

Leaside Residents Association Incorporated

1601 Bayview Avenue, P.O. Box 43582
Toronto, ON M4G 3B0

April 19, 2021

North York Civic Centre
Main Floor, 5100 Yonge St.
Toronto, ON M2N 5V7
Attention: Carlie Turpin, Committee Clerk
E-mail: NYCC@toronto.ca

**RE: NY23.8 Preliminary Report 1710 to 1736 Bayview Avenue – Zoning By-law Amendment and Rental Housing Demolition Applications (Ward 15)
(Planning Application Number 20 153356 NNY 15 OZ)**

Dear Councillor Pasternak and Members of North York Community Council,

The Leaside Residents' Association provides the following comments concerning the above noted application, which seeks permission to construct a nine storey building on the west side of Bayview just south of Eglinton. The site is located on lands designated as Mixed Use within the Yonge-Eglinton Secondary Plan (OPA 405). The proposed building would have a length of 103.4 metres, height of 31.5 metres, gross floor area of 16,931 square metres, floor space index of 4.26 and contain 216 residential units and 134 vehicle parking spaces. The application represents a re-submission of the earlier application for 1718 to 1734 Bayview to include additional properties acquired by the developer.

The Leaside Residents' Association (LRA) has undertaken a preliminary review of this zoning by-law amendment application and the City's Preliminary Report, and has significant concerns with the proposal in its current form, including the following:

Physical Massing and Height in context of the site

- The proposed length of the building is 103.4 metres which far exceeds the maximum building length of 60 metres set out in the Mid-Rise Buildings Performance Standards. Two separate buildings would appear more in keeping with the surrounding development.
- The proposed height of the building i.e. 9 storeys is in excess of the 8 storeys contemplated by OPA 405 for the Bayview-Leaside Character Area unless the policies of section 5.4.10 of OPA 405 are met. Given that the height of the proposed live-work units at the front, and townhouses at the rear of the building are shown as being equal to two storeys, it would appear that the proposal may actually be for 10 storeys rather than 9 storeys. And because of the sloping

nature of the site, the building height at its northern end is not fully reflected in an average height figure.

- OPA 405 provides direction as to how the rear angular plane should be measured that takes account of site situations such as this:

5.3.27 In instances where the rear of the property is at a different grade level than the primary street frontage, the required rear angular plane should always be taken from the lowest grade elevation of the adjacent property located along the rear property line.

However instead of complying with this direction the applicant has used the rear lot line (which generally follows the top of that slope) in calculating the angular plane for the west side of the building. Given the significant slope at the rear of the property, the use of the rear lot line results in significantly more of the building mass falling within the angular plane than would have been the case if the OPA 405 direction had been complied with.

Even measuring the angular plane from the property line, it is noted that several portions of the proposed structure project into its angular plane. This is a major concern given the need to protect the quality of life for the residents of the “Neighbourhood” designated lands to the west.

- The very high density figure (FSI of 4.26) confirms that the application proposes to place an excessive amount of mid-rise structure on the site. This density coupled with the excessive length results in a building some have likened to a marooned Queen Mary liner, or to a Brutalist building on a university campus (Urban Toronto). In either case, its bulk and massing are inappropriate and out of character for the streetscape context.

Fulfilling its Mixed Use Designation

- The property was re-designated from Neighbourhoods to Mixed Use (OPA 405). As such, and especially given its close proximity to the new Leaside LRT Station, retail, service and office uses should be included in the development, as well as the proposed residential uses.
- Prime candidates for such non-residential uses are the proposed live-work units at the front of the building. Such units do not meet the intent of Section 1.3.2 of OPA 405 which indicates “the Midtown Villages are historic main streets that will continue to be vital retail and service destinations for residents, workers and visitors”.

Housing mix and affordability

- The proposed mix of residential units has changed dramatically:

- 56% 2 and 3 bedroom units in current submission compared with
- 80% 2 and 3 bedroom units in earlier submission.

The reduction in proportion of larger units would seem to suggest a move away from family housing toward singles, and perhaps also towards investor purchasers, and away from resident (live-in) purchasers. These are a concern as we wish to maintain a complete community with families.

- No mention is made in the application with respect to the inclusion of affordable housing.

Design and materiality

- The ten sets of quadraplexes immediately across Bayview are important in establishing a distinctive neighbourhood character. They are nominated, and two are listed and designated heritage properties. Greater effort is needed to ensure that the development is compatible with them in design and materiality.
- It is important that the façades of the north and south ends of the building be varied such that they do not appear as solid blank walls for pedestrians and others heading north and south along Bayview. Appropriate step backs and articulation are needed.

Transportation and Parking

- The development is to be entered via a right turn from Bayview southbound and to be exited via a right turn to Bayview southbound. What route are northbound vehicles on Bayview going to use to reach the development? Are there safety issues related to the proximity of the proposed access to the Bayview/Eglinton intersection and to any buses dropping off or picking up passengers from the Leaside LRT station?
- The proposed vehicular parking, 134 spaces (113 res, 21 visitor and no retail parking), would appear questionable given the 216 residential units proposed. It is critical that any parking needs generated by the development be accommodated on site. .

Community Services and Facilities

- As soft services such as schools and parks are limited in the area, it is important that a Community Services and Facilities Study be completed in order that any adverse impacts can be minimized.

The LRA notes that many of the above concerns with the proposed development are noted in the City's Preliminary Report. The LRA supports the recommendations in the staff report, and in addition requests:

- **that notice for the community consultation be extended beyond the required 120 metres, to include an appropriate area west and east of Bayview Avenue.**

The LRA appreciates your consideration of our comments. We look forward to participating in further discussions to resolve the concerns.

Yours truly,

Geoff Kettel

Geoff Kettel
Co-President with Carol Burtin-Fripp

Attachment: Errors and Suggested Corrections to Preliminary Report

c.c Councillor Jaye Robinson, Ward 15
Trustee Rachel Chernos Lin
Giulio Cescato, Acting Director, Community Planning, North York District
Al Rezoski, Manager, Community Planning, North York District
John Andreevski, Manager, Community Planning, North York District
Kathryn Moore, Senior Planner, Community Planning, North York District
Adam Kebede, Planner, Community Planning, North York District
Andy Gort, President, South Eglinton Residents and Ratepayers Association (SERRA)
Bayview-Leaside Business Improvement Area

Attachment: Errors and Suggested Corrections to Preliminary Report

The LRA and SERRA have jointly identified some apparent factual errors in the Preliminary Report and these are listed below together with recommended corrections.

Page 2 Application Description

The development is 10 storeys not 9 storeys. The "live-work" units and townhouses are actually 2 storeys (and not open lofts) despite the developers description of them being "1 storey".

Page 3-4 Table - summary of revised submission

The stated setback and stepbacks on the Bayview side are incorrect:

set back is 4.5 m from property line (not 3m as per the report)
stepback - at floor 3-6 is negative 1.5 m (not 1m above 4th floor and 2m above 6th floor as per the report). This represents a 1.5 m overhang over the live-work 2 storey units.
stepback at floor 7-8 is negative 0.5m (0 metres as per report)

Page 11: Heritage Impact and Conservation

Re "In addition, the residential buildings at 1783 and 1785 Bayview Avenue are included in the City's Heritage Register as enacted by City Council on January 31, 2019"

In addition, 1755-57 Bayview Avenue is also listed on the Heritage Register
Plus BOTH quadraplexes (the four addresses) are designated under Part 4 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

1755-57- Oct 3, 2019 Bylaw 1396-2019

1883-85 - June 19, Bylaws June 19 2019 224-2019, 948-2019

(Note the conflicting dates for designation quoted)

Page 23 - Official Plan Land Use Map #17

The land use designation shown for the east side of Bayview from Parkhurst Blvd. north to 1785 Bayview (S of Eglinton) is incorrect.

The Map in the report includes these lands within "Redesignated from Neighbourhoods to Mixed Use as per OPA 405".

However the current download of Map 17 correctly shows these lands as Neighbourhoods. City Council reversed the staff recommended OPA designation for these lands, and the Map in the Preliminary Report is incorrect.