

To:- Members of Toronto City Council

July 18th 2018

Re TE34.38 44 Jackes Ave 33 Rosehill Ave Zoning Amendment Application
City Council Meeting July 23rd 2018

A)

1. We do not dispute the right of the Site Owner to apply for an added building.
2. **We dispute the concept of applying the Tall Buildings Guidelines to this site which designates a Podium/Base, and seek a waiver from this policy.**
3. We wish for a win-win-win situation, Owner, Residents, Neighbours.

B) OUR BIGGEST ISSUE.

Our biggest single issue is with the overwhelming massing of the building on the site.

Namely.....

- We are being informed that a podium or base is a necessity due to current policies.
- This appears to be inconsistent with the neighbourhood, where not a single existing building along Jackes Ave and Rosehill Ave has a podium, neither are there town houses.
- This feature is more appropriate in a retail situation along major roads.
- The application is not ecologically friendly.
- It is 100% inconsistent with Rosehill Ave.

Footprint comparison.... (Ratio of Footprint Sq M to total GFA)

a) Applied for GFA	ratio is 1:19.	251 Units
b) Existing 33 Rosehill	ratio is 1:28	217 units
c) Proposed 790 Sq.M. Tower (only)...	ratio is 1.27.	250 units

Therefore we ask that this application receive a waiver and be exempted from requirements of the Tall Building Guidelines for the following reasons.

1. Quote from the Tall Building Guidelines policy,
'The Guidelines indicate that the height of the base building should match the existing street wall context '. As above, there are NO such buildings.
2. Similarly, the Yonge-St Clair Secondary Plan states that,
quotes, *'achieving a harmonious relationship to the built form context through..... massing, setbacks, stepbacks, roof line and profile, architectural expression..... co-ordinated streetscape and open space improvements'.*
'Policy 4.2new development in Apartment Neighbourhoods will provide setbacks to facilitate the planting of large shade trees'.. End of quotes.

This is a unique gem of a site, attracting tenants by its location + park-like setting.

C) REMAINING ISSUES OF CONCERN.

We are prepared to support a multi-storey Tower with up to two additional compensatory floors, but with no Podium/Base or Town Houses, It provides for an economically justifiable number of possible family units in line with the application.

An alignment/setback matching the existing 33 Rosehill building is in character.

Additional 40% ground level greenery is worth accepting a higher building.

We propose an (up to) 790 Sq.M per floor 31- storey Tower with a potential of 250 units.

- 1. **Footprint/Setbacks**..... The massing and overwhelming footprint on this essentially triangular site with roadways on two sides and leased property on the west side is a source of great concern.

We would wish to see the footprint, currently 1123 Sq M, and the 1280 Sq M. Levels 2- 4 overhang, all be reduced to 790 Sq M in the form of a tower, to allow for better preservation of site character, pedestrian-safe pathways, landscaping and increased treed setback.

With Podium/Base eliminated, this is a footprint reduction of 30% at Ground level and 38% at Levels 2-4 overhang.

Alignment on north side with adjacent 33 Rosehill Ave is desirable & practical.

- 2. **Podium/Townhouses**... We request elimination of this feature. The current application adds to using up the bulk of the site, and virtually eliminates any worthwhile greenery.

Incorporating town houses in the plan is **inconsistent with current Rosehill Ave. characteristics**. All current residences along Rosehill Ave are set back.

- 3. **Density** The above proposals **would imply very minor changes to the applied-for density of 5.63** with no apparent precedent-setting aspects.

“Win-Win-Win”

It is perhaps unusual to see such as ourselves promoting a taller building.

It is for the following reasons;-

- We recognize the social need of increasing the supply of purpose-built family-oriented rental units via Apartment Neighbourhood in-fill proposals.
- The foregoing will compare with a rental building on Pleasant Blvde with 32 floors. It does not set a precedent. It is still within density parameters.
- Existing tenants and neighbours are minimally affected by shadowing.
- Regaining almost 40% of landscaped area at Ground level compensates for this.
- In terms of economic justification, the property owner retains proposed units.
- The addition of two floors adds a minimal 223 Sq M (Est) to the application.

We believe that this compromise is a “win-win-win” to the benefit of all parties.

- It is the result of consultation and efforts toward mediation.

It is predicated on a waiver of the Tall Buildings Guidelines.

Submitted by Don Pratt

Bretton Place Tenants Association (Executive Committee)