

May 1, 2017

Toronto and East York Community Council
c/o City Clerk
City of Toronto
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON
M5H 2N2

Denise Baker
Partner
T: 905-829-8600
dbaker@weirfoulds.com

File 16061.00003

Dear Members of Toronto and East York City Council:

**Re: Refusal Report – Downtown East Planning Study – Official Plan Amendment
Item TE24.8 – May 2, 2017 – Community Council Agenda
Reference Number – 16 271 639 STE 27 OZ and 16 271650 STE 27 RH**

We are the solicitors for Antorisa Investments Ltd. and the related owners being Ralph Chiodo, Rose Chiodo, 2391958 Ontario Limited and 2382497 Ontario Limited (collectively “Antorisa”), the owners of lands municipally known as 280-290 Jarvis Street, 102, 104 and 110 Gerrard Street (“the Property”).

Antorisa has filed site specific development applications for the Property which were deemed complete by the City on December 29, 2016. Since that time we have been in contact with Planning staff in an effort to receive comments from Planning as well as the other circulation agencies. To date, we have received comments from Engineering and Construction Services, Toronto Building, and Parks, Forestry and Recreation. It is noted that we have not received any comments from the City Planning division.

Prior to a Preliminary Report being prepared, or any consultation with the applicant or the consulting team, a Community Consultation Meeting for the applications was scheduled for April 20, 2017.

In an effort to determine the extent of the Planning staff presentation, our planning consultant contacted the area planner and was informed that a Refusal Report was being issued for the May 2, 2017 Community Council agenda. A copy was provided to us.

This came as a shock to us as we have had no discussions with planning staff since the pre-application meeting and attempts to schedule a meeting with the local Councillor were unsuccessful. We are involved in numerous development applications in the City of Toronto and the process which is normally followed would include at least a meeting with the applicant and staff to identify any overarching concerns and provide an opportunity for discussion and possible revisions prior to any report being prepared. We have no idea why, in this case, staff

did not proceed with any discussions with the applicant or the team in an effort to discuss issues prior to a negative report.

The Property is adjacent to a major intersection in the City's downtown and is designated *Mixed-Use* in the Official Plan. The current use of the majority of the Property is for a Motor Vehicle Repair Facility which does not implement the *Mixed Use* Designation. The Property also contains a number of vacant heritage structures which were proposed to be refurbished and reused as part of the redevelopment.

In addition, we understand that at the Community Consultation Meeting, there were residents who supported the development in its current form.

The Jarvis frontage of the Property is in an area affected by Official Plan Amendment No. 82, being the proposed Garden District Official Plan Amendment. Our client filed an appeal of Official Plan Amendment 82 on April 20, 2015. We continue to participate in the process for the appeal.

In summary, we are disappointed that a Refusal Report has been issued for the application prior to any public input or discussion with the applicant. In our opinion, the Property provides a wonderful opportunity to urbanize a key site currently occupied by undesirable uses in the heart of the City, close to transit and other amenities and we would have welcomed the opportunity to work with staff and the community on this proposal.

Yours truly,

WeirFoulds LLP



Denise Baker

DB/mw

cc Client

L. McPherson, Bousfields Inc.

10405119.1