June 13, 2016

Via e-mail to: teycc@toronto.ca

Toronto and East York Community Council
2nd floor, West Tower, City Hall
100 Queen St. W.
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Attention: Ellen Devlin, TEYCC Secretariat

Dear Council,

TEYCC Item TE17.23, June 14, 2016

We represent Leslie Mews Inc., the Applicant for a proposed 18-unit townhouse development at 397R, 395 and 413R Leslie Street (the “Subject Property”), in the Leslieville neighbourhood of Toronto (Ward 30).

We are writing in response to a Staff Report titled “Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – Refusal Report” and dated May 25, 2016 (the “Staff Report”), and Supplementary Report dated June 10, 2016 [Ref # 15 213190 STE 30 OZ].

The Staff Report incorrectly assessed a sixteen (16) unit townhouse development, whereas the applications filed with the City of Toronto are for an eighteen (18) unit townhouse development. The revised sixteen (16) unit concept was discussed with Staff and drawings were provided, but the revised concept was never formally submitted. We respectfully request the Committee direct Staff to withdraw the Staff Report and review the revised plan and supporting documentation when it is received through a formal resubmission.
My client is also concerned by the conduct of the City in this matter, particularly Planning Staff, who appear to have unilaterally ended the working dialogue established previously, which was close to resolving the outstanding technical issues and concerns of residents.

Our client submitted the applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law on August 25, 2015 and received Notification of Complete Applications on September 24, 2015, deeming the applications complete as of August 26, 2015.

A preliminary staff report was not prepared for this application. In our experience, a preliminary staff report is a normal component of the development review process that is meant to inform Council regarding development throughout the City.

For over ten months, our experienced development technical and planning team worked with Mr. Derrick Wong and Staff to respond to comments received, in aid of the resubmission. The Community Consultation Meeting did not take place until April 7, 2016, and only at our insistence.

At that meeting, we received a number of comments from local residents. At the suggestion of the City, the technical team began working through a list of questions posed by residents. Needless to say, all the issues of traffic, hydrogeology, landscaping, and privacy/shadowing have been addressed to the technical team’s satisfaction and are currently being finalized as part of a formal resubmission package.

The Staff Report unnecessarily inflates the perceived technical shortcomings of the project.

The proposed development represents a unique opportunity to fully utilize a lot with considerable development potential already zoned for residential development. Leslieville is a changing neighbourhood, with a high degree of new and old infill townhouse projects similar to the proposal.

The proposed development is also appropriate within the evolving local context of the Subject Property. On June 1, 2016, Mayor John Tory and Ontario Minister of Transportation Del Duca announced funding for a preferred route for the proposed downtown relief subway line. A new subway/Smartrack station proposed at Gerrard and Pape will be less than 500 metres from the Subject Property. Accordingly, the Subject Property will be located within a “gateway hub” under the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan, and a “major transit
station area" under the Growth Plan, where modest intensification such as the proposed development will help support the viability of rapid transit.

In light of the foregoing, we ask Council to seek a careful review, before my client is forced to resort to an appeal.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 416-572-0464, or by e-mail to david@donnellylaw.ca, cc’ing kristina@donnellylaw.ca, should you have any questions or comments concerning this correspondence.

Yours truly,

David R. Donnelly

cc. Client