CC17.1 - Confidential Attachment 2 - made public on April 6, 2016

McCarthy Tétrault LLP PO Box 48, Suite 5300 Toronto-Dominion Bank Tower Toronto ON M5K 1E6 Canada Tel: 416-362-1812 Fax: 416-868-0673

John A.R. Dawson Direct Line: (416) 601-8300 Direct Fax: (416) 868-0673 Email: jdawson@mccarthy.ca

mccarthy tetrault

February 26, 2016

Via Email

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Ms. Kelly Matsumoto Ms. Abbie Moscovich City of Toronto c/o Legal Department Metro Hall, 26th Floor 55 John Street Toronto ON M5V 3C6

Dear Mesdames:

RE: OMB Case No. PL141134 and related matters

AND RE: Application No.: 15 256733 STE 20 OZ 420 Dupont Street and 275 Albany Avenue (the "Site")

As you are aware, we are counsel to Leeken Investments Limited ("Leeken") respecting the above-referenced address in the above-captioned matter. Further to our discussion in the recent mediation conducted by the Ontario Municipal Board, we would like to take this opportunity to confirm the terms and conditions which our client proposes as a basis for the settlement of its appeals. This offer is conditional upon a further agreement on the final form of the entirety of the instruments necessary to implement these terms and conditions (i.e. modifications to OPA 231, modifications to OPA 271, a zoning by-law amendment, an agreement pursuant to section 37 of the *Planning Act*, minutes of settlement, and any other instruments as may be agreed upon) and on an agreement on seeking any necessary approvals from the Board.

Our client proposes to settle its appeal with the City of Toronto, before the Ontario Municipal Board, upon the appropriate implementation of the following:

- Approval of a zoning by-law amendment which permits the construction and use of a building generally as described in the conceptual drawings prepared by Teeple Architects dated February 26, 2016 identified on Schedule "A" hereto, and for greater certainty shall provide:
 - that the overall height shall not exceed 9 storeys (32 metres) plus 6 metres for mechanicals etc. which are to be located generally as set out on the concept plans;

- (b) that the total residential gross floor area shall not exceed 24,769 square metres;
- (c) that the non-residential gross floor area shall not exceed 2,301.1 square metres;
- (d) no floor above the second storey shall have a gross floor area greater than 3,366.3 square metres;
- (e) that at least 10% of the units will include 3 bedrooms;
- (f) that at least 20% of the units will include 2 bedrooms or 2 bedrooms plus den;
- (g) that with respect to the setback from the railway right-of-way, residential and commercial uses may be permitted within 30 metres thereof, provided that:
 - under any circumstance, residential units are set back a minimum of 20 metres from the railway right-of-way, and residential units, enclosed residential amenity space or office uses located at grade are setback a minimum of 30 metres; and
 - alternative safety mitigation measures are accepted and incorporated in accordance with the applicable policies in OPA 271, as modified including the peer review requirement; and
- (h) for a 2 metre step-back in the building along the Dupont frontage from the front wall of the building at a height of approximately 10.5 metres (i.e. at the top of the second floor) for the majority of this frontage, generally in accordance with the above referenced drawings.
- The approval of OPAs 231 and 271, modified as necessary to permit the contemplated implementing zoning by-law to provide for the normal everyday use of the building and site otherwise for its intended purposes (both residential and employment), including such parts of each within 20 metres of the railway right-of-way.
- 3. Execution of a Section 37 Agreement which provides that the Owner shall pay to the City funds in the amount of \$780,000.00 (Canadian) prior to the first above-grade building permit indexed in accordance with City practice at this time. Such funds will predominantly be used for streetscape improvements adjacent to the Site with the balance used for other capital improvements to public land or facilities in the general vicinity of the Site.
- A minimum of 2,200 square metres of non-residential gross floor area will be provided at grade.
- 5. The City and Leeken shall seek a decision of the Ontario Municipal Board at the earliest practicable opportunity following the finalization of the implementing instruments and thus the settlement, but the Board will be requested to withhold its Order until the City Solicitor has advised the Board that the City has provided to Leeken, or to such party as Leeken may direct, a "NOAC" in respect of a site plan application filed for the Site, or if appealed, upon the Board determining such site plan.

page 3

mccarthy tetrault

6.

The City acknowledges that the plans herewith are conceptual only, and minor revisions to address structural and/or mechanical review and/or unit design considerations are anticipated and consistent with the settlement. For clarity, the non-residential and overall maximum height are intended to remain unchanged notwithstanding such minor revisions, and further, notwithstanding that the specific location of enclosed building "ins and outs" on any floor may change, the location, accounting for such revisions to the massing and pattern, of the south façade shall be generally as shown on the conceptual drawings herewith and no part of the building on the Dupont frontage on any floor of the building on the plans herewith, nor shall the overall gross floor area of any floor increase.

With respect to paragraph 6 above, please note that with the timing constraints imposed by the mediation process and council's schedule, and given the desirability of providing as much graphic information as possible, the concept drawings provided herewith include demising lines between units which are held over from the previous scheme and have not been assessed on even a conceptual level so should be disregarded. Further, there are minor inconsistencies between the model rendering, 2nd floor plan and the elevations with respect to the south side of Level 2, but the gross floor area is accurate so there should be no confusion. Our architect is prepared to make himself available should further explanation be required. Finally, given that the nature of the mediation discussions has focussed on the building above grade, so do the attached concept drawings. Therefore, the parking areas have not been redrawn. Our client is prepared to provide parking to the minimums required in By-law 569-2013. Please do not hesitate to contact us for any clarification you require.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours truly.

John A.R. Dawson

JARD:sc

page 4

SCHEDULE "A" Conceptual Drawings prepared by Teeple Architects Inc. dated February 26, 2016

NO.	DRAWING NAME						
A0001	Cover Sheet						
A0002	Topographical and Boundary Survey						
A0003	Site Plan Project Statistics						
A201	Level 1 Plan/Site Plan						
A202	Level 2 Plan						
A203	Level 3 Plan						
A204	Level 4 Plan						
A205	Level 5 Plan						
A206	Level 6 Plan						
A207	Level 7 Plan						
A208	Level 8 Plan						
A209	Level 9 Plan						
A210	Mechanical Penthouse Plan						
A211	Roof Plan						
A212	Parking Level P1						
A213	Parking Level P2						
A301	South East West Elevations						
A302	North Elevation						
A401							
	North South Building Section A						
A402	North South Building Section B						
A403	North South Building Section C						
A404	East West Building Section 1						













































CC17.1 - Confidential Attachment 3a - made public on April 6, 2016

Aird	ß	Berlis	LLP
------	---	--------	-----

Barristers and Solicitors

Sidonia J. Loiacono Direct: (416) 865-7763 E-mail: sloiacono@airdberlis.com

February 26, 2016

BY E-MAIL

Our File No: 113374

Ms. Kelly Matsumoto and Ms. Abbie Moscovich Legal Services City of Toronto 26th Floor, Metro Hall 55 John Street Toronto, ON M5V 3C6

Dear Mesdames:

Re: WITHOUT PREJUDICE SETTLEMENT OFFER 840 and 860 Dupont Street, City of Toronto OMB Case Nos: PL141134, PL140860, PL150838, and MM160005

As you are aware, we are the solicitors for Sobeys Capital Incorporated ("Sobeys"), the owner of the property municipally known as 840 and 860 Dupont Street, located on the northwest corner of Dupont Street and Shaw Street, in the City of Toronto ("Site").

We believe that the progress made to date, through the guidance offered by the Ontario Municipal Board mediation process led by Vice Chair McKenzie, has either resolved many of the outstanding issues or identified a number of concrete steps that can be taken to resolve them. In an effort to reach a mutually agreeable resolution and avoid the time and expense of a protracted OMB process, we are writing to set out our client's terms of settlement for the herein referenced appeals. Consistent with our client's stated position, this settlement proposal is to settle all of our client's appeals of the various planning instruments related to the Site.

This offer is made on a without prejudice basis and remains open until acceptance by the City during the City Council meeting scheduled for March 10, 2016.

BACKGROUND

In July 2013, our client filed private applications to amend the City of Toronto Official Plan and Zoning By-law 438-86 (City File No. 13 203675 STE 19 OZ) (the "**OPA and ZBA**") to seek permission to construct a mixed-use development on the Site. The OPA and ZBA were deemed complete on August 22, 2013. On August 27, 2015, our client filed appeals of the OPA and ZBA with the Board pursuant to subsections 22(7) and 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13 (*OMB Case No. PL150838*).

A Site Plan Control application (City File No. 15 267085 STE 19 SA) associated with the noted above OPA and ZBA was to the City submitted on December 21, 2015 (the "SPA"). The SPA was appealed to the Board pursuant to subsection 114(15) of the City of Toronto

> Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street, Suite 1800, Box 754 • Toronto, ON • M5J 2T9 • Canada T 416.863.1500 F 416.863.1515

Act 2006, S.O. 2006, c. 11, Sched. A, as amended (*OMB Case No. MM160005*). This correspondence will refer to the appeals related to our client's OPA, ZBA and SPA as the "Sobeys Private Appeals".

Sobeys also filed appeals following the City's enactment of various City-initiated planning instruments related to the Dupont Street Corridor, namely the Dupont Street specific policies set out in Official Plan Amendment No. 231, Official Plan Amendment No. 271 and Zoning By-law 1011-2014 (collectively referred to as the "Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals"). In its decision issued on June 2, 2015, the Board granted a motion filed by the appellants (including our client) to consolidate the appeals related to Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals (*OMB Case No. PL141134*). A hearing respecting the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals is scheduled to commence on May 2, 2016.

On October 27, 2015 the Board held a second pre-hearing conference for the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals and a first pre-hearing conference for the Sobeys Private Appeals. At this proceeding, our client requested that its Private Appeals be consolidated with the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals. The Board deferred consideration of our client's request until the pre-hearing conference scheduled for March 3, 2016. On February 22, 2016, our client formally filed a Motion for Consolidation in accordance with the Board's Rules of Procedure to be considered by the Board at the March 3, 2016 proceeding. Since the filing of our client's Motion, the parties to the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals have consented to the release of the March 3, 2016 pre-hearing conference in exchange for a replacement date of April 12, 2016.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OFFER

Our client proposes that the City and our client agree to jointly support a settlement of our client's appeals related to the Site based upon the following terms:

- Sobeys will revise its development proposal for the Site consistent with the following:
 - provide a 9 storey mixed-use building, reduced from 13 storeys, with an overall height of 37 metres excluding mechanical penthouse and composed of:
 - i. a maximum of 331 residential dwelling units;
 - a seven-storey residential component containing 311 residential dwelling units;
 - iii. a two-storey podium containing approximately 8,750 m² of nonresidential gross floor area;
 - iv. 2,020m² of residential gross floor area located within a portion of the second storey podium to facilitate the provision of 20 residential dwelling units with mezzanine space. The mezzanine space shall be provided in accordance with the definitions of such uses as set out in the Ontario Building Code and such mezzanine space shall not constitute a storey;

- a mix of residential dwelling units with at least 10% of the total residential dwelling units being three bedroom dwelling units and a minimum of 20% of the total residential dwelling units being 2 bedroom dwelling units.
- b. provide a minimum of a 20 metre horizontal setback to all residential dwelling units from the edge of the railway corridor provided that the provision of rail safety mitigation measures are accepted in accordance with the applicable policies of OPA 271, as amended through this settlement and despite the designation of the lands as *Employment Areas*; and
- c. provision of the proposed building to be within the 45 degree angular plane, with the exception of architectural elements, railings, cornices, canopies, awnings, skylights, ornamental elements, wind mitigation elements, trellises, lighting fixtures, screens, fences, landscape and public art elements, water features, retaining walls, window washing equipment, eaves, window sills, wheelchair ramps, vents, stairways, and railings, measured from a height of 16 metres above the front lot line adjacent to Dupont Street.
- Sobeys agrees to convey a 700m² parcel of land (as shown in the enclosed architectural drawings) to the City, free of any encumbrances, for a future neighbourhood park at no cost to the City and in satisfaction of the City's parkland contribution requirements set out in Article III, Chapter 415 of the Municipal Code in connection with this development.
- 3. The City agrees that any parkland contribution owing to the City (in addition to the conveyance of the 700m² parcel of land set out in paragraph 1e) shall be satisfied through a contribution of cash-in-lieu of parkland to be provided to the City prior to the issuance of the first above-grade building permit for the development of the Site.
- 4. Sobeys agrees to provide and design a privately owned area of approximately 89m² adjacent to the proposed future City park which may contain patio spaces and/or seating associated with the adjoining retail uses. The proposed privately owned area shall be accessible to the public, however this area shall not be subject to easements with the City.
- 5. The City agrees that the residential and non-residential mezzanine uses proposed as part of the proposed development shall not constitute a storey and that the definition of storey in any implementing instruments shall define "storeys" as being only those levels above-grade and shall not include a mezzanine.
- The owner of the Site shall work with City Staff as well as the Area Councillor's office with a view to entering into a Section 37 Agreement acceptable to both parties having an estimated total value of \$895,000 provided that:

- a maximum of 10% (\$89,500) of the cash contribution to the City shall be allocated to capital improvements for Toronto Community Housing Corporation Buildings in the vicinity of the Site;
- a minimum of 70% (\$626,500) of the cash contribution to the City shall be allocated to streetscape improvements and public realm improvements adjacent to the Site; and
- c. a maximum of 20% (\$179,000) of the cash contribution to the City shall be allocated to park improvements in the vicinity of the Site, including towards the proposed future park to be located on the Site.
- The City will agree to work with our client to finalize an acceptable form of OPA 231 and OPA 271 prior to the May, 2016 hearing which shall include in particular:
 - a. policies which permit an increase in the maximum number of storeys for buildings within the Mixed Use Area designation to 9 storeys from 8 storeys;
 - b. policies which permit the implementation of alternative rail safety mitigation measures to be assessed as part of a zoning by-law amendment application and to be subject to a peer review by a rail safety expert to be retained by the City such that residential dwelling units can be located a minimum of 20 metres setback from the railway corridor;
 - c. policies which provide that the designation line between the Mixed Use Areas and the Employment Areas designations is conceptual only and where alternative rail mitigation measures comply with the polices set out in OPA 271 (as revised through this settlement) residential dwelling units shall be permitted on the Site on lands located a minimum of 20 metres from the railway corridor and such areas shall be deemed to be designated Mixed Use Areas;
 - d. the inclusion of policies to permit the following uses within the 30 metre railway right-of-way setback:
 - i. retail, service commercial and personal service uses;
 - ii. office uses accessory to the retail uses;
 - iii. rail safety and vibration/noise mitigation measure;
 - iv. residential, residential visitor, non-residential, and non-residential visitor parking;
 - v. car -share parking;
 - vi. residential-occupant, non-residential-occupant and visitor bicycle parking spaces;
 - vii. loading areas and loading spaces;
 - viii. non-residential and residential storage areas and lockers;
 - ix. non-residential and residential garbage areas;
 - x. storage warehousing;
 - xi. non-residential and residential driveways and ramps to underground parking;

- xii. mechanical elements:
- xiii. open space (including green roofs); and
- xiv. parkland.

In the event of any dispute regarding the final form of OPA 271, any party may ask the Board to settle such matters through the Board-led mediation process in advance of the May, 2016 proceeding or as part of the hearing in May, 2016.

- 8. The City will agree work with our client to finalize an acceptable form of a site specific zoning by-law amendment for the Site to facilitate the enclosed settlement proposal prior to the May 2016 hearing and in the event of any dispute regarding the final form of same, any party may ask the Board to settle such matters through the Board-led mediation process in advance of the May, 2016 proceeding or as part of the hearing in May, 2016.
- 9. The City acknowledges that the architectural plans dated February 25, 2016 (enclosed) are conceptual only and shared in furtherance of the enclosed settlement offer. Accordingly, minor revisions are anticipated and will be reflected in the final ZBA and SPA resubmission to be formally submitted to the City upon City Council's acceptance of the herein settlement terms.
- The City will support our client's Motion for Consolidation of its Private Appeals with the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals.
- The City will not seek to adjourn the hearing of our client's appeals outside of the hearing dates scheduled (from May 2, 2016 – May 20, 2016).
- The City and Sobeys shall ask the Ontario Municipal Board to withhold its final Order respecting the Sobeys Private Appeals until advised by the City Solicitor that a satisfactory Section 37 Agreement has been entered into securing the requirements noted in paragraph 6, above.
- Each party will bear its own costs of these proceedings.
- The City agrees that the components of our client's settlement proposal provided herein represent the basis of a final settlement for all of our client's appeals related to the Site.
- 15. This letter is delivered on a without prejudice and confidential basis but may be made public following the conclusion of the Council meeting commencing on March 10, 2016 if the offer contained herein is accepted at that meeting.

In support of our client's settlement proposal, we enclose our client's revised architectural plans dated February 25, 2016 which reflect the above described settlement proposal. Should this offer be accepted by City Council at its meeting on March 10, 2016, and Council resolves to support the within settlement proposal at the Board, our client would proceed to revise and formally resubmit the ZBA and SPA in substantial accordance with the attached drawings and statistics in order to implement the settlement proposal. We will also prepare the necessary instruments to facilitate the development of the settlement proposal which shall be filed with the Board at the May 2016 proceeding.

Finally, we want to thank you and all staff involved for your efforts in working towards a mediated settlement.

We trust the enclosed is satisfactory. Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

AIRD & BERLIS LLP

Lacom

Sidonia J. Loiacono SJL cc. Clients Bousfields Inc.

Encl. 25229359.3

CC1/.1 - Confidential Attachment JU - made public on April 0, 2010	CC17.1 - Confidential	Attachment 3b - 1	made public on A	pril 6, 2016
--	-----------------------	-------------------	------------------	--------------

	AIRD & BERLIS LLP Barristers and Solicitors
	Sidonia J. Lolacono Direct: (416) 865-7763 E-mail: siolacono@airdbertis.com
Febru	ary 29, 2016 Our File No: 11337
BY E-	MAIL
Legal City o 26 th F 55 Jol	elly Matsumoto and Ms. Abbie Moscovich Services f Toronto loor, Metro Hall hn Street to, ON M5V 3C6
Dear	Mesdames:
Re:	WITHOUT PREJUDICE SETTLEMENT OFFER 840 and 860 Dupont Street, City of Toronto OMB Case Nos: PL141134, PL140860, PL150838, and MM160005
owner Toron We ar	u are aware, we are the solicitors for Sobeys Capital Incorporated ("Sobeys"), the of the property municipally known as 840 and 860 Dupont Street, in the City of to ("Site"). re writing further to our letter of February 26, 2016 wherein we enclosed the terms of the terms of the strength of the terms of terms of the terms of term
our u	ant's without projudice eattlement offer respecting its appeals related to the Site
	ent's without prejudice settlement offer respecting its appeals related to the Site. re writing to confirm that our client has agreed to amend paragraph 11 of i ment offer, so that it provides as follows:
	re writing to confirm that our client has agreed to amend paragraph 11 of it
settler We tr	re writing to confirm that our client has agreed to amend paragraph 11 of it ment offer, so that it provides as follows: The City will not seek to adjourn the hearing of our client's appeals outside of the hearing dates scheduled (from May 2, 2016 – May 20, 2016), unless such an adjournment is required as a result of a City labour disruption, strike or lock-out
settler We tr	re writing to confirm that our client has agreed to amend paragraph 11 of it ment offer, so that it provides as follows: The City will not seek to adjourn the hearing of our client's appeals outside of the hearing dates scheduled (from May 2, 2016 – May 20, 2016), unless such an adjournment is required as a result of a City labour disruption, strike or lock-out which would affect staff's full participation in the hearing. ust the enclosed is satisfactory. Should you require further information, please d esitate to contact the undersigned.
We tr not he Yours	re writing to confirm that our client has agreed to amend paragraph 11 of it ment offer, so that it provides as follows: The City will not seek to adjourn the hearing of our client's appeals outside of the hearing dates scheduled (from May 2, 2016 – May 20, 2016), unless such an adjournment is required as a result of a City labour disruption, strike or lock-out which would affect staff's full participation in the hearing. ust the enclosed is satisfactory. Should you require further information, please d esitate to contact the undersigned. truly, & BERLIS LLP MCCM
We tr not he Yours	re writing to confirm that our client has agreed to amend paragraph 11 of it ment offer, so that it provides as follows: The City will not seek to adjourn the hearing of our client's appeals outside of the hearing dates scheduled (from May 2, 2016 – May 20, 2016), unless such an adjournment is required as a result of a City labour disruption, strike or lock-out which would affect staff's full participation in the hearing. ust the enclosed is satisfactory. Should you require further information, please desitate to contact the undersigned. truly, & BERLIS LLP MAXAAA ia J. Loiacono Clients Bousfields Inc.
We tr not he Yours AIRD Sidon SJL cc.	re writing to confirm that our client has agreed to amend paragraph 11 of it ment offer, so that it provides as follows: The City will not seek to adjourn the hearing of our client's appeals outside of the hearing dates scheduled (from May 2, 2016 – May 20, 2016), unless such an adjournment is required as a result of a City labour disruption, strike or lock-out which would affect staff's full participation in the hearing. ust the enclosed is satisfactory. Should you require further information, please desitate to contact the undersigned. truly, & BERLIS LLP MAXAAA ia J. Loiacono Clients Bousfields Inc.



VEHICULAR BUILDING 1

12.337 - DUPONT & SHAW

AREA PRATINE

TOPONTO, ONT STATISTICS

DITE APRA TOTAL OF

10106-0

11.308

11-308

LEVEL		LWE					TOTAL
NENDAL AN PARCALL		***	105207-04 10728	NAVE NUMBER		******	
	FL0091	-06			2		- 10
	061	105	-40				234
	LHE 2					2903	2963
		354	-49		1	290	
	TOTM.	2.69	0.1	1		6.89	596
		11000 SP	(UNIT			LMT	
Intel Preside	ed (heat, 167), B.	111			1	201	
Broad sars	puere (NEL)	11					
Handley	p Parking	15					

BULDING	1		
	LINIL	UNE	

	LEVEL			LOC			TOTAL.
		***	10/18	10440		******	
NEHELA, M PURDAG	FLOOR 1	-06			1		- 10
	061	105	-40				234
	LHE 2					2903	2963
		354	-49		1	290	
	TOTM.	2.69	0.1	8		6.89	596
		11000 SP	UNIT			LMT	
Total Prenit	ed (bed, 163, 8	111	4		1	201	
Ternal sar	pares (NEL)	11					

R PARK	ING - P	ROVIDED						1 VEHICL	1.471 F/4
LEVEL			LON	_		TOTAL.	1	8	
	***	10718	100400 00132.1 100738		******		1	Š9	10.5
L0091	-06			2		- 10	1	55	201.6.3
UG1	105	-40				234	1	38	30.6
LHE 2					290	2903	1	8.	R1
	354	-49		1	290		1	1.8	TAL 6
TOTM.	2.69 0.18			6.80	SHL.		· ·	-	
	11000 SP	UN	r -		LMT		1		

1150

L P.LL



An even of the total encode and how been and a locating, a fee of the water and already flow investmentaling. It increde particing at and before established grade, and answer biotechical, solitop, mechanical and send activacies, electrical, solitop, mechanical and send

Grass Hoor Area Calculatio

Horas

es for a Mi





(i) ton. (ii) a sart

cial Residential Done Ca

00 mm

....

ed Day / Approximent Building in the Carr

and the second second bios



ding me wity for the use on non-removement or conservational balance explosions: But, Marcela das Buddales programma-balances augements that an analysis of the Marcela das Buddales reg facilitaris, danses ar belans gradas, tend i tal das buddales ar deranses at lanear ar budane anale final to associ fan-tites ser titere ef mode finales within its associated militir das attempts for the principied car.

- ing cooling workling

- TWO WINGS WITH PARK ON DUPONT

SAUK WHE

Annual Market The residence of the second

TURNER FLESCH

π.

Courses of the

ł.

WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND CONFIDENTIAL





34

Sobeys Developments Limited Partnership



Seats.

STATISTICS an land

SPA-0.01





Ô 0 www.7 0 Ċ 1.44 9 13-ခုဆု ۲ DOBTING I STOREY BUILDING 13 = 1 = 1 1.10 ۲ άå ð 0 -58-T 4 -۲ مجد ياد XX P 5 X ----۲ EXISTING 4 STOREY BUILDING -8 ۲ DUPONT STREET

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

2

=====

2222

- -- -

=

-






























WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND CONFIDENTIAL





TWO WINGS WITH PARK ON DUPONT

Sobeys Developments Limited Partnership





CC17.1 - Confidential Attachment 3C - made public on April 6, 2016

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Kelly and Abbie -

We are writing further to our letter of February 26, 2016 and our supplemental letter of February 29, 2016 wherein we set out the terms of our client's without prejudice settlement offer respecting its appeals related to the Site.

Further to our without prejudice discussion with you of February 29, 2016, you advised that the Councillor intends to host a community consultation meeting respecting our client's applications for the Site on March 22, 2016. We have no objection to that meeting being held provided that the details of our client's without prejudice settlement offer are <u>not</u> disclosed and the development proposal presented to the community reflects our client's most recent zoning by-law amendment application resubmission made on August 19, 2105, being the 11 storey development proposal.

We also understand that in order to facilitate the timing of the above-referenced community consultation meeting, the Councillor will be seeking a deferral of our client's settlement offer to the City Council meeting commencing on March 30th, 2016 Our client has agreed to extend its settlement offer and accordingly, the offer will remain open until acceptance by the City at its meeting scheduled for March 30, 31 and April 1, 2016.

With thanks, Sidonia

CC17.1 - Confidential Attachment 4a - made public on April 6, 2016

	AIRD & BERLIS LLP
	Barristers and Solicitors
	Sidonia J. Loiacono Direct: (416) 865-7763 E-mail: sloiacono@airdberlis.com
February 29, 2016	
BY E-MAIL	Our File No: 120829
Ms. Kelly Matsumoto an Legal Services City of Toronto 26 th Floor, Metro Hall 55 John Street Toronto, ON M5V 3C6	d Ms. Abbie Moscovich
Dear Mesdames:	
500 Dupont S	EJUDICE SETTLEMENT OFFER reet, City of Toronto s: PL141134 and PL160135
Group Limited, owner o	ont Street Holdings Limited, formerly RoseWater Management the property municipally known as 500 Dupont Street located on nt Street west of Bathurst Street (" Site "). The Site currently tail store.
Municipal Board media many of the outstanding to resolve them. In an and expense of a protra settlement for the herein this settlement proposa	gress made to date, through the guidance offered by the Ontario ion process led by Vice Chair McKenzie, has either resolved issues or identified a number of concrete steps that can be taken effort to reach a mutually agreeable resolution and avoid the time cted OMB process, we are writing to set out our client's terms of referenced appeals. Consistent with our client's stated position, is to settle all of our client's appeals (including those which are clanning instruments related to the Site.
This offer is made on a City during the City Cou	without prejudice basis and remains open until acceptance by the ncil meeting scheduled for March 10, 2016.
BACKGROUND	
Official Plan and Zoning and ZBA") to seek per OPA and ZBA were de client filed appeals of	, our client filed private applications to amend the City of Toronto By-law 438-86 (City File No. 15 226388 STE 20 OZ) (the " OPA mission to construct a mixed-use development on the Site. The emed complete on October 7, 2015. On February 8, 2016, our he ZBA with the Board pursuant to subsection 34(11) of the 90, c. P. 13 (<i>OMB Case No. PL160135</i>).

To date, Council has not yet made a decision with respect to our client's OPA and accordingly, we anticipate filing an appeal with respect to same under subsection 22(7) of

Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street, Suite 1800, Box 754 - Toronto, DN - M5J 2T9 - Canada 7 416.863.1500 F 416.863.1515 www.airdberlis.com

the *Planning Act* by April 4, 2016. This correspondence will refer to the appeals related to our client's OPA and ZBA as the "**500 Dupont Private Appeals**".

Our client also filed appeals following the City's enactment of various City-initiated planning instruments related to the Dupont Street Corridor, namely the Dupont Street specific policies set out in Official Plan Amendment No. 231, Official Plan Amendment No. 271 and Zoning By-law 1011-2014 (collectively referred to as the "**Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals**"). In its decision issued on June 2, 2015, the Board granted a motion filed by the appellants (including our client) to consolidate the appeals related to Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals (*OMB Case No. PL141134*). A hearing respecting the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals is scheduled to commence on May 2, 2016.

On October 27, 2015 the Board held a second pre-hearing conference for the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals. At this proceeding, our client advised the Board of its intension to file appeals of the OPA and ZBA and that it would be seeking a consolidation or a hearing at the same time of its site specific appeals with the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals. On February 22, 2016, our client formally filed a Motion for Consolidation in accordance with the Board's Rules of Procedure to be considered by the Board at the March 3, 2016 proceeding. Since the filing of our client's Motion, the parties to the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals have consented to the release of the March 3, 2016 pre-hearing conference in exchange for a replacement date of April 12, 2016.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OFFER

Our client proposes that the City and our client agree to jointly support a settlement of our client's appeals related to the Site based upon the following terms:

- Our client will revise its development proposal for the Site consistent with the following:
 - a. provide a 9 storey mixed-use building, reduced from 12 storeys, with an overall height of 38 metres, including mechanical penthouse and composed of:
 - i. a maximum of 150 residential dwelling units;
 - a mix of residential dwelling units with at least 10% of the total residential dwelling units being three bedroom dwelling units and a minimum of 20% of the total residential dwelling units being 2 bedroom dwelling units; and
 - iii. ground floor retail uses consisting of approximately 1,800m² of nonresidential gross floor area, including the gross floor area to be attributed to the non-residential mezzanine space within the podium;
 - b. a maximum of 150m² of residential gross floor area shall be permitted above the 9th storey level to permit a mezzanine area associated with 4 residential dwelling units on the 9th storey in order to provide access to

private roof top terraces above the 9th storey level. The gross floor area associated with the mezzanine shall not constitute a storey;

- c. provide a minimum of a 20 metre horizontal setback for all residential dwelling units from the edge of the railway corridor provided that the provision of rail safety mitigation measures are accepted in accordance with the applicable policies of OPA 271, as amended through this settlement and despite the designation of the lands as *Employment Areas*;
- d. allowance for the building or structure located on the 7th, 8th and 9th storeys to be located above the 45 degree angular plane measured from a height of 16 metres above the front lot line adjacent to Dupont Street in general accordance with the attached architectural drawings and in particular as shown in yellow on drawings A400 and A402;
- e. allowance for architectural elements, railings, cornices, canopies, awnings, skylights, ornamental elements, wind mitigation elements, trellises, lighting fixtures, screens, fences, landscape and public art elements, water features, retaining walls, window washing equipment, eaves, window sills, wheelchair ramps, vents, stairways, and railings to be located above the 45 degree angular plane measured from a height of 16 metres above the front lot line adjacent to Dupont Street;
- f. provision of a 13.5 metre separation distance between the two proposed extensions of the development above the second storey; and
- g. provision of a 4.5 metres setback above the 3rd storey of the proposed building for the entire Dupont Street façade.
- The City's parkland contribution requirements as required in Article III, Chapter 415 of the Municipal Code in connection with this development shall be satisfied with cash-in-lieu of parkland to be provided to the City prior to the issuance of first above-grade building permit.
- The City acknowledges that the proposed lands to be conveyed to the City to facilitate a 1.5 metre laneway widening is sufficient.
- 4. The owner of the Site shall work with City Staff as well as the Area Councillor's office with a view to entering into a Section 37 Agreement acceptable to both parties having an estimated total value of \$30,000 provided that:
 - a maximum of 10% (\$3,000) of the cash contribution to the City shall be allocated to capital improvements for Toronto Community Housing Corporation Buildings in the vicinity of the Site; and
 - a minimum of 90% (\$27,000) of the cash contribution to the City shall be allocated to streetscape improvements and public realm improvements adjacent to the Site.

The proposed Section 37 contribution represents a contribution valued at more than double the value of that which would otherwise be required given the existing (and in force) residential permissions applicable to the Site.

- 5. The City agrees that the residential and non-residential mezzanine uses proposed as part of the proposed development shall not constitute a storey and that the definition of storey in any implementing instruments shall define "storeys" as being only those levels above-grade and shall not include a mezzanine.
- The City will agree to work with our client to finalize an acceptable form of OPA 231 and OPA 271 prior to the May, 2016 hearing which shall include in particular:
 - policies which permit an increase in the maximum number of storeys for buildings within the *Mixed Use Area* designation to 9 storeys from 8 storeys;
 - b. policies which permit the implementation of alternative rail safety mitigation measures to be assessed as part of a zoning by-law amendment application and to be subject to a peer review by a rail safety expert to be retained by the City such that residential dwelling units can be located a minimum of 20 metres setback from the railway corridor;
 - c. policies which provide that the designation line between the Mixed Use Areas and the Employment Areas designations is conceptual only and where alternative rail mitigation measures comply with the polices set out in OPA 271 (as revised through this settlement) residential dwelling units shall be permitted on the Site on lands located a minimum of 20 metres from the railway corridor and such areas shall be deemed to be designated Mixed Use Areas;
 - inclusion of policies to permit the following uses within the 30 metre railway right-of-way setback:
 - i. retail, service commercial and personal service uses;
 - ii. office uses accessory to the retail uses;
 - iii. rail safety and vibration/noise mitigation measures;
 - iv. residential, residential visitor, non-residential, and non-residential visitor parking;
 - v. car -share parking;
 - vi. residential-occupant, non-residential-occupant and visitor bicycle parking spaces;
 - vii. loading areas and loading spaces;
 - vili, non-residential and residential storage areas and lockers;
 - ix. non-residential and residential garbage areas;
 - storage warehousing;
 - xi. non-residential and residential driveways and ramps to underground parking;
 - xii. mechanical elements;
 - xiii. open space (including green roofs); and
 - xiv. parkland.

In the event of any dispute regarding the final form of OPA 271, any party may ask the Board to settle such matters through the Board-led mediation process in advance of the May, 2016 proceeding or as part of the hearing in May, 2016.

- 7. The City will agree to work with our client to finalize an acceptable form of a site specific zoning by-law amendment for the Site to facilitate the enclosed settlement proposal prior to the May 2016 hearing and in the event of any dispute regarding the final form of same, any party may ask the Board to settle such matters through the Board-led mediation process in advance of the May, 2016 proceeding or as part of the hearing in May, 2016.
- 8. The City acknowledges that the architectural plans dated February 26, 2016 (enclosed) are conceptual only and shared in furtherance of the enclosed settlement offer. Accordingly, minor revisions are anticipated and will be reflected in the final ZBA resubmission to be formally submitted to the City upon City Council's acceptance of the herein settlement terms.
- 9. The City will support our client's Motion for Consolidation of the 500 Dupont Private Appeals with the Dupont Corridor Instrument Appeals.
- The City will not seek to adjourn the hearing of our client's appeals outside of the hearing dates scheduled (from May 2, 2016 – May 20, 2016), unless such an adjournment is required as a result of a City labour disruption, strike or lock-out which would affect staff's full participation in the hearing.
- 11. The City and our client shall ask the Ontario Municipal Board to withhold its final Order respecting our the 500 Dupont Private Appeals until advised by the City Solicitor that a satisfactory Section 37 Agreement has been entered into securing the requirements noted in paragraph 4, above.
- 12. Each party will bear its own costs of these proceedings.
- 13. The City agrees that the components of our client's settlement proposal provided herein represent the basis of a final settlement for all of our client's appeals (including those which are pending) related to the Site.
- 14. This letter is delivered on a without prejudice and confidential basis but may be made public following the conclusion of the Council meeting commencing on March 10, 2016 if the offer contained herein is accepted at that meeting.

In support of our client's settlement proposal, we enclose our client's revised architectural plans dated February 26, 2016 which reflect the above described settlement proposal. Should this offer be accepted by City Council at its meeting on March 10, 2016, and Council resolves to support the within settlement proposal at the Ontario Municipal Board, our client would proceed to revise and formally resubmit the ZBA in substantial accordance with the attached drawings and statistics in order to implement the settlement proposal. We will also prepare the necessary instruments to facilitate the development of the settlement proposal which shall be filed with the Board at the May 2016 proceeding.

Finally, we want to thank you and all staff involved for your efforts in working towards a mediated settlement.

We trust the enclosed is satisfactory. Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

AIRA & BERLIS LLP Sidonia J. Loiacono SJL

cc. Clients Bousfields Inc. Encl. 25239814.4

CC17.1 - Confidential Attachment 4b - made public on April 6, 2016

	Barristers and Solicitors
	Sidonia J. Lolacono Direct: (416) 865-7763 E-mail: slolacono@airdberlis.com
March 1	
BY E-M	AIL Our File No: 12082
Legal Se City of T 26 th Floo 55 John	oronto or, Metro Hall
Dear Me	esdames:
Re:	WITHOUT PREJUDICE SETTLEMENT OFFER – SUPPLEMENTAL OFFER 500 Dupont Street, City of Toronto
	OMB Case Nos: PL141134 and PL160135
Group L	OMB Case Nos: PL141134 and PL160135 resent 500 Dupont Street Holdings Limited, formerly RoseWater Manageme imited, owner of the property municipally known as 500 Dupont Street located on side of Dupont Street west of Bathurst Street ("Site").
Group L the north We are our clier	resent 500 Dupont Street Holdings Limited, formerly RoseWater Manageme imited, owner of the property municipally known as 500 Dupont Street located of
Group L the north We are our clier our with Further consulta We have without presente	resent 500 Dupont Street Holdings Limited, formerly RoseWater Manageme imited, owner of the property municipally known as 500 Dupont Street located on side of Dupont Street west of Bathurst Street (" Site "). writing further to our letter of February 29, 2016 wherein we enclosed the terms it's without prejudice settlement offer respecting its appeals related to the Site ar
Group L the north We are our clier our with Further consulta We have without presente 22, 2105 We also communisettleme has agr accepta provideo	resent 500 Dupont Street Holdings Limited, formerly RoseWater Manageme imited, owner of the property municipally known as 500 Dupont Street located of n side of Dupont Street west of Bathurst Street (" Site "). writing further to our letter of February 29, 2016 wherein we enclosed the terms it's without prejudice settlement offer respecting its appeals related to the Site ar out prejudice discussion that same day. to our discussion, you advised that the Councillor intends to host a communi- tion meeting respecting our client's applications for the Site on March 22, 201 e no objection to that meeting being held provided that the details of our client prejudice settlement offer are <u>not</u> disclosed and the development proposed to the community reflects our client's original submission made on Septemb

Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street, Suite 1800, Box 754 - Toronto, ON - M5J 2T9 - Canada T 416.863.1500 F 416.863.1515 www.airdberlis.com March 1, 2016 Page 2

Finally, while our client maintains that the proposed section 37 contribution of \$30,000 represents a contribution valued at more than double the value of that which would otherwise be required in association with this development, in order to achieve a resolution in the subject appeals, our client has agreed to amend paragraph 4 of its settlement offer filed on February 29, 2016 so that it now provides as follows:

The owner of the Site shall work with City Staff as well as the Area Councillor's office with a view to entering into a Section 37 Agreement acceptable to both parties having an estimated total value of \$50,000 provided that:

- a maximum of 10% (\$5,000) of the cash contribution to the City shall be allocated to capital improvements for Toronto Community Housing Corporation Buildings in the vicinity of the Site; and
- a minimum of 90% (\$45,000) of the cash contribution to the City shall be allocated to streetscape improvements and public realm improvements adjacent to the Site.

We trust the enclosed is satisfactory. Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

AIRD & BERLIS LLP Sidonia J. Loiacono SJL

cc. Clients Bousfields Inc. Encl. 25269814.1



GCA SUMMARY	(SM)		GFA @ 8	896	SALABLE				1		UDIC
LEVEL	AREA SM	AREA SE		SF	RES. SM		NON RES. SM	NON RES. SF	-	500 DUPONT ST	5
LEVEL	2.329.5	25074	2049	22060	0	0	1145.5	12330.4	1	TORONTO ON	ш
LEVEL MEZZ	781.9	8416	688	7405	0	0	584	6285.8	1	8-123	R
LEVEL 2	1,415.2	15233	1245	13403	801.5	8627	0	0	1		ш.
LEVEL 3	1,308.9	14089	1152	12399	1,152.1	12401	0	0	1		F
LEVEL 4	1,159.3	12479	1019	10978	1,028.1	11067	0	0	1		2
LEVEL 5	1,218.4	13114	1071	11537	1,081	11636	0	0]		WITHOUT
LEVEL 6	1,218.4	13114	1071	11537	1,087.3	11704	0	0]		亡
LEVEL 7	1,218.4	13114	1071	11537	1,098.8	11827	0	0			-
LEVEL 8	1,130.2	12165	994	10703	1,010.6	10878	0	0			\leq
LEVEL 9	1,130.2	12165	994	10703	992.1	10679	0	0]		
MECH. PH	825.2	8882	726	7815	98.2	1057	0	0	1		
									_		
TOTAL	13,735.5	147,847	12,080	130,077	8,349.8	89,877	1729.5	18,616.2	-	1922) 102 102101 (1921) 201 1922) 102 10210 (1922) 201	78 78 78
ABOVE GRAD	E GCA TOT	AL 13	12,080 .735 SM 3 BD 10% 4 UNITS	147,847 SP		89,877	1729.5	18,616.2	_	BUILDING STATS	














































CC17.1 - Confidential Attachment 5 - made public on April 6, 2016

AIRD & BERLIS LLP

Barristers and Solicitors Eileen P. K. Costello Direct: 416.865.4740 E-mail:ecostello@nirdberlis.com

March 1, 2016

VIA EMAIL

Our File No.: 120879

CONFIDENTIAL AND WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Ms. Abbie Moscovich Solicitor - Planning & Administrative Tribunal Law City of Toronto Legal Services 26th Floor, Metro Hall 55 John Street Toronto, Ontario M5V 3C6

Dear Ms. Moscovich:

Re: OMB File No. PL141134 Dupont Street (OPA 231, OPA 271 and By-law 1011-2014) Without Prejudice Settlement Offer in respect of 650 Dupont Street

As you are aware, Aird & Berlis LLP represents Loblaw Properties Limited and CP REIT Ontario Properties Limited, the tenant and owner respectively of the property located at 650 Dupont Street.

The application of the current Official Plan Amendment 271 and Zoning By-requirements results in the significant limitation of the infill and redevelopment uses on the site. The attached diagram of the site illustrates that not only does the proposed split designation (Employment/Mixed Use) and split zoning bisect the existing food store, but that the imposition of the proposed rail setback and berm requirement would sterilize the site. When the proposed rail setback designation and berm requirement are taken into consideration with the split zoning and zoning requirements along Dupont Street, it leaves a very long and narrow strip of property that is not possible to be effectively redeveloped or intensified. In our respectful submission, prohibiting the intensification of the site until a wholesale redevelopment of the site occurs (*i.e.*, with the removal and replacement of the existing food store) is not good planning.

Alternatively, allowing for interim intensification along the Dupont Street frontage in the form of small retail/commercial pads by way of example, would allow for a decrease in the amount of frontage attributed to asphalt/parking, animate the street and provide additional employment opportunities on the site. We believe that this type of interim intensification is wholly consistent with the objectives of both OPA 231 and OPA 271 as they relate to employment within the City.

Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street, Suite 1900, Box 754 - Toronto, DN - MSJ 219 - Canada T 416.863.1500 F 416.863.1515 www.scieftdberdis.com

March 1, 2016 Page 2

Both myself and Jonathan Rodger, of Zelinka Priamo Ltd., have been engaged in the OMB process, including mediation with the City and other land owners in respect of our clients' appeals as they relate to the above-noted instruments. Specifically, our clients' interest in respect of its appeals are as follows:

- to recognize the existing commercial operation and to permit reasonable expansions thereof;
- to ensure maximum flexibility in the range of permitted uses on the site including within proximity of the rail corridor;
- to ensure the ability to introduce interim in-fill development of retail and commercial uses on the site without triggering the need for additional rail safety measures, especially given the current location of the food store immediately adjacent to the rail corridor;
- ensure interim relief from certain built form standards to allow for interim development (i.e., relief from the 10.5 metre height minimum);
- recognize the existing density provisions in the current applicable Site and Area Specific Policy (SASP) 212; and
- address the inconsistencies and conflicts in the proposed split designation and split zoning that currently bisects the existing food store, which would unduly complicate the existing food store operation and any infill development on this site.

Accordingly, our clients' settlement offer it to propose the following:

 a) a Site Specific Official Plan Amendment (in the form of a SASP that builds on the policies in OPA 271 and existing SASP 212); and

b) a Site Specific By-law that would replace the existing Site Specific By-law 1994-0654 applicable to the property, recognizing minor variances granted historically on the property (*i.e.*, for the maximum non-residential gross floor area, number and type of loading spaces, as well as for canopy encroachments) and provide direction and permissions with respect to how the split designation would be interpreted as it relates to both to the current food store and to interim development on the site.

A basic set of terms that we propose to address in the Site Specific Instruments are attached as Schedule "A" to this letter.

We request that you seek direction from Council to permit staff to continue negotiations with our clients in accordance with the above and the attached terms in order to develop a SASP as well as a modified and updated Site Specific By-law for the property.

> AIRD & BERLIS LLP Borristors and Solicitors

March 1, 2016 Page 3

We look forward to working with you in reaching full settlement on this matter.

Yours truly,

AIRD & BERLIS 148 Eilcen P. K. Costello EPKC/lm

Encl.

c. Kathy Kakish, CP REIT Ontario Properties Limited Joseph Cimer, The Grand Circus Mario Fatica, Loblaw Properties Limited Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.

25247455.2

AIRD & BERLIS LLP Bernistern and Solicitors

SCHEDULE "A"

WITHOUT PREJUDICE SETTLEMENT OFFER

General - OPA 271

- Ensure the provisions of OPA 271, as they may be amended through the on-going OMB mediation process, apply to the site (i.e. 9 storey height limit and 20m setback from the railway).
- Provide permission for a full range of retail and commercial uses within the 20 metre rail setback.
- Implement the modifications proposed in Appendix C to the Joint Mediation Brief dated January 21, 2016 as to the language in OPA 271 in order to ensure further clarification and more flexibility with respect to those policies.

SASP for 650 Dupont Street - To Guide Interim Intensification

- Provide appropriate specific policy language to guide interim intensification on the site (i.e. prior to "redevelopment") while ensuring that, in the event of redevelopment of the entire site (i.e. including the demolition of the food store) that the general policies in OPA 271 would apply.
- Recognize the existing density permissions on the property, including in respect of Policy 3.3 as to the permitted non-residential gross floor area of the existing food store (supermarket) by way of minor variance (A0419/07TEY).
- Address the existing built form of the food store and existing site plan and provide appropriate policies to guide interim intensification (i.e. Policy 3.4, 5.4)
- · Clarify the term "redevelopment", including but not limited to:
 - Policy 4.1 and the relationship to By-law 1011-2014, Section 1.(k) Net Gain in Non-Residential Uses;
 - Policies 8.2-8.4 to allow for interim intensification along the Dupont Street frontage without triggering the need for the introduction of railway safety measures.

Site Specific By-law for 650 Dupont Street

- Build on the existing permissions within By-law 1011-2014 (to be amended), including with respect to a height limit of 9 storeys and a requirement for a 20 metre rail setback.
- Exemption from the maximum of 1,500 square metres of total residential gross floor area.

- Maintain the existing permissions for the property including those found in Site Specific By-law 1994-0654, which permits the existing food store (supermarket).
- Include permissions obtained by way of minor variance (*i.e.*, for the maximum non-residential gross floor area and number and type of loading spaces (A0419/07TEY) as well as for canopy encroachments (A-960-95).
- Address the proposed split zoning of the site in order to permit the retail and commercial uses presently on the site and allow for interim intensification on the site.
- Exemption from the 10.5 metre minimum height of any new building requirement.
- Clarification with respect to the regulation Section 1.(k) Net Gain in Non-Residential Uses in terms of infill development.
- Relief from the 90 metre maximum building width as the store is approximately 96 metres wide along the Dupont Street Frontage.

It is recognized that, in the event of a "redevelopment" of the site (i.e. removal of the food store) then a rezoning application would seek a new site specific by-law to provide for the redevelopment of the site. In that circumstance, the provisions of OPA 271 would guide the evaluation of such an application.

25253188.1