

## Teddington Park Residents Association Inc.

153 Golfdale Road | Toronto, ON | M4N 2C1 | 416.484.9513 | tpra@rogers.com

April 5, 2016

Planning and Growth Management Committee  
c/o Ms. Nancy Martins, Committee Secretariat  
Toronto City Hall, 100 Queen Street West  
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Sent via email: [pgmc@toronto.ca](mailto:pgmc@toronto.ca)

### **Dear Chair Shiner and Members of Planning and Growth Management Committee**

**PG11.3:** Mid-Rise Buildings Performance Standards Monitoring  
Planning and Growth Management Meeting No. 11 – April 6, 2016

**PG10.9:** PGMC Meeting No. 10 – February 24, 2016

**PG 9.8:** PGMC Meeting No 9 – January 20, 2016

**PG 7.1:** **Council Meeting No. 10 – November 3 and 4, 2015**

**PG 7.1:** PGMC Meeting No. 7 – October 8, 2015

**PG 6.6:** PGMC Meeting No. 6 – September 16, 2015

---

Teddington Park Residents Association Inc. (TPRA) is writing to request the recommendations for agenda item PG11.3 and supporting staff reports and attachments be **DEFERRED** to the next Planning and Growth Management Meeting held May 11, 2016 with Notice to allow residents, ratepayers, and their groups and interested members of the public and others expecting notice an opportunity to fully consider the revisions and make representations on public record.

The reasons for this request are:

#### **Failed Due Process:**

TPRA did not receive formal notice, but reviewing the agenda item for PG11.3 over the weekend did not disclose any new materials. It wasn't until the day before the meeting, Tuesday, April 5, 2016 that information was revealed on the agenda under 3a. Given the breadth and complexity of the material with 7-days or 5 business days identifying the item on the PGMC agenda and providing a 1-day release of the new materials to be considered is procedurally unfair for such a substantive planning matter.

Over this “monitoring period” of the Avenues and Mid-Rise Building Study, TPRA has asked to be included in the consultations, we have asked to be kept informed and TPRA has asked for Notice several times since our participation in 2010. And we continue to do this today. Listed below are links to our written submissions:

#### **Documentation Lacks Clarity:**

The Staff Report dated August 28, 2015, the Supplementary Report dated October 27, 2015, another Supplementary Report dated March 11, 2016, the initial Recommendations and the

“Addendum” Recommendations and what is now called “2010 approved Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards” add to various of layers of information. It obscures rather than clarifies the standards that will be applied during the interim and where, and what standards will move forward to final stages of a more formalized set of guidelines under a historically precarious notice / consultation / decision making process.

### **TPRA’s Confirmed Correction remains Uncorrected**

TPRA’s deputation on October 8, 2015 and our comments addressed corrections. The correction description on page 17 of the “Addendum” recommendations concerning the “Ledbury / Bedford” Character Area remains incorrect, despite confirmation from Ms. Lorna Day, the Project Manager at the time, and assurances made that the matter would be corrected as noted in the Supplementary Report dated October 27, 2015.

Intended and confirmed corrections that go uncorrected, creates instability and does not respect community. Applied appropriately under the Official Plan, growth directed towards the *Avenues* were meant to ensure neighbourhood stability.

### **Completeness & Adequacy of Recommendations:**

The recommendations remain extensive, while there may be some worthwhile changes, the breadth and complexity does not allow for adequate comprehension to assess their implications especially the one-day allotted to respond.

The monitoring period was to test the Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards for their effectiveness. What were the goals of effectiveness? Why the emphasis on the visual only? Presenting statements of what was done does not satisfy whether this generic template was effective at managing growth or providing context sensitive development that residents’ value. The reference to “2010 approved Mid-Rise Building Performance Standards” remains unexplained and the interchange of the 2 sets of recommendations unclear.

### **PGMC Meetings after Council Decision to Refer the Item PG7.1 Back:**

Consultations and a presentation were undertaken for Councillors rather than residents’ associations and other interested community members as requested in City Council’s referral decision. And having the agenda restricted to a deferral from January 20, 2016 (PG9.8) further restricts Council’s referral decision. All deputant comments and letters submitted after Council’s decision in November 2015 including those submitted for PG9.8 should be uploaded onto the agenda and should have been considered along with comments from Councillors to demonstrate equal treatment and respect for full City Council Decision on referring the item back for further consideration. The link to Council decision for PG7.1 held in November 2015 is provided [here](http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2016/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-87231.pdf): <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2016/pg/bgrd/backgroundfile-87231.pdf> . And the link for Agenda PG9.8 is provided [here](http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2016.PG9.8): <http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2016.PG9.8>.

**Links to TPRA’s written submissions**, where letters have been uploaded onto Committee or Council Agenda:

- PG6.6 September 16, 2015 PGMC Consideration:

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2015/pg/comm/communicationfile-55688.pdf>

- PG7.1 October 8, 2015 Speaker at PGMC Meeting
- PG7.1 November 3, 4, 2015 Council Consideration:  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2015/cc/comm/communicationfile-57065.pdf>

### **Summary**

Not allowing sufficient time to review and understand the implications of the new information, changes and to participate in a meaningful way is procedurally unfair.

The material should have been available to public with ample time to allow for the appropriate consultation with sufficient time to solicit feedback and comment prior to releasing further recommendations for interim use or as base documents to move forward.

The complexity and city-wide implications would naturally demand this without TPRA or any group asking. Alerting the public that the Item is included in PGMC agenda and not following through with the release of the new materials / recommendation and only doing so one day before the PGMC meeting shows a disrespect for good governance.

We once more ask for procedural and administrative fairness – **DEFER Item PG11.3** until this fundamental concept is undertaken.

Sincerely,

*Eileen Denny*

Eileen Denny, President  
Teddington Park Residents Association Inc.

cc. TPRA Board Secretary  
CORRA Executive