June 25, 2018

Planning and Growth Management Committee
10th Floor, West Tower, City Hall
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Dear Chair and Members of the Planning and Growth Committee

RE: OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE YONGE- EGLINTON SECONDARY PLAN

We are not developers but some of the homeowners who own residential freehold townhouses on the west side of Brownlow Avenue. We are just south of Eglinton and north of Soudan, which is part of the Soudan Apartment Neighbourhood. These 12 townhouse addresses range from 54 to 76 (the "Brownlow Property").

Many of us are long-time residents (30 + years) in the Yonge Eglinton area, and plan to continue to live in this neighbourhood once much of the planned area development is complete.

Many of us have attended the area community meetings over the years and are generally supportive of the need to strike a fair balance between the planned development in the area with the infrastructure needs and quality of living of the residents.

But some of the more recent amendments being discussed for this area, including some of the height options presented during the June 21, 2018 Consultation meeting, have raised concerns.

Currently, per the City May 2018 Recommended Plan and the Modified November 2017 Proposed Plan, the allowable height for the Brownlow Property is 23 floors. However, two of the options presented during this June 21 meeting would reduce the height potentially down to 15 floors. We are strongly opposed to this for the following reasons:

- Our block already has a 30-storey building that has almost completed construction just northwest of us, a 21-storey condo behind us to the southwest and a 21-storey building that has been approved just south of that. The "Soudan Apartment Neighbourhood Vision" presented at the June 21 meeting talks about tall buildings from Eglinton that should transition down to Soudan. A city planner at the meeting used the words “transitioning away from Eglinton”. Frankly if this transitioning had been applied consistently, we would have expected the Brownlow Property to be approved for 25-27 floors if not 34 floors consistent with the north side of Eglinton. So, reducing Brownlow Property heights to below 23 floors is grossly inconsistent with this vision.

- The Brownlow Property is approximately 50 meters from Eglinton, so lowering the height even more is inconsistent with having higher density buildings near Eglinton.

- The Brownlow Property will be only a 150-meter walk to the proposed Mount Pleasant/Eglinton subway and within the Secondary Transit Zone, so lowering the proposed height even more is inconsistent with the desire to have higher density near LRT/Subway entrances.
- Limiting the proposed heights is punishing long-time homeowners. We are happy in our homes but the development in the Soudan Neighbourhood in past years has already reduced the quality of life on our street and the value of our homes as residential living spaces. Redevelopment is now inevitable, so an arbitrary reduction of floor heights further limits options with the Brownlow Property.

- There are other ways to limit density beyond lowering heights which are already reflected in the most recent amendment. This includes setbacks and limiting the gross floor area on each storey. The May 2018 requirement to have 15% two-bedroom units and 10% three-bedroom units and an additional 15% of mixed two and three bedrooms, with minimum unit sizes of 87 square meters for two-bedroom units and 100 square meters for three-bedroom units certainly reduces the density. This was not discussed at the meeting but might have served to reduce anxiety amongst persons who wanted to reduce density.

- The 4th alternative proposed at the June 21st meeting would drastically reduce the amount of housing and the number of residents, by over 50%, in this area from the assessment done by the city, and it is questionable whether this would meet the requirements of the Guiding Principle of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, May 2017, to “Prioritize intensification and higher densities to make efficient use of land and infrastructure and support transit viability”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>New Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Estimated New Residential Units</th>
<th>Estimated New Residents</th>
<th>Estimated Office Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. May 2018 Recommended Plan</td>
<td>405,000 m²</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>8,525</td>
<td>6,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nov 2017 Proposed Plan</td>
<td>390,000 m²</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td>6,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Undulating Heights</td>
<td>317,000 m²</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>5,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 20 and 15 stories</td>
<td>200,000 m²</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>5,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We believe an arbitrary height reduction is unwarranted for the above reasons, is not consistent with the Official Plan, nor does it represent consistent planning.

As such, we respectively request that building heights not be lowered on the Brownlow Property from that currently reflected in either the May 2018 Recommended Plan or Modified November 2017 Proposed Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer our views.

Yours very truly,

Jim Woodside, West Brownlow Association

cc: Karen Boctor
    Linda Cooper
    Carolyn Evely
    James Little
    Tomiko Murk
    Walter Murk