

Text of Deputation to Community Council – June 10th

My name is John Shepherd. I live at 66 Heath Street East, about 250 meters from the site. I was a member of the Working Group and attended all six meetings with the Developer.

Here's an aerial photo of the site.

This application has a lot of deficiencies. I'll address only the two most critical and glaring ones - the 37 floor South tower height and the overall 6.28 times density. . You should already have a summary of my deputation in front of you (Appendix XX ?)

We all know that our planning tools in this city are next to worthless. The Official Plan is weak and too general. It does not include height and density limits. The zoning bylaw is embarrassingly out of date and is irrelevant. So all we can fall back upon is precedent.

The Planner did look at precedent. Let's see what he did for density. Look on page 17 of the Final Report, where he says, and I quote "The average density of the 8 significant non-Neighbourhoods and non-mainstreets types of buildings in the area is 8.15 times the lot area." End of quote. Based on this, he claimed that the project's density of 6.28 is OK. Astonishingly enough, he didn't mention that the average height of these 8 buildings is only 14 floors.

Here's an overhead showing the eight buildings that he surveyed. First of all, seven of the eight are right on St. Clair.

Whether it was a typo or a Freudian slip, these seven are not "non-mainstreets types of buildings" - they are MAINstreets types of

buildings. Furthermore the seven on St. Clair are office buildings. These are typically built on main streets and do have high densities. This thing with a density of 12.8 is an office building next to the subway entrance, wedged in beside the streetcar track turnaround. The one side street building in the entire survey is a residential condominium and it has a more reasonable density of 5.0

This project is 97% residential. Most of it is on an inside lot, on a side street, its address is 30 Alvin Avenue, and it overlooks a residential area. The Planner should not have surveyed office building densities for such a residential project. I ask you - could any reasonable person describe that survey as a useful precedent?

For a more representative look at what a reasonable precedent might be, my neighbour and I looked at every tall building, within 400 meters of the site, with 14 floors or more.

(Show third overhead)

There are 21 of these buildings. Details are on the spreadsheet on page 3 of my deputation summary. The sheet shows each building's address, the number of floors, its height in meters and the site density.

The two tallest towers have 32 floors. They're residential condominiums on Pleasant Blvd., on a most unattractive lot, next to the streetcar turnaround. But their density is only 3.1. The average density of all 21 buildings is 4.7. If you take out the 7 office towers, all of which are on St. Clair, the average density of the 14 residential condominiums is only 3.4 times lot coverage.. Remember that figure – 3.4 . I'm going to return to it.

Did the Planner look at any precedent for height? Absolutely not. He did say that because the tower's cross section is small, the shadow effects are minimal. In essence, that Planner took 53 pages to say that any height is OK as long as density is reasonable. I ask you, is a density of 6.28 reasonable when the density of other nearby residential condominiums averages 3.4? Is a height of 37 floors reasonable when residential condominiums in the area average 22 floors?

Please read the report. The Planner's recommendation is based entirely on a flawed, cherry picked study. I'm asking this council, to reject the height and density recommendation, to direct the Planner to do his job properly and to negotiate with the developer to remove some floors from that South tower. We do support intensification on that site, but not to that degree. Ten floors taken off will reduce it's height to a more reasonable 27 floors, and a site density of 5.5. There is a consensus within the Working Group that that South tower will stick out like a sore thumb. What is being proposed is simply not acceptable. Please send it back and direct the Planner to develop something that the community can live with. Please direct the Planner to do his job properly.

Thank you.