a “one-size-fits-all” permission. In the case at hand, when the decision-makers are considering an further apartment on a site not otherwise contemplated, those applicable and relevant considerations must be held to a much higher standard relative to a similar site already designated in the Official Plan as Apartment Neighbourhoods. Let us not be duped nor deceived!

It is my understanding that some 80 or so neighbourhood persons have signed a petition in opposition to the proposed development scheme. Likely many, many more if they were canvassed. Several have taken the time to craft and submit their own opinions in opposition. The neighbourhood is disenchanted and they have spoken! It is incumbent on the local Ward 16 Councillor to heed the expressed wishes of the electorate. I need not have to remind Councillor Stintz of the genesis of her political career. The former Ward Councillor, Anne Johnston, lost her Council seat to Ms. Stintz, when the former abandoned the wishes of her Ward electorate during the Minto Plaza matter at Yonge and Eglinton.

I hereby strongly encourage the Community Council of the North District to recommend to the whole Council the refusal of the current development scheme Application(s) currently under consideration.

Thanking you in advance for permitting me the opportunity to put my thoughts forward.

Respectfully submitted,

Wm. J. Dolan