

PG 33.6.8

**AIRD & BERLIS LLP**

Barristers and Solicitors

Robert G. Doumani  
Partner  
Direct: 416.865.3060  
E-mail: rdoumani@airdberlis.com

June 9, 2014

105912, 105913, 105914

BY EMAIL

Deputy Mayor and Members of Council  
City of Toronto  
Attention: Ulli Watkiss, City Clerk  
Toronto City Hall, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
100 Queen Street West  
Toronto ON M5H 2N2

RECEIVED  
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
SECRETARIAT 12 W  
2014 JUN 9 PM 1 17

Dear Ms. Watkiss:

**Re: Council Meeting June 10, 2014  
Planning and Growth Management Committee Meeting  
Item PG33.6  
Final Report on Areas for Proposed Residential Apartment Commercial  
(RAC) Zone – Proposed Amendments to By-law 569-2013  
OMB: PL130592  
Appeals 118, 119, 120 – W. J. Holdings Limited**

Aird & Berlis LLP acts for W. J. Holdings Limited, ("our client") , the owner various properties within the City of Toronto which are subject to citywide Zoning By-law 569-2013 and included under its current appeals of the parent by-law, [OMB PL130592], specifically:

- (a) 10 Grenoble Drive [Appeal 118]
- (b) 2550 & 2560 Kingston Road [Appeal 119]
- (c) 7 St. Dennis Drive [Appeal 120]

Proposed Amendments to By-law 569-2013 recommended to Council by the Planning and Growth Management Committee to implement the Residential Apartment Commercial (RAC) Zone directly affects the zoning of these appealed properties.

We do not in principle have a major concern with the addition of new ancillary non-residential and commercial uses as permitted uses at these existing apartment sites.

However, we have a fundamental concern with the following matters.

June 9, 2014

Page 2

1. Our client's property specific appeals remain outstanding and, therefore, at this time any further site specific amendment to By-law 569-2013 affecting our client's appeals should be consolidated with their current matters at the OMB.
2. Our client's properties have been rezoned and placed in the RAC Zone designation. Our client needs to be satisfied as to the measure of change from the RA Zone designation which this amendment represents with respect to its current appeals.
3. With respect to the property at 2560 Kingston Road we have repeatedly noted to staff our client's technical objections to Site Specific Exception RA(628) which is carried forward with identical wording under the new proposed Site Specific Exception RAC (170).

Please accept this letter as our written submission as required pursuant to section 34(19) of the *Planning Act* with respect to the proposed amendments to Zoning By-law 569-2013 insofar as it affects our client's properties.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and provide the undersigned with Notice of the Passing of the Zoning By-law Amendment as adopted and passed by Council.

We also reserve our right to make such further submission and/or appeal, if required, based on the final form of the bill.

Yours truly,

AIRD & BERLIS LLP

Robert G. Doumani

e. W. J. Holdings Limited

RGD/RD/rd  
18333173.2