

From: [Valleyanna Residents](#)
To: [North York Community Council](#)
Subject: 2 Valleyanna Drive - Community Council meeting June 23, 2021
Date: June 15, 2021 2:52:37 PM
Attachments: [Detailed Letter to City Planner from VRA - Final 20201120.pdf](#)

Good afternoon -

We write to you with respect to the Application at 2 Valleyanna to allow a townhouse complex. As the Applicant appealed, as the City had not yet rendered its decision, the topic is now being discussed at North York Community Council on June 23, 2021 and at City Council on July 14, 2021.

We stand together with all homeowners on the street as the Valleyanna Residents' Association to object to this Application.

I am attaching the relevant documents. We certainly appreciate the support of all the various departments who voiced their disagreement with the Application.

<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2021/ny/bgrd/backgroundfile-167748.pdf>

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2021.NY25.8>

Of note, the property is now for sale, with the large sign indicating, "Land for sale" which I do not think bodes well for the level of care they have given to the historic home. We also do not like their lack of transparency in the rendering showing the height of the additions below the Heritage home, which is not what they proposed.

<https://www.cbre.ca/properties/search/land/details/CA-Plus-310385/2-valleyanna-drive-toronto-m4n-1j8?view=isSale>

If negotiations do begin to consider some portion of the Application, please refer to our summation letter, particularly page one that indicated what would be fair should the City go ahead. It is attached below. In particular, we ask that the development be made smaller, more setbacks, have no windows overlooking 4 Valleyanna, and be modified to present properly to its legal address, 2 Valleyanna Drive. None of us want to live next door to the parking lot, which is what is presently proposed for us! The key points from the summary page are as follows:

1. We believe for the reasons set out in this letter, in particular the precedent set by the rejected application at Weybourne Crescent (also in Lawrence Park), that the Application should be rejected in its entirety.

- 2. No action should be permitted or taken until the real and profound flooding on the street is addressed.*
- 3. No action should be permitted until a meaningful and accurate traffic study is undertaken and traffic issues properly addressed.*
- 4. Any building permitted should be limited to the severance and permission for only one additional single family home built next to the gatehouse to comply with Neighbourhoods to respect and reinforce the existing physical character of buildings, streetscapes and open space patterns. A single additional home will involve fewer cars, fewer residents, less water use, less land use, and less tree destruction on the lot, and would substantially address the issues below. (Healthy Neighbourhoods policies within Chapter 2 of the Official Plan).*
- 5. Any building permitted should be required to be in line with the building height of the gatehouse and not dwarf it in keeping with the Heritage Act and the Official Plan (Policy 3.1.5.2).*
- 6. Any building permitted should be in line with the building height of the neighbouring homes and not exceed the allowed maximum height per the Neighbourhood Act (Official Plan 3.1.2).*
- 7. Any building permitted should have its setback increased and not require the destruction of trees along Bayview which protect the entire street (see pictures on page 3).*
- 8. Any building permitted should be setback from and have no windows or terraces or decks overlooking the property at 4 Valleyanna, the immediate neighbour.*
- 9. Any building permitted should be required to face the legal address of 2 Valleyanna and should be in keeping with the Neighbourhood Act (4.1.5) to blend in and not have Valleyanna be subjected to a view of a cement wall and parking garage. The built form character and context of the street and the character of the neighbourhood should be maintained (Neighbourhoods policies within Section 4.1.5 of the Official Plan).*
- 10. Any building permitted should comply with the Bayview Townhouse Guidelines with respect to massing, street view, overlook, and green spaces (Chapter 3 and also the Provincial Policy Statement, "PPS") plus Bylaws 438-86 and 569-2013 which all serve to protect areas of infill, and to prevent existing residents from being burdened by developments that do not fit in and would undermine the stability of the neighbourhood.*

We are also in agreement with a concept that the Lawrence Park Ratepayers' Association offered. They believe that if developers want to change the bylaws for their properties on residential streets that back into Lawrence, Mt. Pleasant or Bayview, as if they were on these major streets under different bylaws, then they should also have to construct driveways to Lawrence, Mt. Pleasant and Bayview. They should not be able to pick and choose which by-laws under residential or major street guidelines suit them. If the developers were required to do so then either the plan would not be multiple units or the residential streets would not be negatively impacted by traffic. Should another hearing occur the LPRA would support this.

Sincerely,

Valleyanna Residents' Association

November 20, 2020

Kathryn Moore
Senior Planner, Community Planning
North York District
North York Civic Centre, Ground Floor
5100 Yonge St., Toronto, ON M2N 5V7

Re: Application No: 20 151274 NNY 15 OZ

Dear Ms. Moore:

This letter serves as a response to the Application by the developer at 2 Valleyanna. We are united as a street in opposing this Application. Sixteen of the 19 residents (other than the Applicant) oppose (the other three: one is overseas and two stated they wish to remain neutral as they are friends/cottage neighbours with the Applicant). Thus, 84% of the other owners on the street remain very opposed to the Application for development. The neighbourhood concerns are real and valid and should be addressed and considered.

In summary:

1. We believe for the reasons set out in this letter, in particular the precedent set by the rejected application at Weybourne Crescent (also in Lawrence Park), that the Application should be rejected in its entirety.
2. No action should be permitted or taken until the real and profound **flooding** on the street is addressed.
3. No action should be permitted until a meaningful and accurate **traffic study** is undertaken and traffic issues properly addressed.
4. Any building permitted should be limited to the severance and permission for only one additional **single family home** built next to the gatehouse to comply with *Neighbourhoods* to respect and reinforce the existing physical character of buildings, streetscapes and open space patterns. A single additional home will involve fewer cars, fewer residents, less water use, less land use, and less tree destruction on the lot, and would substantially address the issues below. (Healthy Neighbourhoods policies within Chapter 2 of the Official Plan).
5. Any building permitted should be required to be in line with the **building height** of the gatehouse and not dwarf it in keeping with the Heritage Act and the Official Plan (Policy 3.1.5.2).
6. Any building permitted should be in line with the **building height** of the neighbouring homes and not exceed the allowed maximum height per the Neighbourhood Act (Official Plan 3.1.2).

7. Any building permitted should have its **setback increased** and not require the destruction of trees along Bayview which protect the entire street (see pictures on page 3).
8. Any building permitted should be setback from and have **no windows or terraces or decks** overlooking the property at 4 Valleyanna, the immediate neighbour.
9. Any building permitted should be required to face the legal address of 2 Valleyanna and should be in keeping with the Neighbourhood Act (4.1.5) to blend in and not have Valleyanna be subjected to a view of a cement wall and parking garage. The **built form character and context** of the street and the character of the neighbourhood should be maintained (*Neighbourhoods* policies within Section 4.1.5 of the Official Plan).
10. Any building permitted should comply with the Bayview Townhouse Guidelines with respect to **massing, street view, overlook, and green spaces** (Chapter 3 and also the Provincial Policy Statement, "PPS") plus By-laws 438-86 and 569-2013 which all serve to protect areas of infill, and to prevent existing residents from being burdened by developments that do not fit in and would undermine the stability of the neighbourhood.

Each of the reports that have been submitted will be addressed in turn:

Arborist report:

They are applying to injure 6 trees and to remove 51 trees.

TREE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

9. The client is required to submit an application to Urban Forestry, Tree Protection & Plan Review for a permit to injure Trees 304-308 and 324-362 (6 trees) and remove Trees 301, 302, 309-318, 322, 324-359, 361 and 362 (51 trees).

Six (6) of those trees are located on the property of 4 Valleyanna Drive. Their plan involves removing and injuring trees on a neighbouring home and that neighbour does NOT agree.

No plan should involve such a wanton destruction of the tree canopy, upon which all Valleyanna and Lawrence Park residents rely. The entire street relies on the entire tree canopy as a barrier to shield the traffic noise and light from Bayview Avenue, one of the busiest streets in Toronto.

By removing 51 trees, the privacy of the entire street will be ruinously harmed. The homes at 4 & 6 Valleyanna will be opened directly to Bayview Avenue, eliminating any privacy they enjoy. The immediate neighbours at 1/4/6 do not agree. The majority of the street does not agree. The canopy should be protected.

Any build which is permitted should be required to have greater setbacks so as to not decimate the tree line running along Bayview Avenue.

The following two pictures show the trees on the property from the west and the east:



Architectural Plans:

The proposed height of the buildings exceed BOTH the height of the current gatehouse and the approved zoning maximum height permitted by law. The application is for 3 story building, where the by-law permits 2 story. The by-law should be enforced because it is the law, but also because the neighbourhood has respected that (including a new build at 9 Valleyanna) and to allow a larger development to dwarf the original homes would not be in keeping with the built form character and context of the street nor the character of the neighbourhood. This would create a negative condition.

As a Heritage home, it should be protected and not dwarfed by a three story addition.

Any approved development should be required to conform to the allowed building height and no taller building should be permitted to be built, in particular one that would dwarf the Heritage home.

Zoning changes required:

The zoning is detached single family home, but they argue that an apartment building is possible. They list 16 aspects that, despite the zoning not allowing these items, they argue they can be permitted.

They exceed the number of stories permitted (seeking 3 instead of 2) and the maximum building height permitted.

Site Specific Provisions:

- (A) On 2 Valleyanna Drive, if the requirements of by-law [xxx-2020] are complied with, none of the provisions of former City of North York By-law 7625 apply to prevent the erection or use of an **apartment building**, permitted in by-law [xxx-2020].
- (B) In addition to the permitted residential building types listed in Regulation 10.20.20.40(1), an **apartment building** is also permitted.

The zoning by-laws are in place to protect residents. People bought homes relying on those being enforced. It is not fair to existing residents to allow 16 provisions to be undermined for the sole benefit of a developer, to the massive detriment of Valleyanna Drive residents.

Even if this Application is permitted in some capacity, we respectfully ask that the existing and by-law enforced building height and roof line be maintained.

Heritage Impact Statement:

This home is designated historical and there is a very long, interesting, and colourful history of the property.

However, they both at one hand laud the historical nature and properties of the gatehouse, while at the other propose significant destruction of many elements of the home.

They propose to tear off the part of the house facing Valleyanna Drive and remove in its entirety the octagon dining room.

Chapter 3 of the Official Plan on Neighbourhoods includes a section on Heritage Resources. The City's heritage buildings, districts and landscapes create unique senses of place and provide a local identity. Policy 3.1.5.2 of the Plan states that development adjacent to properties on the Inventory will "respect the scale, character and form of the heritage buildings and landscapes". Therefore, any change to the heritage home at 2 Valleyanna should be required to respect its scale, and not be permitted to dwarf it.

They propose a new build that dwarfs the original gatehouse, adding an additional story in height. This is not insignificant and should not be allowed. The existing roof line and building height of this historical property should be maintained. These proposals are NOT minor as claimed:

Alterations to the historic fabric are minor and present very low visible and physical impact on the heritage structure.

Interestingly, they note the noise and busy nature of Bayview in this section:

The Site was originally designed to front onto Bayview Avenue, which today serves as a loud and busy thoroughfare connecting Toronto's northeastern neighbourhoods to the downtown core.

This point would be well placed in the arborist study above where 51 trees are proposed to be destroyed. These serve as an essential light and sound barrier to the current residents of Valleyanna Drive.

Further, the area is zoned detached single family residential. Mr. Fletcher, an original resident to the street, adapted the gatehouse beautifully, transforming it from a gatehouse into a wonderful family home. The additions were lower than the gatehouse and placed behind, so as not to interfere with the original look of the gatehouse from the front. It is now under Application to rip off the back of the home, destroy the dining room, and be attached to a larger, taller structure that does not respect the original roof line or balance of the original size of the Heritage structure.

The photos at the front appear to maintain similar height but obviously show a large discrepancy when examined from other perspectives. The proposed building is too high (both out of context with the original home, and too high with respect to the by-laws and homes in the area and on the street).

The developer seeks to cut and disturb significant portions of the stone walls that serve as the entrance to Valleyanna Drive, because the walls were not included in the Heritage Application. However, these walls serve as a visual and geographic marker for the entire street, and should not be permitted to be cut or amended solely for the benefit of this developer, to the detriment of the current residents of the street.

The Heritage home is listed legally as 2 Valleyanna Drive, and the front of the house should be maintained; otherwise, the distinction of Heritage would be for naught and the historical structure ruined.

If some development is permitted, it is essential that it does not dwarf the original heritage gatehouse, nor the surrounding homes on the street. The roof line should be maintained. The development should honour the Heritage designation and maintain the integrity of the original building and should not be attached to the side of the building, overwhelming and altering its original look.

Utilities Plan:

These are technical drawings and do not address the issue of flooding on Valleyanna Drive. The problem is persistent and vast, affecting both sides of the street, with multiple flooding at some locations. This problem will not be made better with so many additional homes adding to the capacity issue/pressure on the street.

Hydrogeological Study:

In its report, they state that the runoff will go to existing Municipal catch basins: **water courses present on the Site. Storm water at the Site is expected to drain towards the catch basins located on municipal roads adjacent to the Site.**

As has been discussed and well documented by the City, these catch basins are over taxed and already flood existing homes on Valleyanna Drive. By adding very substantial hardscaping additional driveway to the property, there is no option for meaningful absorption of water on the property. The intention is to fully direct run off into the existing overtaxed sewers.

Of note, the testing did not address existing plagued water draining issues, flooding, and sewer issues on the street, a matter of public record. This issues are not insignificant. The development should not be allowed on that basis alone.

Geotechnical Study:

This survey discussed the ground quality and composition. It does not discuss the connection to the street or its consequences. However, the report does address the lot coverage of buildings/hardscaping. It seeks to cover a significant portion of the property with asphalt and cement. Of note:

3. The need for adequate drainage cannot be over-emphasized. The finished pavement surface and underlying granular and subgrade surfaces should be free from depressions and sloped to provide effective surface drainage towards catch-basins.

“The need for adequate drainage cannot be over-emphasized.”

This study did not discuss the impact to the existing sewer system with the addition of these multiple homes. It merely discusses the linking into the system. The City is well aware of the existing issues that cause yearly damage to homeowners on Valleyanna Drive. The immediate neighbours at 1, 4, and 6 Valleyanna have had 11 floods. Many, many more are reported further down the street. To allow further massive development, knowing this existing issue, is not only unfair to the existing residents, but raises very serious issues of liability when further damage occurs.

Green Standards Statistics:

This section refers to a Stormwater report. It is not attached.

It is important to note the existing stormwater issues facing Valleyanna which have been studied but not yet rectified by the City. The study commissioned by the City is available at the following link:

<https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/8c48-lawrence-park-neighbourhood-investigation-of-basement-flooding-final-report.pdf>

Areas of concern in the City’s study, in multiple references:

- Sewers located along Valleyanna Drive and segments along Bayview Avenue were not designed for large rainfall events such as May 12, 2000 and August 19, 2005. Water ponding on road surface is likely contributed excess water to sanitary sewer system in area of Rochester Avenue, St. Leonards Avenue, Dawlish Avenue and Valleyanna Drive.

Lawrence Park has had tremendous expansion since the area was created 75+ years ago. Huge homes have replaced original smaller structures. Water usage has skyrocketed, and sewer systems have been taxed. Larger homes with associated hardscaping prevents meaningful site and ground absorption of water.

Valleyanna Drive, as part of Lawrence Park, is located on its east side and downhill from the balance of the Lawrence Park area. The runoff waters and sewer flow from Lawrence Park both run downhill towards Valleyanna Drive.

The Applicant seeks to build and add multiple homes which would cover a substantial part of the property with buildings/driveways/hardscaping preventing any site ground water absorption. These additional new residents in 6 new additional homes (with associated water usage) will make runoff and sewer issues worse. This will tax an

already disastrous issue and will only serve to negatively impact the remaining original residents of Valleyanna Drive.

The addition of multiple homes to the top of Valleyanna, where this street is already overtaxed, cannot be minimized. This should alone prevent the Application as more homes will exacerbate an already disastrous situation.

The City should not approve a development which will render worse the condition of existing homes on the street, particularly given that the City is well aware of those issues. Should any development be permitted, it should be limited to one additional single family home to lower the potential harm to the existing residents of Valleyanna Drive. An additional 6 homes should not be permitted as the waste and water usage would break an overtaxed existing system.

Servicing Report:

The proposed sewage connection is outlined:

a 200mm dia. storm connection at 1.0% slope is proposed to the existing Storm Manhole connecting to the existing 250mm dia. storm sewer along Valleyanna Drive fronting the property. The existing 250mm dia. storm sewer drains easterly.

The drains head easterly, directly down Valleyanna Drive, where the existing sewer directly impact an area already over pressured. The homes in Lawrence Park already drain in this direction and cause extreme flooding and damage to the existing homes on Valleyanna Drive. To add a large multi home development would render this situation disastrous. They propose that the existing storm water system is adequate to allow for water run-off from the development (which has an enormous amount of hardscaping and driveways). This is not true. The development should allow for site absorption.

Their claims, therefore, are patently untrue:

F.0. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the existing municipal services are such that they can support the subject development. On the basis of our investigation and examination, it is the conclusion of the writer that:

- Adequate storm drainage and storm water management facilities for quantity control, quality control and water balance in accordance with WWFMP guidelines can be provided within the Site to neutralize the impact of urbanized runoff.
- The existing municipal water supply can adequately service the Site;
- The Site can be drained for sanitary sewage purposes.

The system is not adequate, it is subject to yearly flooding, and the addition of residents at the Valleyanna / Bayview intersection, designed to drain easterly onto Valleyanna below, will create disastrous consequences for the existing homeowners on Valleyanna Drive.

Public Consultation Strategy:

It was stated that an evening was held to introduce the proposed development to the current residents of Valleyanna Drive.

Unfortunately, the overwhelming majority of residents did NOT receive an invitation nor did they know about this event.

Of those that did, the owners at 3, 6, and 15 Valleyanna Drive, attended. One of the invitees alerted a neighbour who was not able to attend at such short notice, but when they asked for details of the proposed development, the developer declined. The invited neighbours at 3 & 6 did not express support for the development.

This cannot constitute public consultation. The City is in receipt of letters of opposition from the majority of existing residents (16/19 = 84%) of Valleyanna Drive.

Planning Rationale:

The rationale states that the proposed development is in keeping with the goal of infill. However, to do so undermines the goal - which was to create opportunities. There is currently a home there; it is NOT an under-utilized site. Neighbours are there who have quiet use and enjoyment of their homes since 1955. Over 51 trees that protect the street from the noise and light of Bayview Avenue are slated to be destroyed

directions supporting intensification and infill
on underutilized sites within the built up area.

Further, the homes in this area are two-story dwellings. This proposal is a three-story dwelling which will dwarf the existing homes on the street and in the neighbourhood. The permitted zoning allows detached single family homes, at 2 stories:

The site is zoned "RD (f21.0; a1375)", Residential Detached Zone by Toronto City-wide Zoning By-law 569-2013, as amended (see **Figure 10**, By-law 569-2013 Zoning Schedule). The maximum permitted height on the site is 10.0 metres or 2-storeys (see **Figure 11**, By-law 569-2013 Height Map).

Further, they use the construction of 6 Valleyanna to justify their application to put a 3-story development at 2 Valleyanna Drive.

permits 16.8 metres and a total building height of 3 storeys, whereas the by-law permits only 2 storeys.

The home at 6 Valleyanna does not have 3 stories; the attic area houses electrical equipment. A retroactive application was made AFTER the legal roof line had already been built. The roof line was in keeping with the permitted zoning. A recent application for a new build was made at 9 Valleyanna and efforts were made to keep it within the house and roof lines of existing homes on the street. This roof line should be maintained for any work undertaken at 2 Valleyanna Drive.

The trees along 2 Valleyanna provide an essential light and sound barrier from the noise and light from Bayview Avenue. To allow this destruction, would ruin the use of enjoyment of the homes at 4 & 6 Valleyanna, whose homes would be made open to perusal from Bayview traffic.

there are a considerable number of mature trees and there is a fairly dense planting along both Bayview Avenue and the east property line, which provides a high degree of privacy from adjacent properties to the east and north.

Further, Valleyanna Drive is a dead end street that exits directly onto Bayview Avenue. There is only one way on and one way off of the street; right at this proposed development. To now create more traffic via five additional homes on the site of 2 Valleyanna Drive, exiting as a side street development directly onto Valleyanna Drive, would exacerbate an already difficult area to manoeuvre.

Valleyanna Drive. Interestingly, north of Glenvale Boulevard and south of Post Road, Valleyanna Drive is the only local residential street which extends east of Bayview Avenue.

The development is proposed to empty directly onto Valleyanna Drive, a dead end street with only one access to Bayview. This side street development will adversely affect all original and current homeowners who currently have significant difficulty in exiting the street.

today pedestrian and vehicular accesses are provided from Valleyanna Drive.

Further, the proposed building neglects the legal address of 2 Valleyanna and, instead, has the “front” of the property on Bayview, leaving the residents of Valleyanna subject to cement walls and a view of a parking structure as their view along the street. This is not in keeping with the Official Plan, nor does it respect the neighbourhood:

respects the existing physical character of the area, reinforcing the stability of the neighbourhood."

As noted, the Official Plan and the Built Form policies in Chapter 3 of the Official Plan state that new development should be located and organized to "fit with the existing and/or planned context", respecting and improving the character of the surrounding area. New development should be designed to frame and support adjacent streets and open spaces, with consistent front yard setbacks and the preservation of existing mature trees. Vehicle access and site servicing should be located and organized to minimize impacts on surrounding properties and adjacent streets, and new development should be articulated and massed to fit into the existing context of the area.

The building requires multiple zoning changes:

The proposal also requires an amendment to the former City of North York Zoning By-law 7625, as amended, and to the Toronto City-wide Zoning By-law 569-2013, as amended, in order to increase the permitted height by 1-storey, to add a permission for a multi-dwelling building and to revise other development regulations as necessary to accommodate the proposed development.

These are not small, inconsequential changes. Further, the mass development, and all of its hardscaping, will leave no area for water absorption, and will drain onto the street, both in terms of rain run-off and sewer/waste water and will overtax an already overburdened system for the existing residents of Valleyanna Drive.

promoted. Accordingly, Policy 1.1.3.2(a) requires that land use patterns within settlement areas be based on densities and a mix of land uses, which are appropriate for and efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, support active transportation and are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed. Policy

The existing infrastructure is inadequate and this is well known to the City. To add five homes to this street, both in terms of traffic/access to Bayview, and with regard to existing flooding/sewage insufficiency, would create dire consequences for the existing residents of Valleyanna Drive.

Further, the Blythwood Public School is already over-enrolled. The sign at 2 Valleyanna Drive admits that residents may not be able to attend their local school because of inadequacy of space.

A Place to Grow, are set out in Section 1.2.1. Key principles relevant to the proposal include:

- Supporting the achievement of complete communities that are designed to support healthy and active living and meet people's needs for daily living throughout an entire lifetime;
- Prioritizing intensification and higher densities to make efficient use of land and infrastructure and support transit viability;
- Supporting a range and mix of housing options, including second units and affordable housing, to serve all sizes, incomes, and ages of households; and
- Conserving and promoting cultural heritage resources to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of all communities.

They state that the Provincial Policy Statement has as its goal to create more housing options. However, the goal of that policy was to create more accessible and affordable housing. Further, by tying this proposed development into the City's goal of additional housing is not comparable as the development has been listed as "luxurious" with multi-million dollar prices, which are largely inaccessible to most. The proposed development does not address the core of the PPS. This is not the goal of infill conceived by the City and this development has nothing to do with infill.

Inherent in the goal of the PPS was to maintain the look and character of the area. By adding a 3rd story, and by exceeding the zoning height maximums, would be to undermine the character of the street and the neighbourhood:

- a. have heights, massing and scale that are respectful of those permitted by zoning for nearby residential properties, while taking into account the existing form of development on the infill property;

It is not insignificant that the other developments to which the developer refers to as precedents all access Bayview Avenue directly or the development is discreet and accesses Bayview Avenue as a unit, thus eliminating any traffic consequences to neighbouring homes.

OPA 320 also provided a new direction with respect to lots fronting onto a major street, and flanking lots to the depth of the fronting lots. It

Because this proposed development is a side street development, exiting onto an existing and notably DEAD END street, with no means to by-pass the development, the consequences to the existing residents are significant and should not be overlooked or minimized. Accessing Bayview Avenue currently is difficult. To add multiple homes directly at this access point to Bayview, exiting onto Valleyanna Drive (and not directly onto Bayview), renders the street more unsafe to existing residents, and makes the challenge of exiting Valleyanna Drive even more difficult. This is not in keeping with the goal of the plan:

- d. front onto existing or newly created public streets wherever possible, with no gates limiting public access;

In fact, none of the goals are met:

Policy 3.1.2(3) sets out policies to ensure that new development will be massed and its exterior façade will be designed to fit harmoniously into its existing and/or planned context, and will limit its impact on neighbouring streets, parks, open spaces and properties by:

- a. massing new buildings to frame adjacent streets and open spaces in a way that respects the existing and/or planned street proportion;
- b. incorporating exterior design elements, their form, scale, proportion, pattern and materials, and their sustainable design, to influence the character, scale and appearance of the development;
- c. creating appropriate transitions in scale to neighbouring existing and/or planned buildings;
- d. providing for adequate light and privacy;

As discussed above, there is a present and urgent existing issue with drainage from Lawrence Park downhill to Valleyanna Drive. This is the subject of the City study and recommendations. Therefore, to add to an existing overtaxed area would be disastrous and not keeping with the recommendations. Their claims of an adequate system are patently untrue given the degree of driveway and hardscaping proposed, combined with the fragile sewage/drainage issues existing.

- Adequate storm drainage and stormwater management facilities for quantity control, quality control and water balance in accordance with WWFMP guidelines can be provided within the site to neutralize the impact of urbanized runoff;
- The existing municipal water supply can adequately service the site; and
- The site can be drained for sanitary sewage purposes.

Clearly the infrastructure, at this location at Valleyanna Drive, cannot serve existing needs, so the additional needs of multiple homes should not be allowed or permitted.

In summary, we don't believe any aspect of the development has a sound planning rationale. It would substantially ruin and undermine the use and enjoyment of the existing residents of Valleyanna Drive, render more dangerous their access on and off of the street, make more overtaxed the already flooding sewage system, eliminate any possibility of ground absorption of water by hardscaping a very large area on the site, eliminate the privacy afforded to 4&6 Valleyanna by the existing tree canopy, and would create a large overbearing building, where two story homes exist on a dead end street. In addition, the destruction of parts of the heritage home and entry wall to the street, plus the addition of a 3rd story would not be respecting the street proportion. All of these issues combine to make this Application offensive to the existing residents of Valleyanna Drive and should trouble all residents in Lawrence Park. It should not be permitted. It will undermine the stability of the neighbourhood.

Traffic Assessment:

The Applicant's Traffic Assessment report admits that, due to Covid restrictions, a full scope of the implications could not be made. But even with the reduced Bayview traffic due to stay home restrictions, the traffic passing Valleyanna Drive was admittedly "substantial." Leaving Valleyanna Drive at the best of times is difficult. It is an impossible left hand turn, and a difficult right hand turn. According to their report:

- Sunnybrook Hospital is a major traffic generator, particularly during the morning and afternoon peak hours. In the morning peak hour, there are long southbound left-turn queues waiting to turn onto Armistice Drive. The combination of these queues and the magnitude of through traffic volumes on Bayview Avenue is expected to result in little to no capacity for the outbound left-turn movement from Valleyanna Drive. Drivers who want to make this movement would likely be reliant upon courtesy gaps.

Even during Covid lockdown, the traffic was so substantial that there was "little to no capacity" and that drivers exiting Valleyanna Drive would "be reliant upon courtesy gaps."

This is DURING Covid, and BEFORE adding so many multiple homes. How would increasing the traffic and the number of homes render that better? This would NOT improve conditions and, in fact, would render conditions WORSE for the residents of Valleyanna Drive.

The addition of five homes, with the added traffic, particularly where the street meets Bayview, will not be easily digested or explained away. The proposed development exits very close to the end of Valleyanna Drive where it meets Bayview Avenue and will add to the congestion at this relatively dangerous intersection.

Residents have on an ongoing basis approached the City for a traffic light or coordination light with the traffic leaving Sunnybrook Hospital but these needs have not been addressed. The proposed development, being a side street development exiting directly onto Valleyanna Drive right at this critical junction, is dangerous. Valleyanna Drive is a dead end street, with no access to Bayview except where it joins Valleyanna Drive. We have no choice but to drive by this development every day.

3. The proposed development is expected to generate a small number of trips which will have a negligible impact on existing traffic operations at the Bayview Avenue at Valleyanna Drive intersection.

The addition of up to 20+ additional persons, with 10 additional cars, entering and exiting this proposed development, right where it is most dangerous, is not “negligible” and should not be discounted. The development is being marketed to families, so they will definitely fall in line with busy family traffic patterns x 6 homes. To add an additional 20+ people, and 10 additional cars, in this proposed development will have a substantial negative consequence to the residents of Valleyanna Drive.

A proper traffic study using the usual traffic patterns (not decreased due to Covid) should be ordered as that would more truthfully reflect the headaches and dangers faced by the residents existing Valleyanna Drive. Adding so many more homes would not be helpful nor make the area safer and will, in fact, make the corner of Valleyanna and Bayview much more dangerous (not to mention how dangerous things would be during the construction phase).

Should approval to build be considered, it should not be granted until a satisfactory and safe means of exiting the street has been developed in conjunction with Sunnybrook Hospital and consideration has been given to Hospital traffic, Valleyanna homeowners exiting, plus the influx into Lawrence Park at Dawlish Avenue.

Precedent and the Official Plan on Neighbourhoods:

The developer refers to a number of buildings to justify this construction. However, the nearest property was originally the Salvation Army property situated across from Sunnybrook Hospital. It had different zoning, did not require zoning change from detached single family home, and has direct access to Bayview. It, therefore, did not

materially impact the residents of Lawrence Park. Further, it DOES follow the “Bayview Townhome Guidelines” put in place to monitor townhome construction along Bayview Avenue in residential areas. These guidelines protect neighbouring communities and ensure that any infill is made with the goal of seamless integration, not stacked/intrusive buildings.

The Bayview Plan regarding Townhouses:

should promote attractive landscape streetscapes that fit with the existing landscaped character of Bayview Avenue and the irregular setback pattern found along the street. Appropriate front yard setbacks should be provided for the preservation of existing mature landscaping and the provision high quality landscaping treatments within front yard setbacks as part of new townhouse developments along Bayview Avenue. A generous front yard landscaped setback should work together with the landscape in the public boulevard to enhance the landscape character and provide amenity along Bayview Avenue.

Front yard setbacks should acknowledge and generally respect the underlying zoning by-law requirements, while maintaining appropriate rear yard setbacks to abutting properties. The minimum landscape area between the Bayview Avenue curb and the townhouse building face should range from 12 to 15 metres and 6.5 to 9 metres from the front yard property line depending on the underlying zoning by-law requirement.

There is no plan for setback. Rather, the developer sets out an apartment building that lies right next to the sidewalk. Further, the proposed development has windows and public areas directly overlooking the neighbours. The street view for the residents of Valleyanna is a cement wall and parking structure; this is hardly in keeping with the intention of the provisions to protect the neighbours who are already there.

There are rules for neighbours, to protect those who already live in the community:

rear yard setbacks should ensure adequate separation distance between the townhouse development and the adjacent detached homes and lots to maintain natural light, views and ensure privacy. Rear yard setbacks should minimize potential overlook and shadows on neighbouring properties.

The developer seeks to utilize every square inch of the property and tears out all the trees that provide both light/sound and privacy for Valleyanna Drive. Further, the building overshadows and overlooks the home at 4 Valleyanna, completely eradicating their privacy.

The developer seeks to distinguish their development from the rules of the Bayview Townhouse Design Guidelines, approved by City Council on December 16, 2013. Those guidelines seek to protect residential neighbourhoods when infill is approved. Valleyanna Drive, as a residential street on the east side of Bayview, has more in common with the residential area of Bayview south of York Mills Road, the area for which the guidelines were drafted. Any developments approved in that area must follow these guidelines. In fact, the former Salvation Army across from Sunnybrook Hospital, to which they point to as precedent and justification for their Application, and sits south of Valleyanna Drive, also follows the Bayview Townhouse Design Guidelines.

We would maintain that the “Bayview Guidelines” should apply. The intention of the guidelines were to protect areas of infill, and to prevent existing residents from being burdened by developments that do not fit in and would undermine the stability of the neighbourhood.

The other developments to which they point as precedent to justify their application are located approximately 1 - 4km from Valleyanna Drive. Some were built before Valleyanna Drive’s arrival in 1955. Further, most exist in a mixed zoning area along the Leaside stretch of Bayview, where homes and business interact in a more commercial area, where mixed zoning was already in place. Further, at that distance, Valleyanna residents were not privy to the direct neighbour notifications of any newer builds and to now hold that as precedent, given the markedly different zoning in that area, would be patently unfair.

Similar applications for this type of development were rejected by the City. One was on Weybourne Crescent, also in Lawrence Park. The other was along York Mills Road at Sandfield Avenue. A third precedent for rejection is 200-214 Keewatin Avenue, again in Lawrence Park, bordering onto Mount Pleasant Road. All three of these properties are similar to Valleyanna Drive, in that they are single family home communities bordering on busier streets.

The Application at 2 Sandfield Road, at the corner of Sandfield and York Mills Road was rejected and refused because the proposal did not conform to the policies of the Toronto Official Plan, as it was not in keeping with the building type and built form character of the geographic neighbourhood. Approval would have created a negative condition and context that could undermine the stable geographic neighbourhood character. This is the situation with Valleyanna Drive. The street would not be improved, nor its residents bolstered, by this development.

The application at 200-214 Keewatin is in Lawrence Park, on the west side of Mount Pleasant. It was rejected, and again on appeal, as the proposal did not conform to the Official Plan's Neighbourhood development criteria policies and did not respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood, in particular: the size and configuration of lots; heights, massing, scale and dwelling type of nearby residential properties; prevailing building types; setbacks of buildings from streets; prevailing patterns of rear and side yard setbacks and landscaped open space.

A closer, direct comparison can be made with the rejected Application at Weybourne Crescent; similar to Valleyanna Drive as it is also located within Lawrence Park. A developer sought to build stacked and regular townhomes on the corner of Weybourne and Lawrence Avenue East, directly in Lawrence Park. The Application was rejected, and further rejected on appeal, due to the Application not adhering to the Policy of the City regarding Neighbourhoods.

NEIGHBOURHOODS:

The revised Development Criteria in *Neighbourhoods* policies within Section 4.1.5 of the Official Plan require that development in established *Neighbourhoods* will respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the geographic neighbourhood, including:

- a) prevailing size and configuration of lots;
- b) prevailing heights, massing, scale, density and dwelling type of nearby residential properties;
- c) prevailing building type(s);
- d) prevailing location, design and elevations relative to the grade of driveways and garages;
- e) prevailing setbacks of buildings from the street or streets;
- f) prevailing patterns of rear and side yard setbacks and landscaped open space; and
- g) continuation of special landscape or built-form features that contribute to the unique physical character of a geographic neighbourhood.

Additionally, the revised Healthy Neighbourhoods policies within Chapter 2 of the Official Plan state that *Neighbourhoods* are low rise and low density residential areas that are considered to be physically stable. Development within *Neighbourhoods* will be consistent with this objective and will respect and reinforce the existing physical character of buildings, streetscapes and open space patterns in these areas. Therefore, the Application to build stacked townhomes, in a stable single family home area, where such stack is prominently overlooking neighbouring properties, is not in accordance with the Official Plan and should be rejected.

When a more intense form of development is proposed it is expected to respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood.

The Built Form policies in Section 3.1.2 of the Official Plan relate to ensuring that new development in the city can fit harmoniously within the existing area. This includes providing appropriate transition to the existing surrounding area to ensure that the new development will fit within the existing and/or planned context. Development should be massed with good proportions to fit within the existing and planned context and to ensure sunlight and sky view from adjacent streets.

The Official Plan designates the site as *Neighbourhoods* which are considered physically stable and new development should "fit" within the existing physical character. Development should "respect and reinforce" this character which includes prevailing buildings types as well as heights, massing, scale and dwelling type of nearby

residential properties. Proposals for intensification of land on major streets in *Neighbourhoods* are not encouraged by the policies of the Plan. Where more intense forms of intensification are proposed, they must be reviewed to ensure that they respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood.

Similarly, the applicant's proposed development does not conform with the emerging policy direction identified in the proposed amendments to the *Neighbourhoods* policies in Official Plan Amendment 320. The proposed *Neighbourhoods* designation policies have been clarified, strengthened and refined in order to support the Plan's goals to protect *Neighbourhoods*. Introduction of this built form type and site layout into the neighbourhood would change the character of the neighbourhood significantly. Approval of the proposal could create a negative precedent that could impact the stability of neighbourhood. The proposed development does not respect and reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood, including the massing, height and scale of nearby residential properties. The proposal is too intense for this residential *Neighbourhood*.

The Built Form policies in Chapter 3 of the Official Plan state that new development will be located and organized to fit with its existing and/or planned context, with buildings that have main building entrances located so they are clearly visible and directly accessible from the public sidewalk. These policies further state that buildings should locate and organize vehicular access and parking to improve the safety and attractiveness of adjacent streets.

The proposed front and side yard setbacks for the development are not consistent with the existing and planned context as required by the Official Plan. Generous setbacks within the neighbourhood result in an attractive landscape character which should be maintained.

Front yard:

Former City of Toronto By-law 438-86 and new City of Toronto By-law 569-2013 require a minimum front yard setback equal to the setback of the adjacent building for a corner lot development. The proposed apartment building would be the closest building to the street in this immediate area and a setback of that size would limit the amount of planting possible within the setback. It is proposed to sit directly at the sidewalk, with no proper setback for lawn or landscaping.

Side Yard:

The Official Plan requires that new development respect and reinforce the existing physical character of a neighbourhood. One of the characteristics of a neighbourhood which needs to be respected is that of setbacks of buildings from the street(s). Neighbourhoods are also characterized by prevailing patterns of rear and side yard setbacks and landscaped open space. The proposed side yard setback does not reflect the existing character of setbacks, the landscaped open space, nor does it reflect the planned context. The side yard setbacks do not meet the Official Plan.

By-law 438-86 requires a minimum side yard setback of approximately 5.5 metres and City of Toronto By-law 569-2013 requires a minimum corner side yard setback of 7.5 metres for a permitted building type. By-law 569-2013 requires a minimum side yard setback for an apartment building of 7.5 metres. The proposed setback does not permit adequate space for landscaping between the proposed building and the lot line with the neighbour at 4 Valleyanna Drive.

The proposed development is not consistent with this generous landscape open space, due to the scale and intensity of the development including the reduced setbacks, at-grade parking garage and proposed site grading. The proposed setbacks and at-grade parking garage remove the opportunities for landscaping and requires the removal of 51 existing mature trees on site that are in excellent condition. The proposed reduced front yard setback limits space available for landscaping.

The proposed development also introduces multiple units at a substantially higher height than adjacent residential property lines. This permits the development to have views into surrounding side and rear yards. These relationships create issues of overlook and privacy which are not acceptable, and are not in keeping with the policies of the Official Plan.

The proposed parking would hardscape a large portion of the land, eliminating any meaningful site absorption of water, and would reduce opportunities for landscape open space on site. Built Form policies in Chapter 3 of the Official Plan state that above-grade parking structures, where permitted, should be integrated with building design to ensure that usable building space is located at grade facing a public street.

The design at Valleyanna sets out side parking along the property line with 4 Valleyanna Drive. This parking garage at-grade results in a blank façade along Valleyanna Drive, with inactive uses at-grade, which is contrary to the Official Plan policy and character of this area.

The building height of the proposed development has a height that is not in keeping with the character of the area. The proposed building has not been massed to fit harmoniously into the existing and/or planned context as required by the Official Plan. As noted, the proposed building types are not built form types which are found in this area. The apartment building and townhouse forms do not fit with the finer grain built form scale and lotting pattern of the area. Transition in scale should be provided from the development to the adjacent existing and/or planning buildings as well as the heritage listed building.

The proposed intensity and scale of the development is not in keeping with the surrounding residential detached dwelling form. The proposed site configuration would result in an unacceptable building relationship within the site. The reduced setbacks, at-grade parking garage and increased building height creates unacceptable building relationships with abutting properties that would result in negative impacts with respect to overlook, privacy and fit. The Official Plan designates the site as *Neighbourhoods*

which policies state that any proposed development should respect and reinforce the existing and planned context. The proposed building configuration, setbacks and heights are also inappropriate and do not fit with the existing and/or planned context of the neighbourhood.

The proposed site layout also does not respect and reinforce the existing character and introduces built form relationships which are inappropriate, insufficient building setbacks and inappropriate relationships to the public sidewalk/street. The proposed development is not good planning, is not in keeping with the goals of the Official Plan, which implements the PPS and the Growth Plan, and is not in the public interest.

Further, the construction of these 6 homes would result in a significant loss of green space and tree canopy - the hallmarks of Lawrence Park - landscaped open space, and significant mature trees, would be decimated.

The proposal does not reinforce the pattern of land use in our area and the FSI variances are not minor. As such this proposal is not good planning and should be refused or modified.

Conclusion:

The increased traffic accessing Bayview with a side road development on a dead end street, adding three stories where 2 are permitted by the zoning rules, adding more sewage pressure on an overtaxed and flood prone area (see City study), extensive hardscaping and driveways rendering any water absorption on site impossible, further burdening already taxed infrastructure including the local school already being oversubscribed, the destruction of 51 trees which provide light, sound, and privacy for the existing residents of Valleyanna, plus the destruction of parts of the heritage home and entry wall to the street all combine to make this Application offensive to the existing residents of Valleyanna Drive

It will undermine the street's stability. It is not in keeping with the nature nor in keeping with the building type and built form character of the geographic neighbourhood.

The City's goal of infill they admit is:

*respects the existing physical character
of the area, reinforcing the stability of the
neighbourhood."*

The application will undermine the neighbourhood and its stability. It should not be allowed.

The proposal disregards the existing detached single family home zoning. If permission is granted to subdivide the land, it should be for no more than one additional single family home, leaving adequate land for site absorption of water run-off, reducing the

proposed increased sewer capacity to one family, and maintain the tree line so essential to the residents of Valleyanna Drive.

The proposed development is a side-street development emptying directly onto Valleyanna Drive, a dead end, at the critical junction where it meets Bayview, an exceptionally busy street. The traffic is a substantial concern and cannot be ignored. Adding five homes will make this situation more dangerous. If permission is granted, we rely on the City requiring the developer to work with the City to address traffic concerns, such as a “no right on red” from Armistice Drive, or a coordinated second set of lights including Dawlish Avenue, or require the development to empty directly onto Bayview where it would not affect the residents of Valleyanna Drive, or some other traffic plan to assist the residents of the street so that a difficult situation is not made dangerous.

The proposed development exceeds the height of the surrounding homes, and exceeds the height of the Heritage home to which it seeks to attach. If changes to this heritage home are permitted, height of the existing heritage building should be maintained and no structure should be permitted which is higher than the current Heritage building, nor the higher than the zoning allows. To allow this would be to permit an out of character building, which would dwarf and undermine the original heritage home, as well as the neighbouring homes on Valleyanna Drive, which is contrary to the *Neighbourhoods* provisions.

The proposed development seeks to eliminate 51 trees, including removing one and injuring 5 on a neighbouring property. This should not be allowed as it is not in keeping with the mandate of the Tree Protection division. This is unfair to the residents who rely on the canopy, and the light and sound barriers to Bayview Avenue, one of the busiest streets in Toronto. The destruction of the trees would be a disaster for the privacy of the street and, in particular, for the residents of 4 & 6 Valleyanna Drive. Further, 4 Valleyanna states that they do not agree to the tree removal on their property, nor the multiple injuries to their other trees. If some development permission is granted, we would request that the development be required to be shorter and more to the centre of the property, to maintain the length of trees running along the property along Bayview at 4 & 6 Valleyanna to maintain their privacy, and to maintain the sound and light barrier to Bayview Avenue for all residents of Valleyanna Drive.

Further, if permission to subdivide and build is granted, any construction undertaken at 2 Valleyanna Drive should incorporate a plan for water run-off and sewage issues, and not merely drain to and connect to an overly taxed existing system. The City is well aware of the existing and profound flooding issues, and adding additional multiple homes will further burden and break the system. This cannot be permitted to happen. The developer must work with the City to develop and implement a plan that will address and not worsen the water/sewage/flooding issues on Valleyanna Drive.

The Valleyanna Residents' Association and 16/19 of its current residents (other than the Applicant) oppose this construction and request that the Application be dismissed.

Please act to protect the residents of Valleyanna Drive who wish to maintain the stability for residents on the street.

Sincerely,

Valleyanna Residents' Association,
and the following residents directly opposing:

- 1 Valleyanna Drive (Zec, Dragan & Vera)
- 3 Valleyanna Drive (Di Leonardi, Phylis / Cardarelli, Corrado)
- 4 Valleyanna Drive (Wang, Andy)
- 6 Valleyanna Drive (Rheaume, Michel / Lall, Sonya)
- 7 Valleyanna Drive (Qian, Wen Hua / Liu, Hui Ping)
- 8 Valleyanna Drive (Niblett, George)
- 9 Valleyanna Drive (Qian, Sam)
- 10 Valleyanna Drive (Cooper, Brian & Stephanie)
- 11 Valleyanna Drive (Sutherland, Will, Ann & Mark)
- 12 Valleyanna Drive (Lee, King Siu & Siu, Gloria M.)
- 14 Valleyanna Drive (Melbourne, Jason & Laurie)
- 16 Valleyanna Drive (MacDonald, Allan & Christine)
- 17 Valleyanna Drive (Feeney, Shane & Leonora)
- 18 Valleyanna Drive (Chen, Esther)
- 20 Valleyanna Drive (Coupland, David)
- 22 Valleyanna Drive (Kowalzyk, Elizabeth)