



## Bay Cloverhill Community Association

1703 – 24 Wellesley St. West , Toronto, ON M4Y 2X6

e-mail: [info@baycloverhill.ca](mailto:info@baycloverhill.ca)

[www.baycloverhill.ca](http://www.baycloverhill.ca)

---

Monday, March 28, 2016

Toronto and East York Community Council  
 Toronto City Hall  
 100 Queen Street West  
 Toronto ON M5H 2N2

**Re: 587 to 599 Yonge Street, 2 to 4 Dundonald Street, 7 to 9 Gloucester Street – Zoning Amendment Application – Request for Direction)**  
**Reference Number: 12235622 STE 27 OZ**  
**OMB File No. PL1303**

Dear TEYCC Members:

The Bay Cloverhill Community Association (BCCA) would like to express appreciation for the deferral of this application from the January 17, 2016 TEYCC meeting to today's meeting, April 5, 2016. It has allowed our association sufficient time to review the proposal and make our response.

The BCCA supports these aspects of this development:

- a north entrance to the Wellesley Subway Station.
- Improvements to the podium
- Compliance with the angular plane as expressed in the North Downtown Yonge Planning Framework
- Retention of the heritage buildings at 7 and 9 Gloucester Street

However, we question a number of internal building changes to the proposal by the new owner of the property, Cresford Capital Corporation, and ask if these are achievable and acceptable changes for this development.

- Family Size Units: In acknowledging that there has been an average 10 square metre reduction in the size of all units, has the downsizing of family sized units been truly realistic in maintaining the capacity to accommodate 3 bedroom/ 2 bedroom plus den units. Or in fact, has the square footage of the family size units simply been reduced without sufficient consideration as to whether the square footage still constitutes family size units?
- Underground Parking: How has the underground parking been increase by 40 spaces from 192 to 232 parking spaces?
- Amenity Space: What is the functionality of the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces as reconfigured for the 108 unit increase of this proposal?

The developer maintains that these and other changes have been made without changing the density or the overall height or square footage dimensions of the building.

Concerns re Appropriate Protocols:

1. Should not this request be placed before the Committee of Adjustment? If yes, does this request before TEYCC today not exclude the opportunity of the community to seek Section 45(9) benefits?
2. Is this an appropriate use of the OMB, this request for a number of site plan variances?
3. How does the public domain acquire the additional amenities needed to serve the extra population intensification pressures affecting the public domain of the residents of the additional 108 units?

The BCCA looks to you, the Toronto and East York Community Council Members, for guidance on these questions.

Respectfully,

Rick Whitten-Stovall, BCCA President

cc: Gregg Lintern, Director, Community Planning, Toronto and East York District  
David Oikawa, Manager, Community Planning, Downtown Section  
Sipo Maphangoh, Planner, Community Planning, Downtown Section  
Mary MacDonald, Manager, Heritage Preservation Services  
Councillor Kristyn Wong-Tam, Ward 27, Toronto Centre-Rosedale

From Bob Fabian March 16 2016:  
About the proposal:

- A) The process has almost been designed to exclude CWNA (& BCCA). Even the strange process of revising a proposal before a final OMB ruling, rather than go the open route through the Committee of Adjustment, seems designed to exclude us. This should be an issue that our Development Committee Chair takes up with city planning.
- B) The increase in number of units will lead, directly, to increased load on the full range of infrastructure in the neighbourhood. There really ought to be some off-setting compensation (Section 37 or Section 45). City planning doesn't seem interested in taking up that challenge.
- C) One of the basic unanswered questions concerns the projected lived experience on Yonge, on the side streets, and on the linear park. The city ought, (at last), to start asking hard questions about the lived experience to which the developer is prepared to commit. They should not be free to walk away, basically ignoring the changes in our lived experience. Much more should be said about this topic, ... and this is a particularly good project to use as a focal point.