

POST-MEETING REPORT

Meeting: City-led Community Consultation Meeting

Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020

Time: 6:00pm to 8:00pm

Place: Online WebEx Events

Project: 1140 Yonge Street

SUMMARY

ATTENDEES

Attendees: Approx. 92

Residents Associations: ABCRA

DISCUSSION

The general topics of the facilitated discussion included the following (see *Facilitated Discussion* section of this report for details).

1. Built Form
2. Traffic, Parking & Access
3. Architecture & Design
4. Heritage

PANELISTS

NAME	TITLE
Councillor/City	
Councillor Mike Layton	Councillor for Ward 11
Kevin Friedrich	Planner
David Driedger	Senior Planner
Robert Ursini	Planner
Nathan Bortolin	Assistant Heritage Planner
James Parakh	Program Manager – Urban Design
Joseph Luk	Senior Urban Designer
Applicant Team	

Pouyan Safapour	Devron
Robert Hiscox	Constantine
Jocelyn Deeks	Bousfields
Peter Smith	Bousfields
Simone Hodgson	Bousfields
Gianpiero Pugliese	Audax Architecture
Tim Arnott	BA Group
David Winterton	ERA

FACILITATED DISCUSSION

This table lists the questions/comments that came up during the discussion and the respective responses that were provided. The additional comments and questions listed were those not addressed during the meeting due to time constraints.

Question/Comment	Response
<p>ABCRA</p> <p>We would disagree with the applicant about some things. Definitely we think the building should be appropriate and sensitive to the context. We disagree with the scale and the massing. We have spent a great deal of time looking at this with our architectural professionals. [The applicant has] outlined their reasoning for height and the planning context.</p> <p>At the lower end we are expecting something between 10-20m but we are getting an application that is almost 3x as high as that. We can't adequately transition to the low-rise neighbourhoods at that height. The transition needs to start at the mixed-use portion of the site. We are in synchronicity with City Planning's thinking that it is out of scale with the site.</p> <p>We are looking forward to working with the applicant to create something that is in more in line with the context of the neighbourhood.</p>	<p><i>Comments were acknowledged</i></p>

Also, our AGM is coming up and we welcome you to join us there.	
On the proposed townhouse units, what is the height above grade of the upper most structural element?	12m to top of mansard roof and 14.8m to the back; cornice lines line up.
My concern is the height of this development. If you make an exception here, won't the owner of the Starbucks site one block south also expect an exemption?	The depth of the <i>Mixed Use Areas</i> is unique. Yonge Street does have unique character.
How does this protect the neighborhood from shadow impacts and their privacy? It's 5x the height of what's currently permitted and in the area. We're also very concerned about traffic impacts, particularly for street parking and the volume at rush hour.	<p>The applicant is required by the City to prepare a shadow study and submit it and it is available with the materials. Because of location of the property, there are no shadows onto the north to the west. Some impacts on the north side and in the afternoon the shadows go onto Yonge in the afternoon. Length of shadows not significant and so not many properties affected at any one time.</p> <p>The shaping of the building was done to limit shadow. Path of sun has no impact to stable neighbourhood. Buffers and plantings will control privacy.</p>
The pictured exterior finishes are quite extraordinary. What ironclad enforceable commitments have been made to ensure whatever is actually agreed to, is in fact what is constructed.	We want to work with community and the city to achieve high-quality building.
Regarding the townhouses, the proposed do not relate to the neighbouring townhouses, which are Victorian in style. Why would you not build townhouses that fit more into the neighbourhood?	The townhouses immediately adjacent but further west they're more of a 1980s design. Some consistency in area, but a range of styles are in the neighbourhood.
What is the proposed square footage of the condo units?	The majority are 2-bedrooms with some 3-bedrooms. The average unit size is 2,200 sq ft.
"The proposed development is expected to generate 40-45 FEWER trips at the site as compared to existing conditions." How	Residential and commercial uses are different in terms of parking.

<p>realistic is this with addition of over 100 additional vehicles?</p> <p>Mr. Smith commented that traffic volumes eastbound along Marlborough to Yonge Street during AM and PM peak periods will in fact be lessened as a result of this development. Can we receive further explanation on this from BA? It seems a stretch.</p>	
<p>Why can't there be an exit/entrance from/to development parking directly from/to Yonge as the condo on west side of Yonge south of St Clair does (adjacent to Book City)?</p>	<p>Policies don't support this, the access needs to be from the flanking street.</p>
<p>Why does proposed parking supply exceed residential requirements?</p>	<p>It is driven by expected market demand. Larger units so there is the expectation that the market would demand more parking.</p>
<p>Where is the garbage pick-up for the building?</p>	<p>Integrated into interior of building.</p>
<p>Thoughtful and contextually appropriate design. Scrivener Court is across the street. Existing transit context. 2 to 3-storeys limits chances of revitalization. Considering infrastructure, mid-rise is more appropriate. Should conserve heritage. Heading in the right direction.</p>	<p>SASP allows for 2 to 3-storey street wall and mid-rise behind.</p>
<p>Housing crises. Climate crises. This is 1 km from Yonge and Bloor. Love that we have 60 units. Can we get more units? More storeys? If we can't put height here where can we put it?</p>	<p><i>Comments were acknowledged</i></p>
<p>I live at 40 Park Road (7-storeys). No concerns re: height and density. Design is a bit gauche, but no problems with the overall design. The cheapest available property in this area is \$1.9 million. I've come to terms that buying a home is unlikely. Why are we so concerned with appeasing multi-millionaires and not shadowing them and giving them privacy?</p>	<p>We are trying to reduce height and achieve transition because staff need to uphold policy.</p> <p>We are striving for sustainability measures, aiming for Passive House, looking at geothermal.</p>

Are you planning on using any environmental features? Sandwich panel? Geothermal heating? We're in a climate crisis, but just wondering if there are other environmental considerations that have been taken into account.

I think it's a great proposal, it's not for me, not my style, but I recognize that there are many people who may be able to retire here. It's steps from Summerhill and Rosedale stations.

Are you prepared to lose at the LPAT?

Echo some of the comments – this building, being close to transit, is where we should be putting density. I don't have much more to add, just wanted to add a voice of support.

It's far too tall and too high. I don't know how you can call it appropriate (13-storeys and appropriate in a neighbourhood of 3-4 storeys).

I find some of the language used by the developers a bit disingenuous (midrise building but refer to the midrise portion).

Have you taken into account the surplus of deliveries in a COVID or post-COVID world?

We have a housing crisis, and with rental prices going down in the City, makes me think that perhaps we don't have as much of a housing crisis as we thought?

How much is a 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, or 3-bedroom going to be?

Will there be an evaluation of the heritage merit of conserving the facades of the front facing Marlborough semis? This should be a stipulated requirement.

Comments were acknowledged

Delivery opportunity in the courtyard.

We do have a housing crisis, notwithstanding COVID and once we inevitably return to a time when we have a sub-2% vacancy-rate.

That's not to say that this building will help with that, because our housing crisis is within the affordable side of the spectrum.

More that the City needs to do, and developers need to have more open minds to putting affordable housing in to their building.

I'm not sure I understand the question. There are no Marlborough semis that are a part of the property, so there is nothing to conserve.

How does the applicant plan to reflect the building's heritage, especially the significant CBC history that took place there?	We heard a lot about this at our session in July and the importance of the CBC period. We will develop robust commemoration strategies to interpret the CBC's use.
Will the construction of this building and the Scrivener development happen at the same time and how long will the build take?	We are working through Site Plan Approval on Scrivener. Demolition is happening very soon. Construction beginning from Spring for 2-3 years. Unknown – 2.5 years approximately.
<p>Thanks for the effort that's being put in to conserve the heritage of the site.</p> <p>With the issue of affordability, is there an option to include affordable units in the construction?</p> <p>Kevin, you and your team have created a plan and the province has one as well, why is your plan not appropriate for this site? I am supportive of this type of space having density, but I don't know why we have bright public servants create plans that get ignored.</p> <p>Developers don't seem to take that/your plan as the starting point. They seem to take the pie in the sky as the starting point and leave it to public servants to rein them back in.</p>	<p>We do look at our plan and that's how we make an evaluation of the building's appropriateness, so we don't ignore it. No tool in place to require affordable housing. Section 37 could provide it in-kind.</p> <p>Inclusionary zoning policies are not in place. The date is Jan 1st of 2022. Otherwise there are pathways through section 37. The City is pretty clear it doesn't want to negotiate section 37 until height and massing have been approved. Even if we wanted to negotiate section 37 now, City would say it is premature.</p>

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS (not answered during live Q&A)

Planning Policy/Context

- Could the site-specific policies be amended to support this development?
- Height restrictions established in consultation of many parties including city and neighbourhood representation. Why is it then that we are expected to provide developers with height variances so that they can make site economics work?
- What is driving the necessity for an official plan amendment to deliver this project? How can this amendment be seen to be maintaining the stability of the neighbourhood?
- If you know the area so well, how can you justify this current proposal which goes directly against the character of it?

- Isn't an obvious potential solution for the problem of the transition being a little abrupt is to allow development in neighbouring areas as well? Let's actually build transit & smoothing density-oriented development!

Built Form & Architecture

Height/Density:

- I appreciate the effort to maintain and raise the historical heritage features
 - i. Is the existing Scrivener Court 13 storey tower not significantly shorter than the proposed tower? What is the actual height of the building vs the zones allowed height?
- The density and height are a big concern - scale of building is out of proportion with this neighbourhood/street
- How is 13 storeys appropriate in a neighbourhood of 3-4 storey buildings?

Shadows/Privacy:

- Will the shadows affect the street and snow ice and safety
- Regarding my question on privacy, it wasn't clear from the architects answer how all of the residents on the ~4th floor and above don't have a full view of a huge block of homes to the west, north and south of this building.

Architecture, Design & Materiality:

- What are the building materials at street level on Marlborough, the new part?

Site:

- How deep is the site excluding the part that is designated neighbourhood or residential?
- Is the western boundary of the "subject site" limited to the existing surface parking lot (or does the application include the demolition of any existing houses on Marlborough)?
- Restoration of the heritage part is very nice, but the mass above that is much too large and way too high. Along Marlborough, where the diagrams show a patio along the sidewalk- is that patio on the developer's site, or is it on City property?

Traffic, Access & Circulation

Traffic:

- Re traffic: will Roxborough St. East, which runs through the neighbourhood of Rosedale, become a thoroughfare? Yonge St. does not cut off traffic, it flows east as well as west.

Access:

- As a street resident I noticed that the Staples parking was almost never full. Could the parking access be from Yonge Street instead of Marlborough, in light of the new traffic light?
- We understand the intersection will be lit. What is the maximum anticipated queuing time during either an AM/PM peak period that a Marlborough Resident will have to endure attempting to access Yonge Street
- Why did you pick Macpherson to exit traffic onto rather than Marlborough?

Yonge/Marlborough Intersection:

- The throat of the right of way at the intersection is very narrow, so too is the Marlborough right of way as a whole. Will there be at least a widening taken at the intersection?
- We have one exit from Marlborough to Yonge. How long do you think it will take us to leave our street?

Parking:

- On the question of potentially new traffic volumes along Marlborough, some of that will turn on the mix of new commercial tenants and their draw to the corner. What commercial tenant mix is BA assuming in their parking demand calculations?
- The number of parking spaces, even considering this massive building for the neighbourhood is considerably over the maximum number allowed for the number of residential units. This will create a crowded situation at the end of our street.
- The site is quite close to the subway station and bus lines and based on even the properties on the street the rate of cars per units is unusual for this area
- New development calls for 126 parking spots, an increase of about 106 more than existing Staples lot, over 400%. Length of Marlborough is roughly 80 car lengths.
- Given the size of the units in the site, and the number of parking spots for such large units, why is it anticipated that the occupants of the units will be taking public transit?

Bike Lanes:

- The city is encouraging and planning extensive bike lanes. Unless streets are effectively widened, any such lanes will necessarily be carved out of the existing roadway. Has any thought been made to requiring the developer to dedicate the front 15 feet to bike lanes.

Public Realm/Landscape

- What are the plans to provide some greening of the Yonge Street frontage. What is the width of the sidewalk on Yonge? Thanks

Other

- Will Councillor Layton be mandating the provision of an affordable housing component in this project - in the context of "complete communities" pursuant to an eventual section 37 agreement?
- The City is already functionally gridlocked. The existing infrastructure is insufficient to even support the existing buildings. On what possible basis can you support more density when the current infrastructure, namely schools, sewage and transportation is deficient?
- The ground floor plan on the north elevation shows a potential patio. Is this expected to be restaurant, assembly related and what therefore is the calculated seating capacity?
- What are the most important potential positive impacts for the neighbourhood that could result from this development?
- Intention is great. What enforceable commitments are you prepared to make?

- If you are so interested in neighbourhood character, feedback, did consultations, and know policy issues, why is this project not modified for this meeting in response to known concerns?

Comments

- "The development can appropriately integrate into the surrounding urban mobility environment with no adverse impacts." It will be traffic gridlock!
- As someone who lives not far from the site, I'm glad to see construction of more density walking distance from Bloor-Yonge and on the subway. However, 66 units doesn't do a lot for our housing crisis. I think you should consider adding a few floors.
- The design is spectacular! This will enhance our neighbourhood, I live local and believe this will keep our neighbourhood up to date and on par as a world class city.
- the architectural style of a 19th century NYC apartment building is out of character with our time
- As a Marlborough resident, I fully agree with ABCRA's submission regarding scale. The proposal overwhelms the site and the street.
- Isn't an obvious potential solution for the problem of the transition being a little abrupt is to allow development in neighbouring areas as well? Let's actually build transit & smoothing density-oriented development!
- The building is simply too high for the neighbourhood. It violates the character of the neighbourhood. It risks turning Yonge Street into a 'tunnel'. So far the development on Yonge, with lower rise buildings has avoided this terrible outcome.
- No issue with height. There should be buildings of this scale all up Yonge Street. Applicant has promised a very high-quality design. Hope this does not become a "bait and switch" scenario where developer over-promises and under-delivers.
- Transit and density is to allow more housing.... especially affordable housing! Transit and density does not speak to luxury housing
- I'm sorry that is nonsense you have a ballpark for your financial plan
- If we want to have people living in central Toronto, which is what we want rather than driving people to far-flung suburbs that gobble up green space, then we need to make central Toronto livable. Right now, Yonge Street in our neighbourhood is livable.
- I strongly support the comment. It's TOO TALL. Yes densification. No to creating a tunnel down Yonge St.