Stikeman Elliott

PH4.1.8

Stikeman Elliott LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
5300 Commerce Court West
199 Bay Street
Toronto, ON Canada M5L 1B9

Main: 416 869 5500 Fax: 416 947 0866 www.stikeman.com

Patrick G. Duffy

Direct: +1 416 869 5257 pduffy@stikeman.com

April 3, 2019

File No.: 145434.1001

By E-mail phc@toronto.ca

Planning and Housing Committee 10th Floor, West Tower, City Hall 100 Queen Street West Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Attention: Ms. Nancy Martins, Administrator

Dear Sirs / Mesdames:

Re: PH4.1 – Don Mills Crossing – Final Report Letter of Concern – Secondary Plan Mapping

We are counsel to OTT 1123 Developments Inc. and OTT 33 Developments Inc. ("OTT"), the respective owners of the properties municipally known in the City of Toronto as 1123 Leslie Street and 33 Green Belt Drive (the "Properties").

Our client shares the City's enthusiasm for the emergence of a distinct and complete community at the intersection of Don Mills Road and Eglinton Avenue East. The introduction of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT presents an exciting opportunity for vibrant, transit-supportive, mixed use development, particularly for lands in close proximity to the transit stations along the planned LRT line.

Although generally supportive of the overall vision cast by the Draft Don Mills Crossing Secondary Plan (the "Draft Secondary Plan"), by this letter, our client wishes to express certain concerns with the present draft.

As a result of unconventional mapping, the Draft Secondary Plan purports to reach beyond the Secondary Plan Area boundaries, imposing policies and designations on lands located outside the Secondary Plan Area.

For instance, despite Policy 1.1, which states that the "lands subject to the policies of this Secondary Plan are identified on Map 40-1 Secondary Plan Area", Map 40-3a (Public Realm Network), Map 40-3b (Public Structure Plan), Map 40-9 (Views and Vistas), Map 40-10 (Pedestrian Connections), Map 40-11 (Cycling Interchanges), and Map 40-12 (Transit and Travel Demand Management Plan) all contain mapping features and designations—with accompanying policies in the body of the plan—for lands located outside the Secondary Plan Area.

This unconventional mapping gives rise to significant uncertainty and confusion in interpreting the Draft Secondary Plan, particularly as it relates to lands located outside the Secondary Plan Area, including the Properties.

To address this confusion, we request that the Draft Secondary Plan be revised to remove all mapping features and designations for lands located outside the Secondary Plan Area, such that



it is clear the policies of the Draft Secondary Plan are limited to the lands located within the Secondary Plan Area.

If you have any questions or if staff wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

In addition, please provide us with notice of all upcoming meetings of Council and Committees of Council at which the Draft Secondary Plan and the Don Mills Crossing planning study will be considered, and we ask to be provided with notice of the Committee's and Council's decision with respect to this item.

Yours truly,

Patrick G. Duffy

PGD/jsc

cc. Jonathan Cheng, Stikeman Elliott LLP

David McKay, MHBC

Client