



LAKESHORE PLANNING COUNCIL

www.lakeshoreplanningcouncil.com
lpcc.lakeshoreplanningcouncil@gmail.com

April 21, 2021

TO: PLANNING AND HOUSING COMMITTEE, City of Toronto

RE: PH22.1 - Christie's Planning Study - City-Initiated Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law and Urban Design and Streetscape Guidelines - Final Report (Ward 3 - Statutory: Planning Act, RSO 1990)

April 17, 2021

Written by Paul Chomik, submitted to the Lakeshore Planning Council Corp. for formal submission

Christie's Bakery Site; 2150 Lake Shore Blvd. West, 23 Park Lawn Road Conversion from Employment Areas Land-use Designation

A development proposal that is "planned to totally fail"

It is shocking to see such a poorly-planned redevelopment, notwithstanding the complete failure of the City of Toronto to comply with existing planning requirements mandated by the Province of Ontario.

The City of Toronto has failed to seriously consider and protect the public interest as the impending land conversion agreement was attained through secret, non-transparent, behind-closed-door meetings that never involved the public.

That agreement was also made in defiance of the statutory requirements of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe ('Growth Plan', GPGGH) and the Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) that determined that the Christie's Bakery site be protected as a 'Provincially-Significant Employment Area'. It is important to note that "*The policies of the Growth Plan take precedence over the policies of the PPS in the event of any conflict*".

Foremost is the absolute failure to provide even close to the minimum required number of new jobs necessary to balance the ultra-high density residential overdevelopment of the Christie's Bakery site.

Current local population density in the 'Motel Strip' condominium area already exceeds that for the densest Toronto Ward in Downtown Toronto. To the year 2041, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GPGGH, Growth Plan) has mandated a target of 0.51 jobs per resident in a local community neighbourhood. In addition, there has been the loss of 550 bakery jobs that also need to be replaced to maintain the requirements of the Growth Plan.

While the development applicant patronizes existing area residents in their proposal stating that "Together this diverse range of employment uses will drive transit ridership, and create opportunities for local living and working, supporting the creation of a complete community ...", it totally fails to provide the minimum number of jobs required not only to serve the development site on its own, but there are insufficient jobs being planned that would balance the current residential over- intensification of population amounting to about 50,000 residents in the "Motel Strip" and surrounding condo area (according to the local condominium association). In addition, it is employment density that drives public transit use – not residential density.

As for the proposed new Park Lawn Road GO Transit station, it is clear that only a half-length station platform can be provided as there is insufficient room to accommodate full-length platforms, notwithstanding other location constraints.

In contrast, a Humber Loop GO Transit station can easily provide full-length platforms between the F.G. Gardiner Expressway and the TTC streetcar tunnel - with the western end of the station's platforms being accessible with less than a ten-minute walk from Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Blvd. West.

Major issues with respect to moving the Humber Loop to the Christie's site include a total waste of the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money recently spent on reconstructing the loop and improving associated streetcar infrastructure, as well as *adding 15-minutes more of travel time* for transit riders using the streetcar service west of the proposed development due to re-routing streetcars from Lake Shore Blvd. West up to the GO Transit corridor and back down again.

The developer's own information clearly states that the streetcar trip time to Mimico will be 22 minutes. Currently, the trip time to Mimico Avenue (where Mimico is located) is about 7-8 minutes. As a result, all streetcar trips west from the Christie's Bakery site towards Long Branch Loop will be about 15 minutes longer.

Catering to a private developer at the expense of other residents in this case unfairly penalizes transit riders from farther west, whose travel times apparently do not matter at all to the City of Toronto.

The site plan also proposes to relocate the existing F.G. Gardiner Expressway on/off ramps (presently located directly east of the site) to terminate inside the development.

That is a recipe for total traffic chaos which can be expected to gridlock roads in the development for excessively-long periods of time. The expected resulting negative impact on quality of life inside the development will be substantial.

Traffic problems anticipated from this development proposal will be monumental, with the addition of at least 10,000 more personal motor vehicles to the immediate area. It appears the traffic impacts on transportation infrastructure were assessed in isolation as if no other development already existed in the area.

The proposed development clearly does not comply with the minimum statutory requirements and policies of the Growth Plan for '*Complete Communities*' as the proposal will result in a significant loss of local employment through the elimination of employment space, with neither the employment space and existing number of jobs being replaced. Nor, is the number of new jobs contemplated to be created in proportion to the new residential population density envisioned.

The Growth Plan is specific that 'complete communities' contain a balance of jobs to residents even on a local neighbourhood scale - as the overarching intent is to greatly reduce the need for long-distance commuting to get to work. The concurrent emphasis regarding active transportation for getting to work also supports the local enhancement of employment base because active transportation is largely only for local short-distance movements – not long-distance commuting.

That means increasing the number of jobs in the local community significantly so that a large proportion of residents do not need to travel very far to get to their jobs. The notion that the majority of Toronto's jobs are to be located Downtown and everyone must travel there for work is impractical, unworkable – and is totally absurd. Today's unacceptable stresses on transportation infrastructure and transit service are a direct result of Toronto's inadequate level of planning to basic acceptable standards.

It must also be noted that the position of Toronto Planning staff, with regard to the Growth Plan requirements for new employment in proportion to residential intensification on a local level, often contend that "that's not how it is done." That position by the City of Toronto is totally wrong, unfounded and not based on factual information.

Allowing a residential development on re-designated employment lands is simply a giveaway to wealthy developers who acquire the land at a small fraction of the price of lands designated for residential uses.

As noted in City of Toronto report; 'Planning for a Strong and Diverse Economy: Official Plan/Municipal Comprehensive Reviews - Draft Policies and Designations for Employment' (Reference Number: P:\2012\Cluster B\PLN\PG12075), on page 9, the City acknowledges that it will run out of land designated for employment between the years 2031 and 2041.

“Employment Areas are a Finite Resource to be Conserved

Our Employment Areas are a finite resource. Given relative land values we rarely see residentially designated lands converted to employment uses. **Our consultant's projections show that we have sufficient lands designated as Employment Areas to meet demands by 2031, but we will run out of land in our Employment Areas for the permitted business functions between 2031 and 2041.** There is a relatively low supply of vacant employment lands particularly given the potential expansion of commercial retail and institutions in Employment Areas, and that the expansion of manufacturing/warehousing uses is wholly confined to these lands. While conversion requests are addressed later in this report, it is recommended that the majority of the City's Employment Areas be maintained for the expansion of non-residential businesses, and that expansion take place in an intensified physical form.”

The concern for protecting the Christie's Bakery site for employment has been so great that in 2012, former City of Toronto Mayor Rob Ford wrote to the former Liberal government of Ontario to request that the Christie's Bakery lands be designated as a “provincially significant employment area” to be retained for employment purposes only.

Also in 2012, local Toronto Councillor Mark Grimes also expressed his concerns to the Ontario Government regarding the loss of employment lands and requested that the Christie's Bakery land be protected under Section 23.1 of the Planning Act. As noted by Councillor Grimes, **“The entire supply of land in the City's Employment Districts will be required to achieve the growth forecast target in Toronto's Official plan.”** (see attachments a, b, c)

Toronto's relentless conversion of employment area lands to non-employment uses (e.g. ultra-high density residential) is only accelerating the time frame when the remaining supply of such lands no longer exists for new employment. This continues despite the City of Toronto being aware for almost a decade that *employment areas* lands are nearing a critical supply shortage. The same situation is also occurring in Vancouver, British Columbia, where employment lands are expected to run out in less than 5 years.

Most importantly, the City of Toronto has failed to comply with the fundamental planning requirements mandated by the Province of Ontario.

As required by the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GPGGH), employment lands can only be re-designated if a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) determines that the *need* for such a re-designation along with other criteria has been satisfied.

In 2012, a conversion request from the property owner at the time (Mondelez Canada Inc.) was submitted (November 1, 2012, revised January 7, 2013) to permit residential uses.

The Municipal Comprehensive Review was carried out for the property and based on the criteria in the GPGGH, Provincial Policy Statement and Toronto's Official Plan Policies concluded that "there is no need for the requested conversion", that the lands be retained as *Employment Areas*, the lands be elevated to the designation of *Core Employment Areas*, and Area Specific Policy No. 15 be amended to reflect the conclusions of the MCR.

It is critical to note that on January 10, 2014, the City of Toronto notified the property owner of 2150 Lake Shore Blvd. West that their "Application to Amend the Official Plan to redesignate the lands from *Employment Areas* to *Regeneration Areas*" (Application No. 13 277843 WET 06 OZ) was severely deficient and did not meet the minimum standard required for a complete application. This occurred after the MCR determined that the request for conversion completely failed to support any land-use conversion. There also has been no "regeneration" criteria or definition contained in the 2014 GPGGH (or, currently).

The applicant was notified that the City of Toronto had completed a Municipal Comprehensive Review for the property as required by the GPGGH and that the property was retained as an *Employment Areas* designation and that it was designated as *Core Employment Areas*, as adopted by the City of Toronto as of December 16-18, 2013. The City of Toronto also clearly noted that a land-use conversion *can only be approved by a MCR*. There is also no legal authority to override a MCR, as the GPGGH clearly establishes that only a MCR can authorize a land-use conversion.

As the Municipal Comprehensive Review for the property stands, since there has been no other MCR conducted for the property, the City of Toronto's actions permitting conversion of the land from the designation determined by the MCR in defiance of the MCR are not legal and constitute a criminal act. Such a defiance of Provincial statutory authority appears to be indicative of rampant corruption within the City of Toronto.

It is also critical to note that there is no reference or definition whatsoever of "*regeneration areas*" in Ontario's Growth Plan (since 2013). Because the GPGGH *represents the minimum standards* with respect to planning in Ontario, any use of *regeneration areas* in planning constitute *non-compliance* and a *conflict* with the governing legislation. That is not legally allowed.

The City of Toronto's 'Status Update – Christie's Planning Study; Preliminary Report' clearly states "In January 2019, the LPAT brought into force the remainder of the policies for the two *Employment Areas* designations, except with regard to the retail policies and office replacement policies which remain under appeal." (on pg. 4)

That means the MCR determination for the site was approved at that time.

While the City of Toronto subsequently notes that an agreement with the landowner was made to overrule the statutory requirements of the MCR in July 2019 after the

updated GPGGH took effect on May 16, 2019, there was no public involvement and through secret meetings that were not transparent, a behind-closed-doors deal was hatched.

In effect, there was absolutely no “public consultation” regarding the conversion of the Christie’s bakery site from the *Employment Areas* designation, as confirmed by the MCR, to ultra-high density residential uses in defiance of the required planning policies mandated by the government of Ontario.

Because that deal was subsequently approved by the Land Planning Appeals Tribunal (LPAT, formerly named as the Ontario Municipal Board), it is evident that LPAT has facilitated the illegal actions of Toronto in defiance of statutory legislation.

The City of Toronto routinely appears to show that it cannot be trusted to uphold the public interest and exercise fiduciary responsibility on behalf of taxpayers.

Following below are two sections of excerpts from the GPGGH that clearly spell out what is required.

The failure of many *to actually read the Growth Plan and follow its directives, such as reading the entire plan and applying the policies contained*, results in the legacy of poor planning outcomes that Toronto has experienced for decades.

Failing to comply with the mandated requirements to provide a balance of local employment in neighbourhoods simply forces ever-greater numbers of residents from new high-density developments into longer-distance commuting to get to work. It is rather amazing that City of Toronto staff appear to be incapable of figuring any of this out. The never-ending game of trying to ‘catch-up’ and respond to out-of-control development continues unabated, and with no chance of ever being corrected at the current pace.

The net result of failing to comply with the mandated statutory requirements of the GPGGH has been a continuous degradation in quality of life in Toronto that is just getting worse.

Today, no-one can honestly claim that Toronto’s quality of life is better than it was in the 1960s and 1970s. Nor, will those who live in the Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Blvd. West area who face gridlock every day because of the (severe) cumulative concentration of personal motor vehicles that result from the local ultra-high density developments.

If such an intrusive and overpowering redevelopment is actually approved by the City of Toronto, considerable Section 37 requirements should be provided by the proponent. The Section 37 monies should be dedicated to funding a Heritage Conservation Study for New Toronto, Mimico and Long Branch as they are on Toronto’s list of Potential Heritage Conservation Districts.

The proposed development also represents the worst form of development in terms of being environmentally-unfriendly.

Stacks of tall towers will interfere with afternoon onshore winds from Lake Ontario in the summer, which serve to flush air pollutants away from the waterfront. The towers will serve to impede and cause stagnation of local air which will create heightened levels of air pollutants locally, as well as artificially-elevated temperatures.

Adverse impacts creating elevated local temperatures include cladding buildings mostly with glass which serves to cause excessive heating in the summer due to redirection and concentration of incident solar radiation which heats up surrounding areas. Because glass is such a poor insulator, it can be expected that heating costs in winter and cooling costs in summer will be much higher than normal for well-built buildings.

Overall, the development proposal is inferior to the older ‘towers in a park’ type of development which typically had sufficient surrounding green open space to help mitigate adverse environmental impacts from ultra-high density development.

Undoubtedly, the adverse environmental impacts that result locally will be incorrectly blamed on man-made global ‘climate change’ - as typically happens.

**[excerpts from GPGGH]
Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe May 2019**

1.2.1 Guiding Principles

... public dollars are invested are based on the following principles:

Support the achievement of *complete communities* that are designed to support healthy and active living and meet people’s needs for daily living throughout an entire lifetime.

Policies Represent Minimum Standards

The policies of this Plan represent minimum standards.

2 Where and How to Grow

2.1 Context

This Plan is about accommodating forecasted growth in *complete communities*. These are **communities that are well designed to meet people’s needs for daily living throughout an entire lifetime by providing convenient access to an appropriate mix of jobs, local services, *public service facilities*, and a full range of housing to accommodate a range of incomes and household sizes. *Complete communities* support quality of life and human health by encouraging the use of *active transportation* and providing high quality public open space, adequate parkland, opportunities for recreation, and access to local and healthy food. **They provide for a balance of jobs and housing in communities across the *GGH* to reduce the need for long distance commuting.****

To support the achievement of *complete communities* that are healthier, safer, and more equitable, choices about where and how growth occurs in the *GGH* need to be made carefully. Better use of land and *infrastructure* can be made by directing growth to *settlement areas* and prioritizing *intensification*, with a focus on *strategic growth areas*, including *urban growth centres* and *major transit station areas*...

Where and How to Grow

2.2 Policies for Where and How to Grow

2.2.1 Managing Growth

4. Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of *complete communities* that:

- a) **feature a diverse mix of land uses, including residential and employment uses, and convenient access to local stores, services, and *public service facilities*;**
- b) **improve social equity and overall quality of life, including human health, for people of all ages, abilities, and incomes;**
- c) **provide a diverse range and mix of housing options, including second units and *affordable* housing, to accommodate people at all stages of life, and to accommodate the needs of all household sizes and incomes;**
- d) **expand convenient access to:**
 - i. **a range of transportation options, including options for the safe, comfortable and convenient use of active transportation;**

Where and How to Grow

2.2.5 Employment

1. Economic development and competitiveness in the *GGH* will be promoted by:

- a) **making more efficient use of existing *employment areas* and vacant and underutilized employment lands and increasing employment densities;**
- b) **ensuring the availability of sufficient land, in appropriate locations, for a variety of employment to accommodate forecasted employment growth to the horizon of this Plan;**
- c) **planning to better connect areas with high employment densities to transit;**

and

- d) **integrating and aligning land use planning and economic development goals and strategies to retain and attract investment and employment.**
 2. *Major office* and appropriate major institutional development will be directed to *urban growth centres, major transit station areas* or other *strategic growth areas* with existing or planned *frequent transit* service.
 3. Retail and office uses **will be directed to locations that support active transportation and have existing or planned transit.**
-

7. Definitions

Complete Communities

Places such as mixed-use neighbourhoods or other areas within cities, towns, and settlement areas that offer and support opportunities for people of all ages and abilities **to conveniently access most of the necessities for daily living, including an appropriate mix of jobs**, local stores, and services, a full range of housing, transportation options and *public service facilities*. *Complete communities* are age-friendly and may take different shapes and forms appropriate to their contexts.

The GPGGH makes it abundantly clear that “complete communities” exist on the neighbourhood scale – and that is not contestable or subject to any other potential ‘interpretation’ of the definition.

In addition, the GPGGH requires that only through a Municipal Comprehensive Review which concludes that a land-use conversion application satisfies the required tests of Section 2.2.5.9 of the Growth Plan, can employment lands be converted to other uses.

[additional excerpts from GPGGH]

A PLACE TO GROW

Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

Office Consolidation

August 2020

Approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, Order in Council No 641/2019. **The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019** was prepared and approved under

the Places to Grow Act, 2005 **to take effect on May 16, 2019**. Amendment 1 (2020) to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019 was approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, Order in Council No 1244/2020 to take effect on August 28, 2020.

This consolidation is prepared for purposes of convenience only. It incorporates the above noted documents. For official wording please consult the approved versions of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019 and Amendment 1 (2020) to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019 which are available by request.

1.2.2 Legislative Authority

This Plan is issued under the authority of section 7 of the Places to Grow Act, 2005. **It was approved through an Order in Council under that Act to come into effect on May 16, 2019.** It was most recently amended through an Order in Council under that Act that came into effect on August 28, 2020. This Plan replaces the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 that took effect on July 1, 2017.

This Plan applies to the area designated by Ontario Regulation 416/05 as the Greater Golden Horseshoe growth plan area. **All decisions in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter will conform with this Plan**, subject to any legislative or regulatory provisions providing otherwise.

1.2.3 How to Read this Plan

This Plan informs decision-making regarding growth management and environmental protection in the *GGH*. It consists of policies, schedules, definitions, and appendices. It also includes non-policy contextual commentary to provide background and describe the purpose of the policies.

Relationship with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)

The PPS provides overall policy directions on matters of provincial interest related to land use and *development* in Ontario, and applies to the *GGH*, **except where this Plan or another provincial plan provides otherwise.**

Like other provincial plans, this Plan builds upon the policy foundation provided by the PPS and provides additional and more specific land use planning policies to address issues facing specific geographic areas in

Ontario. This Plan is to be read in conjunction with the PPS. **The policies of this Plan take precedence over the policies of the PPS to the extent of any conflict**, except where the relevant legislation provides otherwise. **Where the policies of this Plan address the same**, similar, related, or overlapping matters as **policies in the PPS, applying the more specific policies of this Plan satisfies the requirements of the more general policies in the PPS. In contrast, where matters addressed in the PPS do not overlap with policies in this Plan, those PPS policies must be independently satisfied.**

As provided for in the Places to Grow Act, 2005, this Plan prevails where there is a conflict between this Plan and the PPS. *The only exception is where the conflict is between policies relating to the natural environment or human health.*

2.2.5 Employment

1. **Economic development and competitiveness in the *GGH* will be promoted by:**

making more efficient use of existing *employment areas* and vacant and underutilized employment lands and increasing employment densities;

ensuring the availability of sufficient land, in appropriate locations, for a variety of employment to accommodate forecasted employment growth to the horizon of this Plan;”

9. **The conversion of lands within employment areas to non-employment uses may be permitted only through a *municipal comprehensive review* where it is demonstrated that:**

a) **there is a need for the conversion;**

b) **the lands are not required over the horizon of this Plan for the employment purposes for which they are designated;**

c) the municipality will maintain sufficient employment lands to accommodate forecasted employment growth to the horizon of this Plan;

d) **the proposed uses would not adversely affect the overall viability of the *employment area* or the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan, as well as the other policies of this Plan; and**

e) there are existing or planned *infrastructure* and *public service facilities* to accommodate the proposed uses.

10. Notwithstanding policy 2.2.5.9, until the next *municipal comprehensive review*, lands within existing *employment areas* may be converted to a designation that permits non-employment uses, provided the conversion would:
 - satisfy the requirements of policy 2.2.5.9 a), d) and e);
 - maintain a significant number of jobs on those lands through the establishment of development criteria;** and
 14. Outside of *employment areas*, development criteria should be established to ensure that the redevelopment of any employment lands will retain space for a similar number of jobs to remain accommodated on site.
-

It was clearly determined through the Municipal Comprehensive Review that criteria 2.2.5.9.a) and d) were not satisfied, notwithstanding that the property owner failed to properly submit a complete application for the proposed development as of January 9, 2014.

As stated in the “Planning Rationale Summary” from the City of Toronto Staff report for action (pg. 318), “There is no need to convert the employment lands at 23 Park Lawn Road and 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West to meet the 2031 Provincial population forecast for Toronto or to address an incompatibility of Employment Area permissions with existing adjacent lands uses.”

Also noted, “City Council’s planning decisions are required by the *Planning Act*, to conform, or not conflict, with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.” The determination that the land-use conversion request by the property owner failed to satisfy the requirements necessary to permit the conversion to other non-employment uses does comply with the requirements of the GPGGH.

There is also no provision to appeal or to override a MCR, as the GPGGH clearly establishes that only a MCR can authorize a land-use conversion.

It is abundantly clear that the proposal for ultra-high density residential development on the Christie’s Bakery site in southeastern Etobicoke totally fails to comply with the statutory requirements of the ‘Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe’ – notwithstanding that the City of Toronto’s act of defying the outcome of the ‘Municipal Comprehensive Review’ for the property that determined it was to remain for employment purposes only is an illegal act because there is no statutory provision for ignoring or defying the conclusions of a MCR.

Once the Minister of Municipal Affairs approves a planning decision, there is no recourse for an appeal (unless the decision approves a plan that does not legally comply with statutory governing legislation) since illegal acts cannot be made “legal” simply by virtue of being “approved”.

Finally, LPAT has no statutory authority to approve any land use planning that does not comply with the governing legislation. LPAT cannot overrule the rule of law as it must operate to the same standards as Divisional Court – which only determines if actions are compliant with established laws.

Paul Chomik

cc: The Hon. Doug Downey, Attorney General for the Province of Ontario
The Hon. Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
The Hon. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
The Hon. Victor Fedeli, Minister of Economic Development
The Hon. Laurie Scott, Minister of Infrastructure
John Lancaster, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Sue-Ann Levy, The Toronto Sun

MARK GRIMES
COUNCILLOR,
WARD 6
ETOBICOKE -LAKESHORE

TORONTO CITY HALL, C48
100 QUEEN ST. WEST
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5H 2N2

Honourable Laurel Broten
Member of Provincial Parliament Etobicoke Lakeshore
701 Evans Avenue, Suite 100
Etobicoke, ON M9C 1A3

ATTACHMENT a)

November 5, 2012

Dear Minister Broten,

The recent decision by Mondeléz Canada to close the former Christie Bakery at 2150 Lake Shore Blvd W has sent shockwaves through our community with the loss of 550 jobs. At the same time, Mondeléz has proposed, under Toronto's Official Plan Review, that the site be considered for uses other than Employment Lands.

The plant is located on a site that is part of the Toronto Employment Lands and currently zoned for industrial use. Retaining employment land and stimulating investment is important to the City's future economic prosperity, competitiveness and long-term fiscal sustainability. To improve environmental quality by limiting urban sprawl and its ability to continue to provide high quality jobs and generate wealth is the city's goal. Toronto's Employment Districts currently accommodate about 30% of the citywide employment. The entire supply of land in the City's Employment Districts will be required to achieve the growth forecast target in Toronto's Official Plan.

I am committed to doing whatever it takes to keep high-quality jobs and high-quality employers in the South Etobicoke community. In partnership with City of Toronto staff, my colleagues on Council and other levels of government, I am willing to work to ensure that our community continues to be a leader in revitalization and a viable place to do business.

With the Ontario Food Terminal, the largest wholesale fruit and produce distribution centre in Canada, being adjacent to the site, this twenty-seven acre property has large and significant Provincial Interest. The Government of Ontario promotes provincial interests, such as protecting farmland, natural resources and the environment, as well as promoting development that is designed to be sustainable, supportive of public transit and economically beneficial to the region.

As the local member of provincial parliament for Etobicoke Lakeshore, I am looking forward to you joining me in this endeavour to protect this site that has significant public interests. I am asking that the Province exercise its authority as per Section 23.1 of the Ontario Planning act, which allow for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to propose this site be protected in the official plan due to the significant provincial interests.

I look forward to discussing this issue with you and thank you for your support of the community.

Sincerely,



Mark Grimes
Councillor City of Toronto
Etobicoke Lakeshore, Ward 6

T: 416.397.9273
F: 416.397.9279
E: councillor_grimes@toronto.ca
www.markgrimes.ca



City of Toronto

Mayor Rob Ford

ATTACHMENT b)

MAYOR'S REPORT

**Making Room for Jobs –
Protecting an Employment Area in Etobicoke Lakeshore**

Date:	November 19, 2012
To:	City Council
From:	Mayor Rob Ford
Wards:	5, 6
Reference Number:	

Summary

The recent public announcement by Mondelez Canada that it intends to close its operations at 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West in Etobicoke caught most residents, City staff and Members of Council by surprise. This property has long been the home of a Mr. Christie's bakery and is an important parcel of employment land in South Etobicoke employing 550 workers.

This large parcel of land and others in the vicinity play a key role in Toronto's ability to maintain employment within the city and the province. Given the employment situation in Toronto and Ontario generally, and the proximity of this parcel of land to the Ontario Food Terminal, and a major Go Transit corridor, the City should ask the Province of Ontario to consider declaring the employment lands in the vicinity of the Mr. Christie's lands including the Ontario Food Terminal as a provincially significant employment area.

Recommendation

1. City Council request the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Minister of Infrastructure to consider exercising his authority under the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe to identify the employment lands in the vicinity of the Ontario Food

Terminal, as well as the Ontario Food Terminal site itself, and the lands at 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West as a provincially significant employment area.

2. City Council direct the City Clerk to forward the letter attached as Attachment "1" to this report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Minister of Infrastructure.

Background

The recent decision by Mondelez Canada to close the former Mr. Christie's Bakery at 2150 Lake Shore Blvd W. in late 2013, will result in the loss of 550 jobs. At the same time, Mondelez has requested, under Toronto's Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Review, that the site be considered for uses other than those provided under the Employment Area designation. City Planning staff are currently considering this request as part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review and expect to report to Council in the new year.

The Mr. Christie's site is a 27 acre property currently designated for employment and zoned for industrial use. The previous owners of this site expressed concern about the impact on employment uses on the lands when neighbouring properties were converted to residential uses within the past decade. Both the City and the owners of 2150 Lake Shore Blvd. W. attended at an Ontario Municipal Board hearing in opposition, but the Board ultimately approved the change in use of these lands.

Retaining employment land and stimulating investment is important to the City's future economic prosperity, competitiveness and long-term fiscal sustainability. In addition, protecting employment lands within the City helps to improve environmental quality by limiting urban sprawl. Toronto's Employment Districts currently accommodate about 30% of citywide employment. The entire supply of land in the City's Employment Districts will be required to achieve the growth forecast target in Toronto's Official Plan.

The Mr. Christie's plant is located adjacent to both the Ontario Food Terminal, the largest wholesale fruit and produce distribution centre in Canada, and a major Go Transit Line operated by the provincial agency Metrolinx in a major transportation corridor in which the Province has indicated plans to increase service in the near future.

The Ontario Food Terminal is the main venue for food distribution in the Greater Toronto Area, receiving fruits and vegetables from farms throughout Ontario and beyond. Over a million vehicles use the Ontario Food Terminal each year, with daily activity starting as early as 2 a.m. It is an employment activity whose operation could be affected by the encroachment of nearby residential uses. The Ontario Food Terminal is owned by the Province of Ontario and managed by the Ontario Food Terminal Board. The conversion of employment lands to residential uses near the Ontario Food Terminal could touch upon several areas of provincial interest including the adequate provision of employment opportunities, the protection of the Agricultural resources of the Province and the appropriate location of growth and development.



City of Toronto

Mayor Rob Ford

Attachment "1"

Mayor Rob Ford
City of Toronto,
100 Queen Street West, 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N2

November 20, 2012

The Honourable Bob Chiarelli
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing,
Minister of Infrastructure,
Government of Ontario,
3rd Floor Ferguson Block
77 Wellesley Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1Z8

Dear Minister Chiarelli:

The City of Toronto is currently undertaking the review of its Official Plan required under Section 26 of the Planning Act, including the mandatory review of the Official Plan policies and designations dealing with areas of employment and policies dealing with the removal of lands from areas of employment. The City of Toronto has to date received two requests for the conversion of a significant amount of land in proximity to the Ontario Food Terminal, at 23 and 134 Park Lawn Road. The former is a request, but not yet an application, by Mondelez Canada Inc, to consider 27 residential towers on the lands currently occupied by Christie's bakery which employs 550 workers. City staff are reviewing these conversion requests as part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review process.

The Ontario Food Terminal is the main venue for food distribution in the Greater Toronto Area, receiving fruits and vegetables from farms throughout Ontario and beyond. Over a million vehicles use the Ontario Food Terminal each year, with daily activity starting as early as 2 a.m. It is an employment activity whose operation could be affected by the encroachment of nearby sensitive residential uses. The Ontario Food Terminal is owned by the Province of Ontario and managed by the arms length Ontario Food Terminal Board, with members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor on recommendation from the Minister of Agriculture. The conversion of employment lands to sensitive residential uses near the Ontario Food Terminal could touch upon several areas of Provincial interest cited in Section 2 of the Planning Act, including the

adequate provision of employment opportunities, the protection of the Agricultural resources of the Province and the appropriate location of growth and development.

The City of Toronto is therefore requesting that, as Minister of Infrastructure, you consider utilizing Section 2.2.6.8 of the Provincial Growth Plan to consult with other Ministers of the Crown and stakeholders to identify the employment lands in the vicinity of the Ontario Food Terminal, as well as the Ontario Food Terminal site itself, as a provincially significant employment area

Thank you for your consideration of these matters.

Yours truly,

Rob Ford
Mayor, City of Toronto

Toronto



[Home](#) [Bookmark](#) [E-mail](#) [Item](#) [Print](#) [Map](#)

Tracking Status

- [City Council](#) adopted this item on November 27, 2012 with amendments.

City Council consideration on November 27, 2012

CC28.5	ACTION	Amended		Ward: 5, 6
--------	--------	---------	--	------------

Making Room for Jobs - Protecting an Employment Area in Etobicoke Lakeshore

City Council Decision

City Council on November 27, 28 and 29, 2012, adopted the following:

1. City Council request the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Minister of Infrastructure to consider exercising his authority under the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe to identify the employment lands in the vicinity of the Ontario Food Terminal, as well as the Ontario Food Terminal site itself, and the lands at 2150 Lake Shore Boulevard West as a provincially significant employment area.
2. City Council direct the City Clerk to forward the letter attached as Attachment "1" to the report (November 19, 2012) from Mayor Ford to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Minister of Infrastructure.
3. City Council direct the Deputy City Manager Cluster B to report to the Planning and

Growth Management Committee prior to March 31, 2013 on the response from the Province of Ontario to Toronto City Council's request in Part 1 above.

4. City Council refer the following motion to the Economic Development Committee for consideration:

Moved by Councillor Vaughan

That City Council request the General Manager, Economic Development and Culture, in consultation with the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, to strike a working group with Labour, Post-Secondary institutions and other stakeholders to explore options on the Christie site to maintain existing jobs by possibly hosting educational and/or commercial food incubator programs and possible new food industry tenants for the site, amongst other uses.

Background Information (City Council)

(November 19, 2012) Report from Mayor Rob Ford on Making Room for Jobs - Protecting an Employment Area in Etobicoke Lakeshore (CC28.5)

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2012/cc/bgrd/backgroundfile-52344.pdf>

Communications (City Council)

(November 27, 2012) Letter from James Reaume, Chair, Ontario Food Terminal Board submitted by Mayor Rob Ford (CC.New.CC28.5.1)

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2012/cc/comm/communicationfile-33608.pdf>

(November 5, 2012) Letter from Councillor Mark Grimes, addressed to the Laurel Broten, Member of Provincial Parliament for Etobicoke Lakeshore (CC.New.CC28.5.2)

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2012/cc/comm/communicationfile-33618.pdf>

Motions (City Council)

1 - Motion to Amend Item (Additional) moved by Councillor Paula Fletcher (Carried)

That City Council direct the Deputy City Manager Cluster B to report prior to March 31, 2013 to the Planning and Growth Management Committee on the response from the Province of Ontario to Toronto City Council's request in Recommendation 1.

Vote (Amend Item (Additional))

Nov-28-2012 4:45 PM

Result: Carried	Majority Required - CC28.5 - Fletcher - motion 1
Yes: 40	Paul Ainslie, Maria Augimeri, Ana Bailão, Michelle Berardinetti, Shelley Carroll, Josh Colle, Gary Crawford, Vincent Crisanti, Janet Davis, Glenn De Baeremaeker, Mike Del Grande, Frank Di Giorgio, Sarah Doucette, Paula Fletcher, Doug Ford, Rob Ford, Mary Fragedakis, Mark Grimes, Doug Holyday, Norman Kelly, Mike Layton, Chin Lee, Gloria Lindsay Luby, Giorgio Mammoliti, Josh Matlow, Pam McConnell, Mary-Margaret McMahon, Joe Mihevc, Peter Milczyn, Frances Nunziata (Chair), Cesar Palacio, John Parker, James Pasternak, Gord Perks, Anthony Perruzza, Jaye Robinson, Karen Stintz, Michael Thompson, Adam Vaughan, Kristyn Wong-Tam
No: 0	
Absent: 5	Raymond Cho, John Fillion, Denzil Minnan-Wong, Ron Moeser, David Shiner

2 - Motion to Amend Item (Additional) moved by Councillor Adam Vaughan (Referred)

That City Council request the General Manager, Economic Development and Culture, in consultation with the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, to strike a working group with Labour, Post-Secondary institutions and other stakeholders to explore options on the Christie site to maintain existing jobs by possibly hosting educational and/or commercial food incubator programs and possible new food industry tenants for the site, amongst other uses.

Referred by motion 3 by Deputy Mayor Holyday.

3 - Motion to Refer Motion moved by Deputy Mayor Doug Holyday (Carried)

That Motion 2 by Councillor Vaughan be referred to the Economic Development Committee for consideration.

Vote (Refer Motion)

Nov-28-2012 4:46 PM

Result: Carried	Majority Required - CC28.5 - Holyday - motion 3
Yes: 41	Paul Ainslie, Maria Augimeri, Ana Bailão, Michelle Berardinetti, Shelley Carroll, Josh Colle, Gary Crawford, Vincent Crisanti, Janet Davis, Glenn De Baeremaeker, Mike Del Grande, Frank Di Giorgio, Sarah Doucette, Paula Fletcher, Doug Ford, Rob Ford, Mary Fragedakis, Mark Grimes, Doug Holyday, Norman Kelly, Mike Layton, Chin Lee, Gloria Lindsay Luby, Giorgio Mammoliti, Josh Matlow, Pam McConnell, Mary-Margaret McMahon, Joe Mihevc, Peter Milczyn, Denzil Minnan-Wong, Frances Nunziata (Chair), Cesar Palacio, John Parker, James Pasternak, Gord Perks, Anthony Perruzza, Jaye Robinson, Karen Stintz, Michael Thompson, Adam Vaughan, Kristyn Wong-Tam
No: 0	
Absent: 4	Raymond Cho, John Filion, Ron Moeser, David Shiner

*Motion to Adopt Item as Amended (Carried)***Vote** (Adopt Item as Amended)

Nov-28-2012 4:47 PM

Result: Carried	Majority Required - CC28.5 - Adopt the item as amended
Yes: 42	Paul Ainslie, Maria Augimeri, Ana Bailão, Michelle Berardinetti, Shelley Carroll, Raymond Cho, Josh Colle, Gary Crawford, Vincent Crisanti, Janet Davis, Glenn De Baeremaeker, Mike Del Grande, Frank Di Giorgio, Sarah Doucette, Paula Fletcher, Doug Ford, Rob Ford, Mary Fragedakis, Mark Grimes, Doug Holyday, Norman Kelly, Mike Layton, Chin Lee, Gloria Lindsay Luby, Giorgio Mammoliti, Josh Matlow, Pam McConnell, Mary-Margaret McMahon, Joe Mihevc, Peter Milczyn, Denzil Minnan-Wong, Frances Nunziata (Chair), Cesar Palacio, John Parker, James Pasternak, Gord Perks, Anthony Perruzza, Jaye Robinson, Karen Stintz, Michael Thompson, Adam Vaughan, Kristyn Wong-Tam
No: 0	
Absent: 3	John Filion, Ron Moeser, David Shiner

Source: Toronto City Clerk at www.toronto.ca/council