



VIA EMAIL (nycc@toronto.ca)

April 19, 2021

City Secretariat, Attention: Carlie Turpin
North York Community Council

Re: NY23.8 – 1710 to 1736 Bayview Avenue – Zoning By-law
Amendments and rental Housing Demolition Applications –
Preliminary Report

Dear Chair James Pasternak and NYCC Councillors,

The South Eglinton Ratepayers' and Residents' Association (SERRA) welcomes the Preliminary Report as prepared by City Planning and generally, is in support of the comments raised in the report.

We find that the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site for the following reasons:

1) Height

The proposed height of 10 storeys is too tall and runs counter to the height of 8 storeys for this location as per OPA 405.

2) Urban design

This building has an overwhelming presence in many regards and is not acceptable to the community from an urban design perspective. It requires a major redesign.

It lacks both horizontal and vertical articulation with a nearly vertical 30 m high and 100 m long Bayview Ave façade. It is interrupted only by an 11 m wide and 2

storey high opening in the front wall (for access to the garage and the rear of the property).

Stepbacks should be increased and be varied along the east façade to provide both horizontal as well as vertical articulation of the structure (OPA 405, section 5.3.6).

At the rear, the design of the building is not respecting a 45 degree angular plane to the adjacent Neighbourhood. The angular plane should be taken from lowest grade elevation of the adjacent property located along the rear of the property line (OPA 405, section 5.3.27).

The north wall rises up straight for more than 30 m. Since there is a real possibility that residential properties to the north will not be developed, the north façade should also incorporate stepbacks.

Furthermore, the design of the building does not adequately respect the various heritage “listed” and “designated” buildings on the east side of Bayview.

We would ask that two stand-alone mid-rise buildings be erected with a generous and green courtyard between the 2 buildings, incorporating horizontal as well as vertical articulation and recognizing the character and heritage elements of the neighbourhood.

3) Lack of “Mixed Use”

The “Live-work” units along the Bayview frontage appear nearly identical to the “townhouse” units at the rear, signifying the lack of multi-use purpose for this development. The central location of the development adjacent to the future Bayview/Leaside LRT station would suggest that commercial use at the Bayview frontage is required (retail/services).

4) Size of units ... lack of AFFORDABLE housing.

Unit sizes appear to be much smaller than the City’s minimum size unit standards. There are no AFFORDABLE housing units offered, which is a frequent offering for new developments.

5) Traffic concerns

There remain concerns about left turns in/out for this development (turning north on Bayview when exiting the building and turning into the development driveway, when approaching on Bayview from the south). The transportation study for the site mentions that right in/out turns are the preferred way to enter/exit the building. This might lead to the use of Neighbourhood streets to enter/exit safely into this development.

We would recommend that a City Transportation Services review be undertaken for the immediate neighbourhood to ensure appropriate traffic safety improvements are made.

6) Laneway at the rear

We support the current development proposal to create a rear laneway that will function as a privately owned, publicly accessible green pedestrian/cycling pathway. The laneway is proposed to be 7.5 m wide, and the garage below grade will be set back 4 metres from the west property line (to accommodate tree roots).

At the rear of this property is a wide slope (for the whole of the 100-metre west lot line), that serves as a critical transition to the (higher) adjacent residential backyards. The slope is stabilized by many mature trees, which also serve to provide a green privacy barrier between the proposed development and the houses to the west. It would be environmentally inappropriate to remove the slope and replace it with a 2-3 m high concrete wall (that will need to be extended several meters below ground). Replicating this green barrier at the west lot line will likely not be feasible.

In addition, the laneway will be dead ended at both the north and south end since this is a mid-block development. Creating an exit on Soudan and Mann Ave will likely not occur (and the connection to Mann Ave would involve traversing a steep slope). Even if a future connection to Soudan/Mann were feasible, in the interim a building connection to Bayview will be required.

SERRA would welcome an opportunity together with other stakeholders to work with the developer to create a mutually satisfactory, community-appropriate application for this site.

Respectfully,

Andy Gort,
President SERRA

Cc. Councillor Jaye Robinson, Ward 15
Giulio Cescato, Acting Director, Community Planning, North York district
Al Rezoski, Mgr. Community Planning
Kathryn Moore, Senior Planner
South Eglinton Ratepayers' and Residents' Association Board
Leaside Residents Association Board -