

Sylvan/Havelock Development: Community Meeting Minutes

July 12, 2005



900 Dufferin St. • P.O. Box 24081 Toronto ON M6H 4H6 •
thedgra@yahoo.ca • Tel. : 416-538-3146
web : www.thedgra.org

Presenters: Adam Giambrone, City Councillor; Kevin Beaulieu, Adam's Exec. Asst.; Elise Hug, City Planner; Ralph Grittani, RG Consulting Inc, Architect; Manuel DaCosta, JDC Property Mgmt, developer/owner.

Adam - the process will take a minimum of 9 months.

- this will be the first of two meetings. This one is to present the development and hear everyone's opinions. Will have a second meeting in the fall.
- Elise Hug, city planner will be presenting the proposal

Elise - she consults with other departments and the public but the report is comprised of her recommendations.

- then Adam directs East York Community Council to accept or make other recommendations.

- some opposition was voiced about why a City official was presenting the developer's case. It gives the appearance that the City is on side with the developer. Elise said that the developer expected a negative reaction from public and asked Elise to present it in hopes the reaction would be calmer. Adam said he did not know about Elise presenting the proposal until minutes ago. With opposition noted, Elise continued.

The proposal:

- there is a low residential density of 0.6 allowed in the area of the development.
- if the existing building is a different size and shape than the other buildings in the area can make some considerations. Right now, including those considerations, the City only allows for 1.0 density and the developer is proposing 2.44.
- Elise, the City planner said that the development was not out of line with other developments going on in the City but is quite a bit more than surrounding houses.
- the second building in the back courtyard is terraced but still 4 stories.
- all parking for the development will be underground. 62 spaces have been allocated.
- are aiming for not less than 45 units in the buildings.
- there are a large number of canopy trees on the site. Are proposing to position the entrance to the underground garage between two trees.
- there are a number of other issues. For example, rental replacement. There are 16 units presently. The developer can replace them on site but are proposing to do it off site and proposing to replace only 10 of the units. A

proposal submitted late in the day that Elise had not yet read, is proposing to place those 10 units on Bloor St. above the "Buck or Two" store.

Q – What about the 75 year old Magnolia tree in the backyard?
- no definitive response given

Q – Simon Wookey- What materials are going to be used on the building? What kind of facing will it have?

R. Grittani – pre-finished metal, limestone, fibre reinforced molding, asphalt shingles, cast iron pickets, some copper, roof crests.

Q – What effect will this development have on the root systems of the surrounding trees?

- a tree expert will be engaged
- there are rules in place to prevent damage to trees during construction and make impact minimal

Q –Bill Wright- What other developments has the developer worked on?

- the developer is Manuel Da Costa, JDC property mgmt. Has primarily worked on infill commercial property in Toronto
- the Nova Era bakery on College at Shaw and Bloor and Dovercourt
- infill house on Hepbourne at Dovercourt

Q – The trees need a guarantee. Trees won't die right away, could be 7 years. What about traffic problems? Already can't move or find parking as it is.

Q – To Adam: How is this complex going to make our community better?

AG - it's a question of balance. On one hand we know the city is going to grow, the goal is how we manage density and intensity for our community. Note that City Council does not have the final say. A decision at Council can be appealed at the OMB and the OMB is not friendly to communities.

Q-Carol Seljak DGRA- The OMB is changing because the Liberals are appointing new members who are not so focused on approving huge developments. The Harris appointees are leaving. Presently a couple in Rosedale was challenged by a residents association at the OMB for requesting that a large balcony be built overlooking the Rosedale Golf Course. The issue of privacy was respected by the member.

Council has not been successful at limiting development in our area. Presently 46 Delaware and 730 Dovercourt are being challenged at the OMB by the community and the City in the second case. But the City and its planners seem to be promoting intensification even if it is not compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Q – To Adam: Mike Mitchell: If everyone in this room thinks it's too dense, would you help us?

AG – we would say okay you have issues with density. Is it the parking spots? Is it the # of people? Is it the # of units? So we would want to look at these things...If our city legal department wants to look at it at the OMB, we have lost control. It's a delicate balance. We could say no but may lose all power.

Q – What are the timelines of this thing?

- proposed a month ago, will take a minimum of 9 mths.
- building will take 12 months to build

Q – Traffic initiative started years ago. Where does it stand now in relation to this development proposal? There will be a major impact on traffic; will a Traffic Study be done?

AG – a traffic initiative is being reformed. We have a working group meeting on it tomorrow night. Will be a 6-8 month process. Adam will take on the issue of traffic impact and this development with the traffic dept at the City.

RG – we will provide visitor parking underground. Number of spaces will depend on the number of units. I.e. 45 units means 62 spots less 45 unit parking spots = 17 visitor spots.

Q – How far back from the sidewalks will the development be?

- 1.5 ft further back than it is now.

Q – Very uncomfortable with the density. (many attendees voicing agreement). Very concerned about traffic. Will be a hazard for children going to the park. Very concerned with the height. Enormous in comparison with our houses on Havelock across the street. Concerned that only 10 units not 16 being replaced. What kind of accomodation with there be for us who live around the building?

RG – there are rules about having boards around the site, sidewalk preservation, tree preservation, by-law about the hours and days of work, when large machines can be used i.e. not before 8:00 a.m.

Q – how long will the demo take?

RG – will be done in a week.

Q – Jill LeClair: we've been trying to get city hall to get a clear marking of the 2 stop signs at the intersection of Sylvan and Havelock. Yellow lines on the road. We've been requesting this for 8 years. We haven't been able to get this addressed. This is why we are upset.

To Adam: Whenever we've had a development in the area we have asked for a working group. Can we have a working group for this development?

AG – I don't have a problem sitting down and meeting with you.

Q – No. We want a formal working group.

AG – Okay. I will do it.

Q – More concerns about parking. Am concerned for the safety of children. Dufferin Grove Park is heavily used. Already on Soccer nights there is no parking. What will be done by the city to keep the children safe?

Q – What height restrictions are there?

EH – 10 metres is presently the restriction and they are applying for 13.2 metres.

Q –Gino-you have an official plan, why don't you follow it?

AG – regardless of the plan have the committee of adjustment. There is no legal way for the city to not engage in the process with a developer.

Q –W. Lukachuk- Am concerned with privacy in the overlook. I own the triplex on Gladstone, 365 Gladstone. Concerned with the 4 storey building looking in my backyard.

I don't think the building proposed for the back of the property fits there. It should be removed.

RG – there is a set-back, will be a walk-way between the buildings. (shows window placement on the side of building referred to)

EH – what rooms will those windows be in?

RG – don't know yet. Will also be a privacy fence of 6.1 metres.

Q – Mike Mclean, DGRA to Elise, What is the maximum permissible density under the current land-use designation? Page 6 of the preliminary planning report says that a density of 2.0 is contemplated for the site under the Official Plan, BUT the in-force Official Plan actually says only up to 1.0 in low-density residential areas? Could you clarify this please? My concern is that with this statement, you have basically given the developer a go-ahead

EH- Will have to confirm whether there was an error in the planning report. If so, this will be communicated to the developer.

In a follow-up email to Mike and Adam Giambrone, Elise said the following: "You know what, Mike, I think you're right. The Existing OP only allows for rezonings up to 1.0 (without OPA). Anything over that needs an OPA. The Existing OP allows for rezonings up to 2.0 (without OPA) for Medium Density Residential Areas."

In other words, the developer would need to have the site redesignated as medium density (instead of low-density as it is now) for any proposal above 1.0 density. This is significant because it would require more public consultation, greater consideration of how the development fits into the surrounding neighborhood and a careful assessment of whether such high density is appropriate for this site.

Q – Looking at the original unit, why does the new one have to be 50 units? Why not 30 units? No need except greed.

Q – Storm water management on the site?

RG – we will hire civil engineer to contemplate that.

Q – what about green roofs? I'm thinking long term, can you look at something like that?

RG – absolutely

Q – I'm concerned with privacy. How does this effect owner's property taxes?

[Response unclear. Basically, it's hard to predict what the impacts will be]

Q – Typically how has it worked (property taxes) in other developments?

AG – don't know. Do know that multi residential properties pay a rate of 3x more than single residence.

Q – What about the West Sylvan overlook?

RG – 4 windows overlook that direction, also an ornamental gate and arbour separating the properties. There are 4 metres between the building and the first house West on Sylvan.

Q – I don't think this is a room full of NIMBY's. We have to face higher density and better use of space. I do not object to increased density. Need to change. It's the extent of the density increase and the additional storey. Sounds like it will look good but is a monolith in the neighbourhood. Don't see what's wrong with 3 stories.

Q – Yves Bonardeaux, architect, DGRA. ON the fact sheet how many bedroom units are you proposing. There isn't even enough square metres for 50 units.

RG – haven't figured it out yet. Yes there will be jr. one bedrooms.

Yves – at most 70 people. Having 50 one bedrooms is not appealing. This is a good area to develop family units because of its proximity to the park, schools, transit etc. Why aren't there more family units?

Q – Most people that live in College St. apartments park on Havelock. How many more people will there be in this building? Invites Elise to come find out how many cars come from Dufferin Mall. Most people on Havelock don't have parking.

RG – with the new development we are increasing the parking. Parking problems are the reality of living in the city.

Q – what is the current density of the building that is already on the site?

EH – don't know. But what is allowed is 0.6. If they wanted to go up to 1.0 could do it with a minor variance. To go up to 2.0 have to apply for rezoning. Over 2.0

need to ask for Official Plan ammendment. [note: this is not entirely correct, for clarification see question above from Mike McLean]

Q- formula for density?
- 38 units = 1.8 density.

Q – Carol Seljak, DGRA, Sylvan resident – Overlook south onto Havelock a concern as well. What kind of privacy will they have? D block (the second building proposed for the back courtyard) looks on their back yard. That's a problem.

EH – the overlook to the South is something we are looking at on page 6 of the planning report. I said earlier that there are no balconies but I stand corrected that D block does have balconies. The L-shaped main building has juliette balconies.

- the developer is required to have higher density to replace the rental units
- the previous owner didn't keep the building up. They have to replace the rental units with units of similar size and quantity even if the original units are substandard.

Q – What is the "formal public hearing"?

AG – it is at the East York Community Council Meeting. You get 5 minutes to make a deputation to council. Occurs right at the end of the process. In this case it should happen in 8-9 months. We don't think that is enough which is why we are holding this meeting now.

Q – I hear everything you are saying. I agree we have to not turn our back on all development. But why as the developer, aren't you selling this to us. Tell us how this will make our community better. Why isn't this a model for the future? How about some new thinking? Present this to us so we have to say "we'd be crazy to turn it down".

RG- that's a wonderful comment. But there is a new sense of ownership as condos so people will take better care of the building.

Q – or they will rent them out.

RG – you will have new families in your neighbourhood.

Q – we pride ourselves on being an inclusive community. We respond well to new things.

Q – let's not kid ourselves. The developer is in the business of making money.

MC – that's not true. You never know if you are going to make money on a project or not.

Q – how much will the condos sell for?

MC – don't know yet.

Q – concerned that the people that live there now won't be able to afford the new apartments. Concerned the developer didn't present the project. Concerned with the numbers.

AG – the numbers are official not final. The report will be based on a huge file.

Q – numbers change as you build don't they?

EH – we won't say you can build anywhere on the site. We will lay it out, footprint, # of parking spots etc. will be written in the new by-law. If anything different they will have to go for a variance.

AG – and the city will review it in the end.

EH – we will include in the report a drawing of what we would approve with the wording of the by-law. Then it goes to Council. They have to come in for a building permit.

Q – Nowhere does it say # of units, size, how many 1 bedrooms etc. Will that be in there?

EH – the 2nd part of the process happens concurrently. If they are pretty sure they are going to get it they will come up with detailed drawings. The site plan application happens after they get the permission to build.

Q – I have a vested interest. I have children. I believe there is a need for affordable housing but the size is excessive for the neighbourhood. Will not have a positive impact on the neighbourhood.

EH – is it the 4 stories that is not okay at all? Or is it on the L-shape or on the back building?

- group responds overall 4 stories too much.

Q – where is the entrance to garage?

RG – through the arch the door will be inside the building.

Q – can the architect draw 2-3 houses on either side of the development? If so will see it will stick out like a sore thumb.

RG – our building is at grade.

Q – How many units are expected to have balconies?

RG – 5 units

Q – Concerned with noise from balconies

AG – noise by-laws are very hard to enforce. Legal ways are cumbersome. They are good by-laws it's the enforcement. Require police intervention. We live at 14 division and they have other high-priority calls.

Q – the question of how much the units are selling for is crucial. When will you know?

RG – we'll be sitting down with real estate professionals, marketing professionals closer to the time of sale.

Q – Can't you do something more like the townhouses on College at Rusholme?

RG – they have basement apartments and are 5 stories. In the back the ground slopes down. There are balconies on the backs of the units and frankly are quite frightful.

Q – What about garbage disposal?

RG – there will be a mechanical room

AG – we'd like to see curbside collection as it increases recycling. We'd like to see this happening here.

Q – Yves B., DGRA, thank you for holding the meeting. Mario Silva didn't do it until a year later on Doversquare. Can you part with a set of drawings so that the DGRA can look at them.

RG – yes no problem.

Q – Density is the last issue in the report. Why is the report so general? Why not be more specific? If you just list the issues the community and even the developer doesn't know where he stands.

EH – there are 2 kinds of reports. This is the preliminary report and we don't want to take a stand.

Q – Sheila Pin, DGRA – will there be a tree preservation plan?

- yes and Arbour report.

- there is also a new tree by-law

Q – Have the Heritage Impact Statement and Housing Issues Report been submitted?

AG – the Heritage Impact Statement is about a month away and the Housing issues Report was submitted today.

EH – I haven't seen the report yet but understand the developer is offering 10 not 16 rental units on Bloor St. above the “Buck or Two”.

Q – when will the next planning report be ready?

-EH – don't know yet.

Q – when is the next community meeting?

AG – sometime in September

Q – Jill LeClair I am concerned about the structure of the working group. I was involved in an ongoing process when Dufferin Mall expansion was being challenged by the community. This included many meetings with the developer, the City and the community. Who will be chosen for the working group? Will the

DGRA and some of the people in attendance today be part of the group? This is an important next step and I would like some details.

AG- I have promised that there will be a working group and I will get back to the community with more details.