Stikeman Elliott

Stikeman Elliott LLP Barristers & Solicitors 5300 Commerce Court West 199 Bay Street Toronto, ON Canada M5L 1B9

Main: 416 869 5500 Fax: 416 947 0866 www.stikeman.com

Patrick G. Duffy Direct: +1 416 869 5257 pduffy@stikeman.com

June 25, 2021 File No.: 136574.1001 By E-mail phc@toronto.ca

Planning and Housing Commitee 10th floor, West Tower, City Hall 100 Queen Street West Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Attention: Nancy Martins, Committee Administrator

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

Re: PH25.5 – Zoning Conformity for Official Plan Employment Areas - Phase 1 Final Report and Phase 2 Update Letter of Concern

We are counsel to 39 Wynford Inc., the owner of the property municipally known in the City of Toronto as 39 Wynford Drive (the "**Property**").

We are writing to express our client's serious concerns regarding City staff's proposed amendments to various zoning by-laws, including City of Toronto Zoning By-law No. 569 and Former City of North York Zoning By-law No. 7625 (the "**Proposed Zoning Amendments**") which, according to staff, are intended to bring the City's zoning by-laws into conformity with the Official Plan, as amended by Official Plan Amendment No. 231 ("**OPA 231**").

By this letter, we hereby request that the Committee direct that staff revise the Proposed Zoning Amendments to exclude the Property from the Proposed Zoning Amendments.

In the alternative, we request that the Committee defer consideration of the Proposed Zoning Amendments to allow staff an opportunity to discuss with our client and consultant team and to make the necessary revisions to the Proposed Zoning Amendments.

As drafted, the Proposed Zoning Amendments inappropriately downzone the Property, stripping away a wide range of existing land use permissions (including adult education school, college, commercial gallery, community centre, day nursery, fitness centre, hotel, museum, place of worship, public library, theatre and university uses) even though the policies of OPA 231 do not presently apply to the Property.

As it relates to the Property, our client maintains an ongoing site-specific appeal of OPA 231 before the Ontario Land Tribunal (the "**Tribunal**"), which is proceeding under OLT Case No. PL140860 as Appeal No. 38 (the "**Appeal**"). The Appeal has yet to be scheduled for a hearing before the Tribunal, and while the Appeal is maintained, the policies of OPA 231 do not apply to the Property.

Downzoning the Property through the Proposed Zoning Amendments, in advance of the hearing of the Appeal, goes beyond staff's stated intent of bringing zoning into conformity with OPA 231.

Stikeman Elliott

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further with staff in an effort to resolve our client's concerns.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

PD-14

Patrick G. Duffy

PGD/jsc

cc. Jonathan S. Cheng, *Stikeman Elliott LLP* Mike Dror, *Bousfields Inc.* Client