

OMB file PL 160564 – 18 Brownlow Ave.

South Eglinton Ratepayers' and Residents' Association (SERRA)

1) Does the proposal conform with the Provincial Growth Plan, PGP?

The proposed development represents significant overdevelopment of the site. It also does not address planning issues and potential construction impacts as it relates to the adjacent TSCC 2120 condo/townhouse buildings at 83 Redpath Ave and 75-81 Redpath Ave and their residents.

2) Does the proposal conform with Toronto's Official Plan, OP?

Transition : the proposed development is located adjacent to the Y-E Urban Growth Centre and is intended as a transition to the low rise neighbourhood directly to the south. With its almost vertical rise of 14 storeys and, at higher elevations an angular plane of only 60 degrees, rising to 20 and 25 storeys, the proposed development does not respect an appropriate transition to the low-rise neighbourhood directly to the south, and in fact threatens to destroy the stability of the two-storey, low-rise neighbourhood directly to the south. Nor does it transition appropriately to the townhouses to the west at 75-81 Redpath Ave. These townhouses were part of an agreement to “form transition from high to lower density to the south” (per page 4 of OMB decision PL060299, which also involved 18 Brownlow Ave. and the same developer as for this project).

Common infrastructure – garage/ramp : The proposed development will almost triple the number of the existing parking spots (from 147 to 416), while maintaining only a single on/off ramp. We are concerned that this will create garage layout and on/off ramp issues of safety, congestion, and inadequate and possibly dangerous traffic flow.

The current garage is part of a shared facility with the existing condo and townhouse complex TSCC 2120, whose residents say they have not been adequately consulted about the design and impact of the garage addition.

Quality of life : Infill development is expected to contribute to the quality of life for both new and existing residents. We are concerned that the near tripling of vehicles on the 18 Brownlow site, and exiting onto Brownlow Ave., will endanger the safety of Brownlow Ave. and other neighbourhood streets. The Eglinton Public School with its very large playground (500 students and growing) is located on Brownlow Ave. in close proximity to the parking entrance of the 18 Brownlow development.

3) Does the proposal conform with the Yonge Eglinton Secondary Plan, YESP?

Density and height : the proposed development significantly exceeds density and heights of other buildings to the west, north and east and as such contravenes the requirement to respond to and be compatible with its planned and built-form context.

It also fails to decrease in height from Yonge St. to Mt Pleasant Rd. (as the other planned developments along Soudan Ave. heading east from Yonge St. to Mt. Pleasant Rd. do) and towards the residential low-rise neighbourhood area to the south. Transition: The proposed development does not plan for an appropriate transition in scale and activity between neighbouring districts.

Under OP 5.2.1.3 : SECONDARY PLANS: POLICIES FOR LOCAL GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES, Secondary Plans will promote a desired type and form of physical development resulting in highly functional and attractive communities and plan for an appropriate transition in scale and activity between neighbouring districts.

4) Does the proposal conform with OPA 289?

Setback from the property lines: the proposed development does not respect the setbacks as required per OPA 289 – Midtown in Focus of a 10-metre greenway along Soudan Ave. and a 5-metre greenway along Brownlow Ave. The proposed development also doesn't comply with the OPA setback regulations in force prior to the implementation of OPA 289. OPA 289 has been appealed to the OMB as PL150678 (including participation of this development). If the setback requirements of OPA 289 were applied for this development, the impact would be so significant that the proposal, as currently submitted, would likely not be able to proceed (the implementation of a 10-metre setback would reduce the available width of the newly acquired properties at many places from 100 feet to approx 65 feet). We would propose that this appeal await the outcome of PL150678 (next pre-hearing date Feb. 27, 2017).

5) Does the proposal conform with the zoning standards?

Density : The proposed development has approx 2.7 x the density of the currently existing development of 19 storeys. [When evaluated as a standalone development (vs. an infill) the FSI of the proposed development would be approx. 9.7. The existing 18 Brownlow property has an FSI of approx. 3.6].

Height : The 2 towers at 20 and 25 storeys of the proposed development are both higher than the existing 18 Brownlow tower of 19 storeys.

We take issue with the **excessive density and height** of the proposed development **in relation to the existing 18 Brownlow tower** and because of **its location in the part of the site intended as a transition to the low-rise neighbourhood to the south.**

6) Does the proposal conform with the Tall Building Guidelines?

Tall Tower guidelines : the proposed development does not respect the guidelines in areas such as tower base floor plates exceeding 750 sq. metre and tower spacing not adhering to a 25-metre separation (between the two proposed towers and between the existing 18 Brownlow tower and the proposed SE tower).

The excessive density and height together with the lack of setbacks and minimal angular planes create a number of unacceptable effects :

- o a massive and overbearing presence
- o an unacceptable shadowing effect and sky view impact
- o uncomfortable and possibly dangerous wind conditions

7) Does the proposal satisfy the parkland requirement?

Parkland designation : The proposed development does not comply with the request by the City of Toronto for a parkland designation of 655 sq metres (or approximately 17% of the newly acquired lots). It also stipulates that the land to be conveyed has to be free and clear above **and below** grade. We understand that a parkland designation is not eligible for appeal to the OMB. Again, we would argue that the impact of implementing the parkland designation is so significant that the proposal as currently submitted might not be able to proceed.

We also object to the planned destruction of the mature treescape at the western edge of the proposed addition, which provides “green views” for residents living in close proximity to the highly built-up Yonge and Eglinton area.

8) Does this proposal represent Good Planning?

Contact information for SERRA - “The SERRA Party – 18 Brownlow” :

Andy Gort,
President, SERRA
president@southeqlinton.ca
416-481-3559

mailing address : South Eglinton Ratepayers’ and Residents’ Association
P.O. Box 43613
1601 Bayview Ave.
Toronto, ON M4G-4G8