Dear Toronto & East York Community Council,


The Corktown Residents and Business Association (CRBA) Development Committee has participated in the community consultation process for this application [14 175807 STE 28 OZ], the public consultation process for the Queen-River Secondary Plan which includes the proposed development [File No. 11 183733 SPS 00 TM], and has registered as a participant to the subsequent Ontario Municipal Board appeal hearing initiated by the Developer and other parties [OMB PL PL 150375 – OPA 287].

The CRBA Development Committee, representing the interests of local residents and businesses, has serious concerns about the proposed development at 77 River / 7 Labatt, and has brought those concerns to the attention of the Developer, City Planning staff
(Alex Teixeira), City Urban Design (Myron Boyko), City Legal staff (Rob Roberts), the local Councilor (Pam McConnell), and her staff (Tomas Davidson).

Following a recent October 3 2016 meeting with City Planning, City Legal, the Councillor and her staff, the CRBA again highlighted community concerns, as they were strongly expressed during the one-and-only public consultation, which have not been addressed in recent revisions to the proposed development at 77 River St / 7 Labatt Ave. Just today, October 12, the day before the TEYCC meeting, we received a response from City staff.

As this is still an active, unresolved matter, the CRBA requests that the TEYCC:

1. Direct City staff undertake a detailed review of the CRBA concerns,
2. Direct City staff, and the Developer, to meet with the community at large, to present and receive feedback on the revised development proposal,
3. Request that changes be made to the built form and ‘zoning envelope’ to address the original community concerns, and
4. Defer a decision on the application to later date.

Please refer to the following attachments for more detail:

Attachment A    Email: October 6 2016, from Scott Barker (CRBA) to City staff - Tomas Davidson, Alex Teixeira, Rob Robertson
Subject: “CRBA DEV Re: Labatt/River report”,
Summary: CRBA summary of concerns following the Oct 3 meeting with City staff.

Attachment B    Email, with doc attachment: October 12 2016, received from Myron Boyco,
Subject: “7 labatt”
Summary: City of Toronto Senior Planner Urban Design response to community concerns (highlighted)

Attachment C    Email: October 12 2016, from Scott Barker (CRBA) to City staff – Myron Boyco, Tomas Davidson, Alex Teixeira, Rob Robertson
Subject: “CRBA DEV – Re: 7 Labatt St”
Summary: CRBA response to Urban Design’s comments on community concerns.

Thank you,

Scott Barker
Chair, CRBA Development Committee, Board Member
on behalf of the Corktown Residents and Business Association.

scottbarker@gmail.com

CC
Hello Thomas, Alex, Robert

The Corktown Residents and Business Association (CRBA), Development Committee recognises the improvements and enhancements made to the design, since the public presentation and consultation earlier this year. However, the CRBA would like to highlight the strongly expressed community concerns, which were brought to the attention of the Developer, Architect, and the City, which have not been addressed in the redesign of the project.

Concern centres around the relationship between proposed building at 77 River St, and the existing smaller scale, fine grain, single family dwellings to the North and South on River St.

The proposed building at 77 River St, presents a 12m, four storey tall, blank, featureless wall, built on the property line, running 85m East-West, spanning the length of the site. Above this wall, a podium building of residential units with balconies rises to over 35m (10 storeys), topped with amenity space, all of which overlooks the ‘sunken’ townhomes to the south.

The north-south oriented rows of townhomes are approx 10m tall, and are less than five years old. The contrast between this recently built, small scale development of single family terrace homes, and the new building at 77 River St, which does not start until it is 12m above grade, could not be any more pronounced.

The CRBA would like to see a more gradual and sensitive transition between the new building and the adjacent housing to create a softer, less abrupt, less overbearing transition. The CRBA asks that the Developer address the community’s concerns, and consider the height of the wall, its massing and materiality, the use of setbacks, stepped terraces or balconies, and landscaping within the first 12m, to create a more gradual and sensitive relationship between neighbours.

We observe that the new development has a single storey area, topped with a massive 20m x 10m atrium skylight north of the wall. This skylight, however, is blocked, and walled in with a 5m tall wall, separating it from the south. Perhaps changing the location of this skylight, or splitting it into smaller elements distributed along the south wall, open to the south, would provide opportunities for the building’s tenants and residents while satisfying the community’s concerns about the blank, featureless, 12m tall, uninterrupted 85m long wall.

The CRBA would not be opposed to additional height in the tower, in exchange for further setbacks and improvements to soften the transition between the new building and the existing housing to the south.

We also are concerned about the increase in the height of the podium from the original proposal, presumably to compensate for the loss of one tower. This trade-off is not beneficial in our view. The Regent Park developer is showing great concern about podium heights on the west side of River, and we believe this same sensitivity is necessary on the east side. The height of the podium is totally out of the context of both the existing and new built form on River Street and is certainly well beyond what was envisaged by the Queen-River Secondary Plan that the community had input and which has been challenged at the OMB as providing for too much density.

We welcome any further communication or discussion with the City and Developer on these issues.

Scott
on behalf of the CBRA

- SCOTT BARKER ARCHITECT
  +1 416 939 0690
  220–11 ELM AVENUE, TORONTO M4W 1N2
  SCOTTBARKER.CA
  /

- On Oct 6, 2016, at 10:16 AM, Thomas Davidson <tdavids2@toronto.ca> wrote:

  Hi again,

  Scott/all- when you have a summary of your points to address, can you send them on? Staff are meeting to address the issues and your list will be helpful.

  Tom
Tom Davidson
Senior Advisor, Planning & Projects

Pam McConnell
Deputy Mayor
City Councillor, Ward 28 (Toronto Centre - Rosedale)
100 Queen Street West, Suite A7
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Phone: 416-338-5157 | Fax: 416-392-7296
Email: tdavids2@toronto.ca | Councillor_McConnell@toronto.ca
Web: www.pammccconnell.ca | Twitter: @PamMcConnell28
Hi Scott,

Please find attached my comments in regard to your concerns on behalf of CBR.

Myron

(416) 392-7190
Hello Thomas, Alex, Robert

The Corktown Residents and Business Association (CRBA), Development Committee recognises the improvements and enhancements made to the design, since the public presentation and consultation earlier this year. However, the CRBA would like to highlight the strongly expressed community concerns, which were brought to the attention of the Developer, Architect, and the City, which have not been addressed in the redesign of the project.

Concern centres around the relationship between proposed building at 77 River St, and the existing smaller scale, fine grain, single family dwellings to the North and South on River St.

The proposed building at 77 River St, presents a 12m, four storey tall, blank, featureless wall, built on the property line, running 85m East-West, spanning the length of the site. True, however this is an application for rezoning. The detail of what this wall will look like will be determined during the site plan application process. For example, approximately the first 1/3 of this two storey wall starting at River St does not sit on the property line which could provide for plant material, windows in some locations, lighting for a safer north end of the townhouse blocks as well as surface and material articulation.

The central 1/3 portion of the wall where the skylight is located steps down to one storey creating a significant break in massing helping to reduce the impact of the wall. The last 1/3 part of this wall steps back up to two storeys. Above this wall, a podium building of residential units with balconies rises to over 35m (10 storeys), topped with amenity space, all of which overlooks the ‘sunken’ townhomes to the south. The wall above the podium referred to steps back 10 metres away from the townhouses. This is significant since the experience from the townhouse side is more like a datum line of a podium which defines scale. Normally 3-5 metres is provided on a streetscape with a tall building on top. That's not to say that the residents will be not aware of the taller parts of the proposal but a large step back helps to reduce that impact. This of course would all have to be studied by staff and informed and agreed to by the area residents.

The north-south oriented rows of townhomes are approx 10m tall, and are less than five years old. The contrast between this recently built, small scale development of single family terrace homes, and the new building at 77 River St, which does not start until it is 12m above grade, could not be any more pronounced. The proposed podium height of 11.5 metres along Labatt is at an appropriate scale for the street and the townhouses on River St. However an opportunity does exist to reduce that height by approximately 1 metre where the green roofs at level 3 are proposed by eliminating the parapet detail.

The CRBA would like to see a more gradual and sensitive transition between the new building and the adjacent housing to create a softer, less abrupt, less overbearing transition. See last comment. Note a fine grained scale and rhythm related to the townhouses can be achieved through the site plan process. The CRBA asks that the
Developer address the community’s concerns, and consider the height of the wall, its massing and materiality, the use of setbacks, stepped terraces or balconies, and landscaping within the first 12m, to create a more gradual and sensitive relationship between neighbours. The podium wall will be looked at as stated above but will be subject to comprise on both sides.

We observe that the new development has a single storey area, topped with a massive 20m x 10m atrium skylight north of the wall. This skylight, however, is blocked, and walled in with a 5m tall wall, separating it from the south. Perhaps changing the location of this skylight, or splitting it into smaller elements distributed along the south wall, open to the south, would provide opportunities for the building’s tenants and residents while satisfying the community’s concerns about the blank, featureless, 12m tall, uninterrupted 85m long wall. This would be subject to developers building program.

The CRBA would not be opposed to additional height in the tower, in exchange for further setbacks and improvements to soften the transition between the new building and the existing housing to the south. Additional height would create problems for the City's desire to keep heights down for other tall building proposals in the Queen River secondary plan area.

We also are concerned about the increase in the height of the podium from the original proposal, presumably to compensate for the loss of one tower. This trade-off is not beneficial in our view. The podium is stepped to reduce built form impacts - while it did increase in size it helped to eliminate one tower. The Regent Park developer is showing great concern about podium heights on the west side of River, and we believe this same sensitivity is necessary on the east side. The height of the podium is totally out of the context of both the existing and new built form on River Street and is certainly well beyond what was envisaged by the Queen-River Secondary Plan that the community had input and which has been challenged at the OMB as providing for too much density.

We welcome any further communication or discussion with the City and Developer on these issues.

Scott
on behalf of the CBRA
Hello Myron, thank you for your comments, I have reviewed them. (Who is CBR?)

On your 8th point, the City’s desire to keep heights down has set up problem with the lower level setbacks and podium heights. If a developer cannot have height, and cannot sell top units at a premium, they must make up their costs with more cheaper units in a taller, wider, bulkier, more massive podium which comes at the expense of well designed urban spaces, increased setbacks, stepped setbacks to angular planes, and contextual relationships with existing neighbourhoods be they over 100 years old (north on River), or built within the last 5 years (south on River).

The CRBA has stated that we are not opposed to additional height in exchange for further concessions and improvements to the design where the building meets the sidewalk, and in the first four storeys where there building forms part of the community and has a direct impact on existing and future residents. I would expect the City, the Developer and the community are in agreement that it is this zone that has the biggest impact on the community (positive or negative), and that a high-quality building at grade is the primary objective of City building, and where the local block-by-block character of a neighbourhood is maintained, enhanced, or destroyed.

I have yet to see evidence of a successful site plan approval process where changes to the height, massing, and setbacks of the building, (the envelope) are modified to address community concerns, or improve the contextual relationship of the proposed development to the surrounding neighbourhood. We would like to see binding measures, motions, (or a deferral) in place, in writing, to ensure that this takes place, and that the stated objectives are achieved before approval is granted.

I also want to more succinctly respond to your comment on the phone about the site already being zoned, as-of-right, for a 15m wall facing the southern townhouses. While a 15m blank wall would not be ideal, a 15m tall building, blank, windowed, or otherwise would be more in keeping with the larger warehouse type buildings North and South on River, and as proposed at 41-43 River St. I do not follow the logic of your argument that because a 15m wall is permitted as-of-right, that the community should be willing to accept a 12m wall (topped with an additional 8 storeys of overlooking balconies, and a further 20+ storey overbearing tower). This trade-off is not something the community is prepared to support as currently presented.

Scott
on behalf of the CRBA (Corktown Resident’s and Business Association)

On Oct 12, 2016, at 3:45 PM, Myron Boyko <mboyko@toronto.ca> wrote:

Hi Scott,

Please find attached my comments in regard to your concerns on behalf of CBR.

Myron

(416) 392-7190
<CBRA comments.docx>