TE25. 4.18

June 11, 2017

David E. Harris, LL.B Rebecca Scovel 84 Admiral Road Toronto, ON M5R 2L6

We, Rebecca Scovel and David E. Harris, 15 year residents of 84 Admiral Road, join with our neighbours opposing the development at 321 Davenport Road as currently configured.

We have read the letters written by Clayton Ruby dated June 9, 2017, counsel for several of our neighbours, Dr. Christine Connelly dated June 4, 2017 (110 Admiral Rd.), Kenneth Bartlett (159 Admiral Rd.), Gillian Bartlett and Juta Reed (96A Admiral Rd.). We are in general agreement with what they have written and with Mr. Ruby's position with respect to the protection and preservation of the trees.

We live on the west side of Admiral Road, across the road and slightly south of the proposed development. Our predominate personal concern is the height of the building. I should add however, that we are strongly opposed to the very limited setback proposed for the building from our neighbours at 113 and 111 Admiral. This setback will dramatically change their privacy and living circumstances. A substantially larger set back would make an enormous difference and ought to be required.

The building height affects us all in the vicinity on Admiral Road. We believe it is drastically incongruous with the residential nature of the street and with the privacy rights of us all, particularly those at 113, 111, 121, 123 and 131 Admiral Road.

The proposed building will be a hulking presence overlooking Admiral Road. Currently, while walking up our street, the character of the street is of a continuous houses with a maximum of three stories. With the new building, this will drastically change.

We are not against urban development and midrise buildings if they are constructed with sensitivity to the immediate residential locale. We have consciously chosen to live in an urban environment with all that entails. However, this building, although perhaps consistent with other development on Davenport, is completely out of keeping with the character of Admiral Road.

I cannot see how it can be said that the building constitutes a "transition" or a "balance" between our street and the interests of new development. It is twice the height of the houses on Admiral. Unlike the apartment buildings on St. George to our west, it will be a conspicuous looming monolith seen from any where on our street.

From the perspective of those of us living on the street, it will radically alter the character of the

street. There will also be a substantial loss of privacy to us and particularly to our neighbours living on the east side of Admiral.

It is our belief, as some of our neighbours have expressed, that the consultation process has been inadequate. Much more careful scrutiny ought to be levelled at this proposed project.

Please contact us if you have any questions.

Yours truly

David E. Harris

Rebecca Scovel

deh/me