



## PG12.8.36

May 10, 2016

Chair and Members  
City of Toronto Growth Management Committee  
City of Toronto  
100 Queen Street West  
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2

Dear Chair and Committee Members:

Re: Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan and Urban Design Guidelines - Final Report

We are planning consultants to 1623707 Ontario Limited, owner of 25 Portland Street, which is located on the south side of Portland Street, at the east end of Block "E" in the proposed Secondary Plan.

The property at 25 Portland Street, which is approximately one acre in size, forms part of an employment cluster, which currently supports a number of active and successfully operating industrial/office businesses. The one storey, 14,400 sq.ft. (1,338 sq.m.) building located on the property has recently been upgraded with significant investment. At present, the owner is interested in maintaining, and potentially expanding and enhancing, the current use of the property. This specific location is ideal for the uses currently operating on the site. Moreover finding an equivalent property of the same size, and in a similar location with the same attributes, would be very difficult.

The specific locational criteria that make this site appropriate for the current uses are:

- full access to the site for all users at all times;
- individual external access to individual units;
- sufficient on-site space for parking and outdoor storage;
- close to main highway system, GO transit and City transit;
- close proximity to downtown;
- good exposure/visibility to GO line for passby traffic;
- 19 active business serving approximately 150 employees;

The existing businesses utilize the entire site, including space within the building itself and outside storage of waste disposal bins, various types of commercial vehicles etc.

The current businesses operating at this location are:

- Access Demolition and Renovations
- Dependable Disposal (Commercial Bins)
- Aquamaster Plumbing Contractor
- Adonis S & C Cross Fitness Gym
- Ediface Property Management Inc. (Renovations)
- Polanski Moving (Truck Storage)
- Harrabi (Ice Cream Trucks)
- Vikmar Window Cleaning
- Restoration Gardens Inc. (Green Roofing)
- Avonmore Electric Home Renovations (Truck Storage)
- Fashion Truck (Vehicle Storage)
- Affordable Rubbish Removal Ltd. (Bins)
- Master Drain (Plumbing)
- Pita Express (Food Truck)
- Milmax Build ( Home Renovation)
- PEG (Home Renovation and Installation)
- Attard Plumbing
- Rheall Contracting
- Miro Construction

Regarding the Proposed Mimico - Judson Secondary Plan, we support the Vision with respect to the first guiding principle which states:

- i. **Retain and expand business through land use certainty and flexible mixed use regeneration.** The Secondary Plan continues to protect the area's economic function by providing land use certainty for businesses that wish to continue their operations in the area and requiring that all new development in *Mixed Use Areas* include an employment component either on-site or within the same block.

The subject property is proposed to be designated within a *Mixed Use Area* as identified on Map 35-3 and the owner wishes to "retain and possibly expand, their existing business".

We agree, that as indicated in Policy 1.1, "the Secondary Plan remains a viable place for business to locate and operate".

However, we have specific concerns with a number of proposed 'public realm policies' and other implementation policies, that would appear to contradict the above referenced guiding principle. Based on my review of the communications to the City to-date, our client is not alone in expressing this same concern.

Of particular concern is Policy 1.2 CONNECTORS, which provides for:

- a) Grand Avenue Extension: a street extension that runs along the rail corridor and expands the street network and improves mobility towards the Mimico GO Station and
- b) Mimico-Judson Greenway: a pedestrian and cycling connection between Ourland Park and Grand Avenue Park.

Since the location of these facilities, as identified in a conceptual way (on Map 35-2, the Structure Plan, Map 35-4, the Public realm Plan and Map 35-5, the Movement Strategy Plan), traverse the property at 25 Portland Street, such policies if implemented would have a significant adverse impact on the current business operations on the site. Therefore we are not in support of this proposed policy and find it to be in conflict with the vision and policies that support the retention and expansion of existing businesses.

LAND USE policy 2.3 (which we do support) states that "Lawfully existing uses established at the time of the enactment of this Secondary Plan are permitted to continue.

Under policy 2.7 the lands are identified in "Block E" and are designated *Mixed Use Areas*.

Policy 3. ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION indicates that area specific policies in the Plan are "intended to attract new investment and retain existing businesses within the Secondary Plan Area."

We support this policy since the owners of 25 Portland Street have recently made a considerable investment in the property with the intention of retaining the existing businesses on the site and may invest further through expansion of the existing businesses.

Policy 3.1 further indicates that "Development will be consistent with the vision of revitalizing the Secondary Plan Area's economic function and promoting new employment opportunities, while protecting existing business operations."

We support this policy for the same reasons as noted above.

Policy 4.2 Grand Avenue Extension, proposes to extend Grand Avenue through the subject property. Policy 4.5 Mimico-Judson Greenway is intended to be a dedicated, direct and safe multi-use trail for pedestrians and cyclists through and beyond the Secondary Plan, which will also extend through the subject property. As noted above, the location of these public facilities, as identified in a conceptual way (on Map 35-2, the Structure Plan, Map 35-4, the Public realm Plan and Map 35-5, the Movement Strategy Plan), take up more than 60% of the subject property and would have the effect of eliminating the existing business operations.

This would be in direct conflict with the vision and the policies noted above that provide land use certainty for businesses that wish to continue their operations and specifically for owners who wish to retain, and possibly expand, their existing businesses.

#### Conclusion

Therefore we are opposed to the proposed Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan and Urban Design Guidelines, as recommended in the Final Report, and most specifically the Detailed Block Plan for Block "E", as described in Section 9.7 along with the associated Maps 35-2, 35-3, 35-4, 35-5 and 35-6.

We will be in attendance at the May 11, 2016 meeting of the City of Toronto Growth Management Committee and request that we be formally notified of any decision made by the Committee and any matters related to the ongoing process for consideration of the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan and Urban Design Guidelines by this Committee and/or City Council.

We look forward to continuing our participation in this process. Thank you.

Yours truly,

MPLAN INC.



per: Michael S. Manett, MCIP, RPP.

cc. 1623707 Ontario Limited  
Elise Hug, Planning  
Jeffrey Streisfield, Land Law