

Mayor Miller and City Councillors  
cc Ted Tyndorf: Chief Planner

February 7, 2005

**Re: 730 Dovercourt Road, 323 & 357 Rusholme Road  
Rezoning and Official Plan Amendment Application**

Dear Mayor Miller and City Councillors

We are writing to express concern over the proposed erection of a massive fourth tower on an already over-developed site. The existing 3 high rise buildings on the site (19, 19 and 15 stories) are an anomaly in the middle of a low density residential area—already way out of scale with the surrounding neighbourhood---a relic of the 1960's block-busting era.

**The proposed massive 285 unit building does not comply with either the former Official Plan (still current) or the new (yet to be approved) Official Plan. Why are the City planners encouraging this redevelopment that is totally out of sync with both Official Plan policies?**

You will be expected to vote on the recommendations contained in the January 24, 2005 planner's report which will be considered by the Toronto/East York Community Council on February 8 and by City Council on February 16.

**We urge you to vote “no” to this proposal.**

**NO POLITICAL REPRESENTATION**

Our community has no political representative to present our views on this issue. Although our ward councillor Adam Giambrone fiercely opposed this development during the municipal election campaign he has since declared a conflict of interest. After the municipal election Giambrone passed the file to Deputy Mayor Joe Pantalone at which time the proposed fourth tower grew bulkier and much larger (from 16 784 sq.m. to 22 780 sq.m., an increase of 35%) while the number of proposed units zoomed from 179 – 285 bringing the total number of units on site to 1 135.

To make matters worse, Deputy Mayor Pantalone did not attend the public meeting on November 23.

On the other hand, our political representatives at the federal and provincial levels, ie Mario Silva M.P. and Tony Ruprecht M.P.P., have clearly supported the community in its opposition to this development both in the past and at the recent public meeting on November 23.

**NO PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Although the proposal was first submitted to city planners in November 2002, it was fully two years before the first public consultation meeting was held on November 23, 2004. Former Councillor Mario Silva had held an informal meeting with a group of residents back in April 2003 where residents had expressed concern that the proposal would create an over-concentration of development on the site and within the neighbourhood.

Over 250 community residents attended the public meeting to protest against the proposed massive, ugly intrusion into their stable neighbourhood. Concerns were expressed about the impact of the development on the abutting low-rise neighbourhood as well as on neighbourhood services and facilities including parks (this is designated as a park-deficient area) schools, wind and shadow impacts, increased traffic, the introduction of a road on site as well as the loss of on-site landscaped open space.

In December, Pantalone called together a handful of residents to meet with the planners and himself to discuss the application. Ever cagey, Pantalone said that he does not support the development proposal “in its current form” but would not tell us what he would support. The planners clearly supported the massive building and didn’t want to listen to residents quoting from the City’s Official Plan policies which they had clearly ignored in assessing the application.

### **PLANNERS HAVE MISLED US**

For the last two years since this application was filed, the planners have totally misled us regarding what the Official Plan has to say about the permitted density on the site. They told us back in the spring of 2003 at an informal meeting called by then Councillor Mario Silva and again in an April 17, 2003 planning report that the Official Plan density permitted on the site is 3 times coverage. Since the existing site has a density of 2.4 times, we were led to believe by the planners that an increase in density on the site was sanctioned by the Official Plan and that we must therefore give serious consideration to the developer’s proposal for a huge fourth tower.

It was not until the August 2004 planning report that we discovered that the permitted density under the Official Plan is 2 times, not 3 times. This means that the site is already developed to its capacity (and then some) which places the developer’s outrageous proposal in a totally different context.

### **PROPOSAL OUT OF SYNC WITH BOTH CURRENT AND NEW OFFICIAL PLAN POLICIES**

Although the new Official Plan does not state a density limit for new development on already – developed sites in Apartment Neighbourhoods, it clearly contemplates small infill development of the townhouse/small apartment building variety if, in fact, there is space to accommodate such development.

**A massive increase in density of 43% and a 33% increase in the total number of units is clearly not contemplated by Official Plan policies.**

To quote the new Official Plan:

***“Significant growth is not intended within developed Apartment Neighbourhoods. However, compatible infill development may be permitted on some sites...while providing good residential amenity and quality of life for new and existing residents.”***

And further:

***“Built up Apartment Neighbourhoods are stable areas of the City where major growth is not anticipated.”***

A massive construction project on this site is clearly going to adversely affect the well-being of existing tenants. Their previous experience with balcony and underground parking renovations has made that all too clear.

**Why are City planners supporting a *significant, major* addition to the site {an increase of 43% in gross floor area) which is totally out of sync with Official Plan policies?**

The stability of our neighbourhood is being threatened. What is the point of the City adopting new Official Plan policies with specific criteria aimed at stabilizing existing neighbourhoods and then totally ignoring them?

**We ask that:**

- 1. Council vote to oppose this outrageous development proposal, and**
- 2. Council vote to provide us with funding so that we can hire the representation that has been lacking to legally represent us at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing.**

Yours truly,

Carol Seljak  
Bloor-Dufferin Residents' Committee Ltd.