

NORTH YORK COMMUNITY COUNCIL
City Clerk, Attention: Administrator
c/c Toronto City Hall, 2nd Floor west, 100 Queen Street West, Toronto On M5H 2N2

Delivered by E mail: nycc@toronto.ca , Michelle.Corcoran@toronto.ca

Re: Application Nos: 21 169802 NNY 17 OZ 169804 NNY 17SB

On behalf of the Silverview Community Association, we wish to thank you for an opportunity to evaluate this proposal. The detailed information including background information can be described as thorough and comprehensive, and reflective of the traditional City of Toronto "completed applications". The following is our Association's position on this proposal. It is based primarily on a thorough, comprehensive review of the Planning Justification Report and the Urban Design Brief, as well as all the technical report.

Our Analysis of the Planning justification Report

We have issues with the very first page of the report, where it is stated that "the proposed development is based on a shared vision to create an inclusive, welcoming new affordable residential community that will set a new bar for sensitive redevelopment of a large inner suburban site, embracing walk-ability, environmental sustainability, and heritage preservation. Silverview Community Association's boundaries are not adjacent to the proposed redevelopment, but the proposal is so massive, and impactful that it has significant impact on our community. Our Association does not share a shared vision as proposed.

It is disturbing to read this introduction because it is unacceptable that "this proposal will set a new bar for redevelopment of a large inner suburban site", using traditional planning standards. The report states that the resulting density will be 1.30 FSI. There is nothing wrong with this standard if using traditional planning evaluation tools. The FSI requested could easily be 2FSI or 1 FSI, and neither will represent unacceptable density standards. These standards are meaningless if one contextualizes the redevelopment of a large inner suburban site.

The proposal cannot be evaluated on this basis and it is problematic that the ex-chief planner is a proponent of this proposal. One has to ask if a proposal with this intensification would be considered acceptable in "World Class Cities such as Barcelona, Paris, London, or Washington. It is our judgment that this proposal would be outright rejected because of the form and function contributions of this large inner suburban site to Toronto's Urban fabric.

A proposal like this would be rejected in these cities because of the unique urban form and function of the subject site. Where is the professional judgment of our ex Chief Planner and project proponent in trading a unique land use feature in suburbia and eradicating it for 1.5 FSI of rental housing? The subject site with **its urban function and form is unique** and cannot ever be replaced in suburban Toronto.

Toronto is no different than the world class cities mentioned above and as such the destruction of this City-wide amenity cannot be supported using traditional City of Toronto analysis of Official Plans, Zoning By laws and analysis of FSI ratios. The 29 page report is comprehensive and well written but fails to address properly the uniqueness of the subject site and its urban function in City building. The Planning report under 4.4 Conclusions and Recommendations, acknowledges that the proposal is unique and distinct in nature and after a 29 page analysis totally fails to contextualize the significance of the form and function of the existing land use.

...2/

Directors:

Jeff Horodyski, **President**, Tony Moscrop, **Vice President**; Chris Stoute, **Secretary/Treasurer**;
Directors at Large: Cathy Towle, Stephen Fagyas

In summary, our analysis shows that the Planning Justification Report must be revised to reflect a thorough analysis and uniqueness of the subject site and its urban function and form. Secondly, where can this site be replicated in the City of Toronto if the site is intensified? We cannot come up with one location.

Our Analysis of the Submitted Urban Design Brief.

We have difficulties at the very beginning of the Vision Statement: We do not believe the proposal has any merit in striving to urbanize this unique Site, especially with “suburban style” high rise residential units. The underutilized portions of the site serves specific functions in the urban fabric that are irreplaceable, and certainly not compatible with 50% affordable housing built form. This is not an inner city redevelopment scenario, and the Urban Design Brief appears to disregard this reality. We have a problem if our Association cannot buy into the Vision Statement as presented in the report. **As such we respectfully request a modification of the report to reflect an analysis that it is not an inner city redevelopment scheme, and thorough examination of the urban form and function of the existing land use within a long standing history of uniqueness of the existing land use within the Willowdale Community.**

For and on behalf of the Silverview Community Association,

Jeff Horodyski
President
www.silverview.ca
information@silverview.ca

Directors:

Jeff Horodyski, **President**, Tony Moscrop, **Vice President**; Chris Stoute, **Secretary/Treasurer**;
Directors at Large: Cathy Towle, Stephen Fagyas