Nydia Robin, Secretary
Planning and Growth Management Committee
City of Toronto
pgmc@toronto.ca

Re: Item PG17.5, 1x, 2 and 10 Audley Street, 8 Newcastle Street, and 29, 31, 59 and 71 Portland Street - Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Application – Refusal Report

Dear Ms. Robin,
We are writing on behalf of the Mimico Lakeshore Community Network, an umbrella group that brings together seven community groups that are concerned with planning in the Mimico-Lakeshore area.

Our organization wholeheartedly supports the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan in the form recommended by the City’s planning staff and finalized in the Supplementary Report #2 dated June 6, 2016.

We made a deputation to the Planning and Growth Management Committee when it debated the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan on May 11, 2016. At that time we opposed the amendments made by the committee and ultimately endorsed by City Council. We see the present application as a further attempt to negate both the intent and the detail of the Secondary Plan.

The proposal from Freed Development does not simply ask for an exception to be made to some of the provisions of the Secondary Plan. It ignores the Secondary Plan completely, and envisages truly egregious overdevelopment of the neighbourhood, to an extent that would be in violation of the City’s Official Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

We will not engage in unnecessary repetition of the detailed case that is made by the city planners in the Refusal Report. We simply note that approval of any application that even
approximates to the ambitions of Freed Development will make a mockery of the Secondary Plan, of the work of the City’s professional planners, and the entire planning regime of the Province of Ontario. It will mean that the considerable amounts of planners’ time, taxpayers’ money, and unpaid effort on the part of dedicated members of the community, that have been invested in the production of the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan, will simply go to waste. We urge the Committee in the strongest terms to avoid starting down such a disastrous path.

We object to the second provision of the motion in the staff report, which calls for negotiations to come up with a proposal that would be “more in keeping” with the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan. The planners and community members whose efforts shaped the Secondary Plan never intended that it should be nothing more than a starting point for negotiations with developers leading to a vastly different outcome. Rather than being offered continuing discussions and an invitation to negotiate, the applicant should be told go away and prepare a development application that conforms to the Mimico-Judson Secondary Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines.

For the Mimico Lakeshore Community Network,

Martin E. Gerwin gerwin40@gmail.com
Judith A. Rutledge jarutledge40@gmail.com

Co-chairs,
MLCN Steering Committee

20 Miles Road
Etobicoke, ON
M8V 1V3
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