



July 6, 2026

North York Community Council
c/o City of Toronto
North York Civic Centre
5100 Yonge Street
Toronto, ON M2N 5V7

Attention: Chair and Members of North York Community Council

Re: Item NY34.14 - City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment 912 for the Don Mills Regeneration Area Study
July 7, 2026 - North York Community Council Statutory Public Meeting
METRUS Properties Inc., as general partner of and on behalf of Metrus Properties 2004 Limited Partnership c/o Metrus Properties

On behalf of the registered owner, METRUS Properties Inc., as general partner of and on behalf of Metrus Properties 2004 Limited Partnership, of the lands municipally known as 1121 Leslie Street, we are pleased to provide you with our updated comments with the respect to the recommendation report scheduled for the July 7, 2026 Statutory Public Meeting of North York Community Council (NYCC) as it relates to the proposed Official Plan Amendment 912 (OPA 912), including the proposed new Site and Area Specific Policy 848 (SASP 848), prepared through the City-initiated Don Mills Regeneration Area Study. We acknowledge that the item was deferred from the May 26, 2026 NYCC Meeting to provide an opportunity to further work with staff to revise the proposed policy wording to address identified concerns.

As previously stated, the owner has been an active participant in the planning process to convert the subject Don Mills Regeneration Study Area lands (1121 & 1123 Leslie Street) from *Employment Area* to *Regeneration Area*, and now to a *Mixed Use Area* designation to permit the creation of a new mixed-use community. The owner has also engaged in and provided feedback at the numerous landowner information meetings, as well as the City-led public engagement events. The owner has also provided written correspondence to City Staff dated October 24, 2025, March 18, 2026 & May 26, 2026.

While we appreciate the revisions that staff have made to the proposed policies including the latest adjustments from the May 26th deferral and the progress made thus far since the initial draft was released for review, we remain concerned that the proposed SASP 848 policy framework will be too restrictive to allow for an efficient and market responsive build out of a community that can be constructed in phases that are feasible. Furthermore, we are also concerned that the proposed policies do not provide adequate consideration that the two sites located within the proposed SASP 848 are owned by two independent landowners with different build out time horizons. We look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with staff to insert sufficient flexibility into those policies so that the goal of a community-based development is achieved.

For additional context, Metrus Properties views the 1121 Leslie Street site as a complementary extension to the growing Crosstown Community, rather than a stand-alone development. The Crosstown Community/Subdivision

30 Floral Parkway
Vaughan, Ontario L4K 4R1

905 669 9714
info@metrusproperties.com

metrusproperties.com





already has abundant community facilities and employment/office uses imbedded into its design/build out given its proximity to the major intersection of Don Mills Road and Eglinton Avenue East, as well as the Don Valley Station on the now operational Eglinton Crosstown LRT and future Ontario Line subway station.

Metrus believes it would be beneficial for the future development of 1121 Leslie Street to leverage its proximity to the Crosstown Community/Subdivision and all its amenities/public facilities, including the future pedestrian bridge over the rail line which will reinforce connectivity between 1121 Leslie Street and the growing Crosstown community, rather than attempting to generate its own non-residential/employment uses and meet a pre-determined minimum GFA for non-residential uses.

As outlined in previous correspondence, a non-all-inclusive list of issues to be further addressed would be:

Land Use:

Policy 3: indicates that 13,000 sq.m or 5% of the total GFA (whichever is less) will be non-residential space to be located anywhere within the SASP 848 area. The owner has no issue with this wording.

Public Realm:

Policy 6: notes that parkland dedications will be secured to establish a single consolidated park, however, language should be introduced to also allow for two centrally located parks, one positioned on each property. This revision will make development phasing more feasible & ensures the City secures a park for when residents are occupying their units and can utilize/enjoy that amenity space.

Community Services and Facilities:

Policy 23: notes that the provision of community services and facilities will be prioritized to support growth and identifies childcare centre(s) & a potential elementary school to be provided on the two sites. The policy language should make reference that the need for a potential facility, which is unknown, will be negotiated based on real data at the time of development application filing/processing.

We also note that the policies continue to require several other elements to be provided, including a new consolidated park, POPS areas, new roads and a minimum non-residential gross floor area. In addition to that, Policy 26 now adds an additional element, including consideration to provide an emergency service to the area (fire, paramedic and police facilities). Staff should consider how the cumulative impact of these requirements affects the feasibility of redevelopment and how to best balance enabling redevelopment with these various obligations. As well, it should be noted that Toronto Fire Station # 125 is already sited & operating at the southwest corner of the SASP/Metrus property.

Mobility:

Policy 18: we note that the policy states new streets are conceptual and the exact alignment, design and location will be refined through the development process in accordance with existing June 2024 Consolidated Toronto Official Plan Policies regarding Public Streets which is currently flexible enough to allow for public & private roads to be developed. Metrus supports this progressive design flexibility.

Built Form:

Policy 31: states that the permitted gross density is 3.0 FSI. Although the policy states that greater densities may be considered without amendment to the SASP if certain conditions are met, establishing a set density on the subject site is contrary to Provincial and City direction encouraging intensification on sites with access to higher



order transit. In our opinion, **imposing an artificial set density at this stage is redundant & not necessary** as height/massing/density will be determined when site specific development applications are filed.

Policy 34: provides that development will be set back a minimum of 5 metres adjacent to parks. Whereas the City has on numerous occasions accepted less (i.e. 3 metres). Flexibility in the language to avoid an OPA for a park setback should be implemented.

Housing:

Policy 39: the policy dictates the mix of residential unit types and sizes in developments with more than 80 new residential units (i.e. a minimum of 40% of new units will have 2 or more bedrooms, a minimum of 15% two-bedroom units and a minimum of 10% as three or more-bedroom units). The policy can encourage such unit mix targets, however, **should not require** actual unit mix numbers or percentages as that exercise is dictated by the market, with the development addressing the demand of the market when the project proceeds.

Implementation and Phasing:

Policies 41-49: outline specific conditions with respect to securing easements, preparing materials to ensure that the infrastructure capacity will not be exceeded, sequencing of development to ensure appropriate transportation and municipal servicing is in place, etc. We note that all these matters would be addressed during the development proposal stage and the City should not include them as specific policies in the area plan since it represents a duplication of policies/conditions that will be dealt with through project development. For instance, the notion of a landowner's group agreement or the inclusion of a holding ("H") provision is unnecessary & cumbersome at a time when the development process needs to be made more efficient & streamlined for speedy approvals to realize residential development to market faster.

Policy 43: states that the development proponent will utilize best efforts to coordinate improvements with other property owners to the satisfaction of the City, however, if best efforts have been expended by the proponent then approval by the City will not be unreasonably withheld.

In conclusion, we thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the process and respectfully request that North York Community Council members address the above noted items prior to the recommendation for City Council to adopt of the policies of SASP 848 and OPA 912. In addition, we continue to request notification of any decisions made by the City of Toronto Council on this matter.

Yours truly,

METRUS PROPERTIES LIMITED

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Drake', written over a horizontal line.

David J. Drake
Vice President, Planning & Development

