

**From:** [Bayview Woods Association](#)  
**To:** [councilmeeting](#)  
**Subject:** Re: City Council meeting March 9 , 2022 agenda item no. CC41.13  
**Date:** March 9, 2022 12:25:43 PM

---

Sure. And thanks for asking.  
Michael Lancefield on behalf of Bayview Woods Association.

On Wed, Mar 9, 2022 at 10:49 AM councilmeeting <[councilmeeting@toronto.ca](mailto:councilmeeting@toronto.ca)> wrote:

Good morning,

Could you please provide a person's name representing the Bayview Woods Association to add the communication?

Best regards,

Council Team

**From:** Bayview Woods Association [mailto:[bayviewwoodsassociation@gmail.com](mailto:bayviewwoodsassociation@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** March 9, 2022 9:55 AM  
**To:** councilmeeting <[councilmeeting@toronto.ca](mailto:councilmeeting@toronto.ca)>  
**Subject:** City Council meeting March 9 , 2022 agenda item no. CC41.13

Dear Councillor,

You are going to be asked for direction by the city solicitor regarding a settlement offer on application no. 20 188104 NNY 17 OZ, a.k.a. agenda no. CC41.13 at the city of Toronto council meeting on March 9, 2022. I would urge you to tell the city solicitor to oppose this settlement offer. I would ask at a minimum that this agenda no. CC41.13 be placed on hold or deferred. This application has been referred to from various city officials as monstrous, brazen, and bulbous.

This application is significant intensification based on its location. It will set a terrible precedent for your neighbourhoods and contribute to the destruction of the city's greenbelt. Although it is not the largest project tabled, it is relative to the property. The property location in this application abuts one of the only provincially significant wetlands & environmentally sensitive areas in the city unless you go to the Rouge Valley to the east and the Humber River to the west. The location is found on OP map 12A~ Environmentally Significant Areas February 2019 and map 12B~Provincially Significant Wetlands and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest February 2019. I have included a pdf of 12 (A), (B) maps (box showing location), location map and Architectural image for your convenience.

It also abuts “*neighbourhood*” consisting of 1-2 storey detached single family homes with a significant grade change from the west to east side/north to south side of the property eliminating any privacy component of many rear yards encompassing 3 streets in the surrounding neighbourhood due to the grade changes. The city did not do their due diligence and review OP policy 2.3.1.4. If the city chooses not to use policy 2.3.1.4 for one parcel of land, then it should have been suggested for the quadrant Bayview Ave, Leslie St., Finch Ave., Steeles Ave. especially since there are applications of significant intensification before the city for this quadrant and more to come.

Additionally, as identified in the OP the parcel of land is **NOT in a Strategic Growth Area**. This stretch of Finch Ave. E has no future plans to be a high transit corridor. While this is a mixed-use parcel of land the definition of mixed use means one thing: commercial and residential. However, it does not state the build form. The OP identifies Finch Ave as a major street not an Avenue. Although, mid-rise guidelines are permissible, there is nothing that states the maximum of mid-rise guidelines is the only acceptable choice. The OP if used holistically and as originally intended is a great document, containing approx. 600 pages with a lot of wording for comprehension of appropriateness and some mathematical elements to assist. However, it appears in this case it has only become mathematical.

I urge you to take the time to review the massing on the location of this application. There are two (2) key words in the OP. They are **appropriate and compatible**. I am not opposed to revitalization or proper form of intensification of this property as long as it’s appropriate and compatible. I hope you will protect both mine and your neighbourhoods, our greenbelt and sensitive ecosystem and oppose this precedent setting application.

Also, I’m not aware of anyone addressing as part of this application the flooding mitigation construction work that was to be done, as recommended by the City’s environmental assessment dealing with the 2005 storm event, which flooded many houses in the same community. The recommended solution to the problem was to do construction work on and/or near the Tridel property. The ideal time to do the work is when the property is redeveloping or else the opportunity will be lost forever.

Our neighbourhood negotiated in good faith and provided constructive input. Their settlement offers mirrors their initial proposal with respect to the height of the building which demonstrates their unwillingness to change their design in any comprehensive manner. I hope you will do the right thing and tell the city solicitor to oppose this settlement. It is never wrong to do the right thing.

Regards,  
Bayview Woods Association