

Transcript HPCA Annual General Meeting - Sept 23, 2020

*** inaudible words due to audio break up are designated by empty brackets like this [[]]]*

Welcome/introductions

Elissa Aknay HPCA President I think we're ready to start now. [1.9s] People are still coming on but, we should be all right. So welcome, everybody. Thanks for participating today in the High Park Community Alliance virtual Annual General Meeting. Bear with us, this is our first time doing a virtual meeting. And there's probably going to be some technology problems that arise. So let's hope for the best. The HPCA executive is myself Elissa Aknay, Steve McNally, Richard Waldie, and Albert Fung. I don't know if you can actually see all of them. But Albert is the one that might be chiming in every so often. He's handling our technology. So if you hear a male voice speaking to ask a question, that is Albert.

Elissa Aknay So just before we review the agenda I wanted to provide some background information on or where we're at today. There is a lot of H.P.C.A. information I wanted to share. So I actually pre recorded a message. [[]] I kept tripping over myself. I guess I wanted to make sure, so I recorded it earlier today. We're going to play it now. If you have any questions that arise from it, write them down. I will take questions. [[]] And then when that's over, we will go through the agenda for today. Albert, if you could play that video.

(VIDEO STATEMENT) **Elissa Aknay HPCA President** We've been at this for almost 4 years. High Park Community Alliance came out of a meeting of the High Park Tenants' Association in January 2017, when their Executive, some of whom had been involved in opposing the Great West Life Grenadier Square development proposal (those 2 almost, if not completely, finished towers around High Park subway station), advised that Minto and Great West were submitting two massive development proposals for our apartment neighbourhood.

They warned us that it would be an uphill battle, because the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)'s approval of the Grenadier Square towers set a precedent for intensified development in the area. But, it was important for the community to be vocal about opposing these new, over the top, proposals, because if we didn't, the developers could get everything they asked for.

One brave soul agreed to spearhead this undertaking. Cathy Brown built a partnership with concerned homeowners surrounding the neighbourhood and organized within the apartment towers. Ian Flett, the HPCA lawyer, was recommended by those who opposed the Grenadier Square development (he was the community's lawyer for that too). Ian from the start warned that something would be built - because of precedent, and Toronto's need for more housing.

Ian believed that our best bet would be to work with our City Councillor and the developers through some kind of mediation to come up with a reasonable development plan for the apartment neighbourhood. Ian also told us at the time that there would be a good chance this would be taken to the OMB, and advised us to incorporate HPCA so that we would have party status at the OMB, and so be full players in the process.

The OMB is a very costly and challenging process for community members to engage in. Our friends who worked on Grenadier Square opposition explained that they had raised money mostly from one community fundraiser, and got donations from condo boards and another residents association. They kindly transferred the small amount of funds they had left over from their earlier fight. But, the rest of the money would have to come from the community. The condo boards that had contributed significantly on Grenadier Square were of course unhappy that their donations failed to stop the 2 tall towers going up there now, and so were not wanting to provide funds to oppose the 2 current developments.

So we were faced with raising money for potentially 2 OMB hearings for massive developments, easily 100-thousand dollars.

But we felt we had to try. City Planning, and Ward Councillor Sarah Doucette agreed the proposals were over the top, and they needed community support to oppose them. Again, doing nothing would guarantee the worst outcome. And I can say that while the developments are still significant in size, they are definitely better plans and smaller in scale than the originals.

A lot has happened over the last few years.

The then-Liberal provincial government moved forward with dismantling the OMB in favour of the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT), a body that would make it easier for communities to access and participate. In response, Great West Life and Minto filed their cases with the OMB before the LPAT came into effect, so that if it went to a contested hearing, they could proceed under grandfathered OMB rules at the LPAT.

Councillor Doucette pushed for and got an Area Character Study led by City Planning. The City, the developers and members of the community and HPCA participated in this process. The goal was to analyze our neighbourhood and lay out what appropriate development would look like. This took several months.

The end result of that character study was an Official Plan Amendment (OPA), which set out parameters for development significantly smaller in scale than what either of the developers proposed. The developers, along with 12 other parties, appealed the OPA to the LPAT, arguing it was too restrictive. By way of a motion at the LPAT, regarding the Minto and Great West Life appeals, the developers asked that their development applications be

exempt from the OPA, because it was not the policy at the time they submitted their applications.

As an update, the appeal of the OPA was settled at the end of July 2020 and the OPA is now binding as of the end of August. However, there are some modifications to where it applies and we have yet to see that information in a convenient form from the City.

Within our own LPAT process, the developers were successful in arguing that the OPA not be determinative to the two Great West Life and Minto applications because the Official Plan Amendment came after they'd submitted their plans. There was legal precedent at the LPAT for that argument.

That was just one setback.

Then there was a provincial election and the Conservatives came into power. They are development friendly, and dismantled the LPAT and brought back most of the procedures of the OMB, except keeping the LPAT name.

Meanwhile the city's housing crisis worsened, creating a desperate need for new accommodation. That put additional pressure on the City to approve new projects, especially projects incorporating affordable housing.

We recognized the need to push for mediation as the best way to have a say in what was coming. We hired an urban designer to lay the groundwork for our arguments. Our lawyer was trying to get the other parties to the table. The City was very reluctant and that had an impact on the developers, who had initially said they would consider it.

That left us only one option, to present the best case we could at the LPAT, whose hearings were set for jointly for January 2020. Hiring and keeping an expert witness to support our case became a problem. Some were reluctant to be seen arguing against development. Even professionals in our own community turned us down for fear of what it might do to their work prospects under the current provincial government.

Fortunately for us, we got an offer from one urban designer who once lived in our community to testify in favour of reducing the proposals.

But, last fall (2019) we were informed that the City had started settlement discussions with the developers as the LPAT hearing date approached. This meant mediation was off the table and the City turned down HPCA's request to be included in these discussions.

This was hard to accept. We had done all we could to be reasonable and constructive partners with the City.

We were told that we should submit our own counter proposals in writing, and that they would be taken into consideration. Part of the presentation you will see tonight includes the community's asks in our submission to the City and developers that we submitted in late fall 2019.

At that point, the only way to have a real and direct say was to fight at the LPAT hearing. In December 2019, we did a final fundraising push to pay the legal cost, and cover expenses for our sole professional witness.

A short time later, the City revealed that it had reached settlements with Minto and Great West Life.

The fight went from us and the City versus two developers, and became us versus two developers and the City.

A week before the January 27th LPAT hearing date, our lawyer was told that the developers wanted to meet with us to discuss a pre-hearing settlement. While this was not our preferred option, we were advised that without the City's support and in the current housing and political climate, it was almost impossible to imagine the LPAT scaling the plans back despite our valid arguments and existing development guidelines.

At the boardroom meeting we set out our terms. Again, you will find these laid out in detail in the chart in the presentation you'll be seeing tonight. The presentation including the chart is also on our website for review. However, at this meeting, there was no discussion of design matters, as that was "off the table" at the time. Our concerns at this time were more related to things like how to support current residents during construction.

Our suggestions were all rejected. We walked out of that meeting planning to go to the contested LPAT hearing so the community would at least have a chance to express its frustration with what was being done to our neighbourhood.

When we told our lawyer to convey that to the developers, he urged us to reconsider. Ian Flett will be able speak more to this later but he told us the developers told him that they were capable of blocking us at the LPAT and that we may not be able to present our evidence at all. We would risk coming away without securing any benefits at all.

It was days before the hearing was to start and though we wanted to consult with the community on this decision, there was no time to consult with the wider membership. We instead contacted some of our advisers, some of whom were to be our witnesses. Opinions were deeply split.

In the end the Executive felt the risk of coming away with absolutely nothing for all the time and money invested (by the wider membership and the members of the Executive), was unacceptably high. We opted instead for the settlement we will discuss this evening.

Our lawyer attended the start of the LPAT hearing to withdraw from the case. He witnessed a member of our community who pursued her own case being treated very poorly. Based on recounting of the interaction, it appeared that the LPAT Chair had no sympathy for the community's views or the right of people to "have their day in court."

Knowing what we know now of how that process went, I absolutely stand behind our decision to settle.

It did not take very long for the LPAT to provide an Interim Order accepting the applications.

The City had a long list of details and reports attached, and the developers and planners were to report back on their progress at a late October 2020 case conference.

That is the latest update we have ourselves on the matter. Councillor Gord Perks and our lawyer Ian Flett may have more information. People have sent in many questions over the last week, including what else can be done to stop the developments, has the pandemic slowed down the developers from completing the work that needs to be done to get a Final Order, and when does construction start? We will get to those questions and more later this evening.

(END OF VIDEO)

Elissa Aknay [00:32:07] OK, Albert, if you can post the agenda. I'm also going to mention that this entire presentation is being recorded, and we will post it. I know what I just said, there was a lot you will have a chance to see it again. So just to go through the agenda, welcome introduction. You will notice there is one item that was removed. Initially, we had the High Park Tenants Association who was going to speak at the AGM tonight, (but) for timing purposes we spoke with them and they were in agreement about speaking at our next meeting, so that we could focus on getting in everything we need to do tonight. So, High Park Tenants Association will not be speaking tonight.

Review of Financial Statement & Questions

Elissa Aknay [00:32:55] We will have a review of our financial statement and we'll have some questions about that before we go to [[]]. The HPCA, lawyer Ian Flett and ourselves, are here to comment on our settlement and we will have a question and answer after that. Then we will have a presentation by Shahrzad Davoudi and Diana Jardine on the City's agreed upon plans for the Minto and GreatWest Life applications, including a chart comparing the HPCA counter-proposal and what the City achieved. And there will be a question about that. So we had mentioned before City Legal did not give permission for City Planning to speak publicly about the matter until there is a final order. Which is why they were not able to come and speak themselves about the presentation. And we're really appreciative that Shahrzad and Diana are here to help out by doing their best to explain, based on what is available to us, what the City agreed to. Councilor Gord Perks is here and we'll speak to whatever he can, in the end. I believe his staff, Chris Haskim, who you might remember worked for Sarah Doucette previously [[]] around this file and will be helping tonight. Then we'll have a general discussion [[]]

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:34:25] So just a reminder, we have a lot of participants in this meeting. Could you kindly mute your mics when you're joining. That'll be great for everybody who is just listening to the presentations right now. Thank you.

Elissa Aknay [00:34:44] Everybody that is Albert, member of our executive, and he is dealing with all the technology tonight. He might come out of nowhere sometimes and give us some instructions. Please listen to him. Albert, can you post the financial statement? Richard (Waldie) will read through it. After Richard is done reading through it. Steve McNally will speak further to provide some information, and we will have questions and answers if there's any concerns or questions people have about the financial statement. And then we will vote on the financial statement.

Albert Fung - Moderator So this is the financial statement.

Elissa Aknay [00:35:26] This will also be posted to the website later.

Richard Waldie - Treasurer OK. This is the financial statement. And you can hear me?

HPCA has on deposit with CIBC \$9,400.00 in our bank account and in cashable GICs has \$160,302.52 The total cash available is \$169,702.52

The first part of the Cash Flow State is the source of the funds - where we received the money.

GoFundMe - \$6,861.19 and PayPal - \$7,914.48 both are Internet sources of money.

We received over 100 donated cheques, totalling, \$14,313.39.

Cash donations, and Fund Raising events provided \$22,885.36, and HPCA has received interest from GIC's totalling \$384.11

Just recently, High Park Community Alliance received a private grant of \$150,000.00 - Steve McNally will be speaking on this later.

The total funds raised since HPCA was formed is \$202,358.93.

Cash Disbursements:

HPCA purchased T-Shirts \$1,356.00, Lawn Signs \$610.20, and Seeds \$152.50 - all three items purchased for resale. These items were sold in the area at a nice profit.

Printing and promotion, \$1,568.47 includes flyers for distribution, advertising for upcoming events, tickets for special events, fundraising letters, etc.

Special events: Rental of the Revue Cinema for the film Citizen Jane (Jane Jacobs) \$1,017.00 and the sponsorship of plays at the The Bloor West Village Playhouse - \$1,250.00

Meeting room rentals include the meeting location as well as audio equipment - \$725.60

Office and organization costs includes the registration of our Non-Profit Organization with the Government of Ontario, and various web-site charges - \$1,124.34

Professional fees - \$23,687.65. \$21,450.25 was legal fees and \$2,237.40 was for an Urban design presentation regarding the proposed development.

Internet fees represent the processing fees charged by GoFundMe and PayPal for each donation HPCA received from them.

Bank charges - \$269.30

The current cash position of High Park Community Alliance is \$169,720.02.

No salaries, wages or benefits have been paid to anyone.

Elissa Aknay [00:38:34] I think Steve is going to have, is going to say something now. Albert, if you could play that now, that would be great.

(VIDEO STATEMENT) Steve McNally [00:38:47] Hi, my name's Steve McNally. I'm a member of the HPCA Executive and I want to pick up on something you likely noticed in the financial report, and that is that we registered a deposit of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I can tell you that there are some conditions attached to that payment and we will tell you what we can based on those conditions. First of all, the money is intended to provide a community benefit in the form of fighting for rent abatements for those people who are entitled to get rent reductions that reflect the loss of quality of life during the

construction period and the loss of the use of amenities that you normally would be paying for in your rent. Also to fight AGIs, the Above Guideline Increases in rent that the landlords often apply for. Now, those are matters that have to go to the Landlord Tenant Board. And so the HPCA is in discussions with a community organization that has experience with going to the Board and fighting those increase applications. And we are in the process right now of working out a memorandum of understanding with that group as to how these funds are going to be transferred, administered and used for that purpose. As soon as that agreement is concluded, of course, we'll come back and share the details of who that is and what's going to happen with that money. There are some things we can say, some we can't. We have our lawyer Ian Flett here with us tonight, and we'll do our best to answer your questions. Thank you.

Elissa Aknay [00:40:36] OK. I think we're going to have a question and answer, period. I think Albert is going to explain how people can ask their questions.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:40:48] All right. And everyone here. Yes. So if you look in your WebEx interface. There is a "Chat" button on your bottom right. Some of you have already been using this to send me some feedback about the quality of the presentations. But you can use that to send me a question. What I'll do is I'll post that on to the PowerPoint so everyone can see. I'll also be announcing these questions by voice. So the people that are joining us by phone, they can hear.

Caller [00:41:36] (interruption) I can hear them. [[]]

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:41:42] And, I'm sorry. If everyone can kind of cooperate and keep your mikes muted for now is this is really difficult to have a presentation or AGM like everyone would be, you know, talking at the same time. So I ask that if you guys have questions, please just type them up first and then we can kind of go through them one by one. So if you have a question, please go ahead and use that chat box right now and I'll slowly put the questions onto the PowerPoint slides one by one. In the meantime, I'm going to have Ian, Elissa, Steve, and Richard, your mic's on right now.

Elissa Aknay [00:42:42] Albert, I'm going to have you explain how to use the on-the-phone only option. How they can ask questions.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:42:52] Sure, this is also an option. If you're calling it right now, you're not using the computer or the smartphone, please, press star three. And I will be able to un-mute you and call on you for your question. The first question we have.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:43:22] "Give us an example of how the \$100,000 could be used to ameliorated the construction noise, etc." Elissa, anyone on our team able to take that with that be directed to Ian or to Gord?

Elissa Aknay [00:43:41] It looks like Ian wants to explain.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [00:43:49] I'm happy to hazard a guess. So there wouldn't necessarily be a link between the hundred fifty thousand dollars and an amelioration of the actual construction noise itself. The idea is that because there would be construction noise, there is the opportunity to seek an abatement of rents, because when you signed your lease, you didn't sign a lease that included a bunch of construction noise caused by your landlord. [[]] That's where that link would come in. Now, there are ways, of course, of having constructive conversations with developers. No pun intended. And in trying to find ways to get them to change some of their practices, to make noise better, such as the types of [[]] that are used, the hours that they do certain types of activities, things like that. But there's not necessarily a direct link between the 150,000 and a substantive reduction in the decibels of the noise itself.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:44:55] Anything to add or should we go on to this next?

Elissa Aknay [00:45:02] I think the next question.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:45:10] All right, here's the next question. "My understanding is that the High Park Tenants Association is able to oppose and successfully fight AGIs multiple times a year for a pretty nominal fee. Sometimes just a few hundred dollars, probably max a thousand. So, I am unclear how a 150K would be used towards this. "

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [00:45:38] I don't want to steal anybody's thunder, but having been the lawyer who does represent clients before the landlord tenant board, I will offer an answer to that. So there is, I can't remember the organization, but there is an organization that will provide a thousand dollar grant for the fighting of an AGI. I can tell you, having been the lawyer paid a thousand dollars [[]] and AGI, it was a major reduction in my fees to do that. And I did it mainly because it was a neighboring building where I live. And I viewed it as, not quite pro bono, but as a mitzva for my neighbours. The reality is that with more resources, a group of tenants can either fight an AGI, or seek that rent abatement with the assistance of professional witnesses. And at the end of the day, no matter how fancy your lawyer or paralegal is, it's the evidence that is going to be most persuasive in your case. And so the resources that could be martialed this way to protect tenant interests are far, far more powerful than they would be with just the thousand dollar grant. Sometimes you may be asking a noise expert to testify as to noise levels that are measured. You may be asking for a structural engineer to interpret what kind of work that was done by a landlord or whether or not it truly fits within the four corners of an AGI, allowed by an AGI, and the reality is that those can be expensive undertakings.

Councillor Gord Perks [00:47:14] It's Gord Perks. Can I add a word here?

Elissa Aknay [00:47:17] Absolutely.

Councillor Gord Perks [00:47:18] So the thing that is very important to remember is quite recently the province of Ontario has dramatically reduced tenant rights under the Landlord

Tenant Act. And because of that, the experiences you had two years ago in fighting an AGI, they don't apply anymore. And I think actually the community is very well served by the community association getting this benefit.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [00:47:52] I just want to be ah... (dog barks). Just, we'll deal with something that's important. The source of the funding is a matter of confidentiality and the High Park Community Alliance is not identifying the source of any of the grants that it refers to tonight.

Elissa Aknay [00:48:22] Monster dog! (laughs) Is there any other question?

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:48:33] There is. Here is a question. "Hello. Who qualifies, and can we apply for the quality of life disruption rent reduction now?"

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [00:48:42] So I'll happily speak generally to that. There is the opportunity under the landlord tenant act, I mean, the Residential Tenancies Act, to bring an application to the landlord tenant board for rent abatement. And it goes to the earlier point that I made is that many of your leases, if you pull them up and look at them, you'll notice that you're entitled to quiet enjoyment of your unit. That also is a similar wording in the residential tenancy act, though not quite as strong. And essentially, it says that you did not sign your lease expecting your landlord, it has to be your landlord who makes the noise, expecting your landlord to disrupt your quiet enjoyment of your unit. And if you're being asked to give up on that quiet enjoyment for a certain length of time, and the disruption of your quiet enjoyment is substantial enough. The landlord tenant board can require that there be an abatement of rent. I will say that I have negotiated through the OMB process and through mediation, prescribed rent abatements and the City has actually also done similar negotiations in the past. That was not on the table for us in this case, but it might be something that could come from a conversation with your landlords.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:50:01] All right. We have this from the previous participant. "Similar to my other question, follow up to Ian's response, is I believe there isn't actually a high cost of applying for rent abatements. This is a fairly affordable process through the landlord tenant board. No? So what would the funds actually be used for? "

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [00:50:25] So I apologize if my answer wasn't clear, but I'll try to get more clear. It would be used for martialing expert evidence against the landlord's case for AGI or in favour of rent abatement, such as for the hiring of engineers to provide professional opinions and respective impacts on quality of life and noise. To hire civil engineers who may look at whether or not certain types of construction required are attributable to a required capital expenditure as compared to a development expenditure. It could be used for any number of things that are important. You may very well find yourselves in a situation where there's a legal interpretation on the table that you would want to bring to the divisional court. And this could be used for that. Yes, the questioner or

the questioner is correct in saying that these can be argued cheaply, but they are better argued with better evidence.

Steve McNally [00:51:31] Could I add one thing here? Steve here. This is not something that is going to be a process that plays itself out in a short period of time. The construction period estimated in these projects is very long, a couple of years. And so you can imagine that over a period of time, three or four years, that this amount of money is not so much. So there is an aspect to this that I think that's [[]] a legacy grant of sorts that carries us into the future. I just wanted to make that point.

Elissa Aknay [00:52:14] Also, Gord's earlier point 2020 is very different from 2017 [[]] and the [[]] of the process. And so what could have been done cheaply and achieved a couple years ago is very different today. So the grant would be very helpful, to be used to support the tenants during the construction process. Any more questions?

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:52:42] There are actually. "I noticed that the noise mostly comes from the poor quality of windows. Now I see a tower behind me (has) replaced their windows last year. Are there any plans of having 65 High Park Ave. also having their windows replaced?" I'm wondering if we can leave this question for later or should we address it right now? Since we're kind of focused on the financial statement.

Elissa Aknay [00:53:17] And so I guess we can leave it for later. But when I read the question, it's kind of something that the landlord of 65 High Park would have to [[]]. And I believe that's GreatWest Life, they are not actually represented here. I don't know if Gord or Ian you have any kind of answers to that.

Councillor Gord Perks [00:53:43] No.

Elissa Aknay [00:53:47] Yeah, there was a number of questions [[]] about various things [[]] about the buildings. And that's not something we are [[]] able to answer, and we are directing people to talk to whether it's Minto or GreatWest Life about the various [[]] for their buildings.

Caller [00:54:05] I have an answer on that question. I volunteer with the HPTA, do you want me to share it with the group? Sure.

Caller [00:54:12] OK. So what happens is scheduled to be replaced in 66 Pacific and 65 High Park as well this past Spring so because of the pandemic it got put on hold. They sent out a notice to tenants. I think it was that they are now scheduled for this coming Spring instead. I think this person asking this question is a tenant at [[]] High Park, they should have received that notice from the landlord. And if not, then they should make sure they're on the landlord's e-mail list. I think they will send us an update about that.

Elissa Aknay [00:54:54] Thanks, Barbi. Any other questions about the financial statement?

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:54:59] We have a few more, but I think I can group two of these together. One, the question is "Oh, it's for the lawyers and expert witnesses rather than subsidizing individual's rents." And along that vein, a similar question is "Why is money donated with the intention of reducing the scale of the development being used to fight rent increases for certain tenants?"

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [00:55:37] So having provided the answer that's led to the question that maybe I would describe as rhetorical. That's correct. The money would be used for landlord tenant board hearings. If the money was deployed for the subsidizing of rents, which would be depleted very quickly, compared to what would be available to rent abatement. Then "why is money donated with the intention of reducing the scale of development being used to fight rent increases?" Certainly, I'll let the executive speak to this and there'll be more commentary on this. This probably is the heart of many people's concerns on this call. And it will get addressed. And I'll leave it to Steve and Elissa as to when they want to get into the nuts and bolts of the answer to that.

Elissa Aknay [00:56:24] So, I mean, for right now, the short answer is money that was donated with the intention of reducing the scale of the development, not to fight rent increases for a certain time. The money that is being used to fight the rent increases, AGIs, rent abatements, that is from a private grant that is unrelated to the community fundraising that we did to fight at the OMB. Steve, do anything else that you want to add to that right now?

Steve McNally [00:56:52] Well, I'd point out that the money that was donated that has not been spent is now subject to a community decision on which charity it gets donated to in our community once we wrap up the final order, once the final order is issued on the development and the HPCA is wound down. The constitution states very specifically what is the intention of the HPCA, and also what is going to be the disposition of any funds raised from the community is going to be, and how it's going to be disposed of. That's the donated money you're referring to. Whereas the grant money is completely different. It's not raised from the community, say, by us. It is not subject to that. So our goal is to put it to work and to amplify its impact on a benefit to the widest number of people in the community, the ones who are closest to the development.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:58:06] Well, I believe that kind of answered this question I just got. "So what does the association plan to do with the remainder of the money, minus 150K?" Unless there's anything else we want to add.

Elissa Aknay [00:58:20] I guess the only thing I would say is that there's probably going to be one more meeting when we wrap up. And we will be sending out obviously before that, to say this is how much money is left over at this point and ask people to send in their suggestions about where to consider to vote on [[]] that amount to donate to charity. That will be closer to wrapping up.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:58:49] So I have a final question here. " When is the construction expected to start? And will you be showing us the layout again of buildings part of the settlement? "

Elissa Aknay [00:59:02] OK. So what I'm going to say that's not part of the financial statement. So, let's hold all that for later. Because I know we got [[]] much [[]] earmarked. So how about we [[]] vote on the [[]] financial statement [[]] in order to move along. Because there's a lot to [[]] including all that stuff.

Albert Fung - Moderator [00:59:21] Ok, here is the slide on voting. We wanted to reiterate the rules per our Constitution. Sorry, Elissa, do you mind reading this though?

Elissa Aknay HPCA President [00:59:38] Sure Ok. So, to be able to vote to pass the financial statement, you have to be 19 year old, and [[]] live within the boundaries of the High Park Community Alliance, which is Bloor, North side of the street, to Annette North side of Annette. East side of Keele Street, and then along the back [[]] along Gothic Ave and Pine Crest Road to the west side. And so Albert, you have a poll you can post for people to vote if they are signed in via their phones, their tablets or computers.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:00:11] So, shortly I will add this poll. But this should show up on your screen directly. If you don't see it, click on that little "dot dot dot" button on your bottom right. I'll just open, oh sorry, I'll just open the poll right now. Now, if you're joining us through the phone, we have a different mechanism. If you're voting Yes, please press star-three right now, if you're voting No, or if you're abstaining from voting, no further action is needed. (pause).

Elissa Aknay [01:01:14] [[]] Minutes left to this, do we wait the four minutes or do we just [[]] the one?

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:01:19] I can wait to have everyone. So far I have maybe about a half right now. But... (pause) Once again, if you're joining us through the phone, if you'd like to vote, star-three is a "Yes" vote and not doing anything is a "No" vote or abstain from voting. If you are on the computer right now, the question should be in your polling information box. If you don't see that, simply go to the bottom right and click on that dot dot dot button. And there should be a button that says "polling". (pause)

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:03:50] So we have about 90 seconds left. Again, if you haven't voted yet and you're on your computer laptop, please pick up on your bottom right corner, there is a little dot, dot, dot button that should bring up the polling. If you click "Yes", "No", abstain from voting and click "Submit" that would complete the voting process. If you're calling in on a phone, if you'd like to vote yes, please press star-three. If not, then there's no further action required.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:04:58] There's our final 30 seconds. For anyone that doesn't have their vote in these, go ahead and make your votes. (pause) All right. So voting has ended. I'm going to show the poll results to everyone. So you should see them on your screen, if you don't I can also find them on the powerpoint.

Steve McNally [01:06:24] Should we read them out for people on the phone Albert?

Elissa Aknay HPCA President [01:06:26] Sure. I will read them out. Question "I vote to accept 2020 AGM, uh sorry, 2020 Financial Statement." Yes, 23 out of 38 votes. No, 1 of 38. Three people abstained. And 11 people did not answer, so the vote for the financial statement passes. Thanks, everybody.

HPCA lawyer Ian Flett/HPCA Executive comments on our settlement/Q&A

Elissa Aknay [01:06:50] So we will now have High Park Community Alliance lawyer Ian Flett speak to our own settlement with Minto and GreatWest Life. And then he and the Executive are available for question and answer on that.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:07:09] Thanks Elissa. The outline that you provided at the beginning of the meeting really provided an excellent overview of the entire process. And I will say that this was a very long and difficult process, and we had it coming at us really from all sides. Not only were we dealing with two separate developers with separate applications, which obviously made it complicated, we were dealing with this City that initially very courageously put together an excellent planning report for the High Park neighborhood, which it hoped would apply to the development applications. There was a basis for that for the City to believe it would apply because of the City's own infill plan. And there's extraordinary development pressure in the area. The City's first [[]] to study that area before it begins to make decisions in respect to development applications. Nevertheless, the existence of that policy was rejected by the OMB/LPAT. There were a number of motions, some to do with that issue and others to do with consolidating two appeals from the developers. And there was just a lot of back and forth, and I'm not sure that anybody could have really predicted the implications of the changes in the legislation. Amazingly, this file is a file that not lived through two major amendments to the Planning Act into the Ontario Municipal Board Act, which then became [[]] Tribunal Act. So it was a rough ride. And much of it was very difficult to navigate effectively with some of the handicaps that we had to deal with.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:09:05] Elissa, explained the advice that I provided at the beginning of my relationship with the HCA, which was something was going to get built there. And having done the Grenadiers Square application, and having done a contested hearing on that, so we brought up the whole fight with a planner and other witnesses to

the OMB. If it was any consolation, [[]] which lost but OMB took about eleven months to make its decision on that matter.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:09:32] And in that case, the OMB came back and said this is a development application right on the subway line. And whether we like it or not, the province is telling us that along the subway line is where we need to be intensifying neighbourhoods. That was six, seven years ago. Those policies have only become more rigorous and more demanding that municipalities to intensify. And so for as much as the City may have wished to have defended the neighborhood in line with the excellent policies, award winning policies, that it put together, and as much as I as your lawyer would have wanted to have taken in this fight as far as possible, we were working with a policy matrix that was just not on our side. That was the starting point. Through my career as Land-Use planning lawyer, I attended a lot of mediations, and it is my personal opinion that mediation is the best way to resolve many of these conflicts because you can get people around the table and to discuss what their interests are and nobody comes out a clear winner, but nobody comes out a clear loser. And mostly people come out ahead. Knowing that that was generally going to be the scope of my advice, what I always tell my clients, and this is not a secret to anybody who is listening, is hope for peace, but prepare for war. And so it was very important that we always be in a position to carry through on the ability to bring a credible case to the OMB or the LPAT. And in negotiation parlance, that's called your "best alternative to a negotiated agreement", your BATNA. And I spent a lot of time with the HPCA discussing BATNA and saying we're always testing what's on the table for resolution against our BATNA, against the best alternative to a negotiated agreement. And we're always, no matter how hard we might be trying in the background to negotiate to settle, we're always cultivating that BATNA to the best of our abilities. Except every time that we tried to cultivate that BATNA in this case, it was one step forward, two steps back. Unfortunately, the reality in Ontario land use planning is that the money to be made is made being on the side of developers. And so many of the urban designers, many planners are reticent to take positions against a development application. Sometimes it's a bonafide position that they agree with the development application, and it's totally in line with the policies and they do not have a reason in their own professional opinions to oppose it. And I think that they come to those conclusions in good faith. Unfortunately, other times they are concerned because they don't want to be known as the urban designer or the planner or the engineer who opposed such big potential future clients as Minto and GreatWest Life. Thankfully, there are still some experts who are willing to stand up for a different view of the policies in a different view of development. And we were the beneficiaries of a relationship with one who then unfortunately joined a firm who didn't want him to take that [[]] in order to continue the relationship with HPHA. And then with Shahrzad, who we'll hear from later this evening, we had as the case was progressing, we had an okay BATNA. But when we found out that the City was settling with the developer, we really had a pretty terrible BATNA. My experience in the last three years at the OMB/LPAT is the minute the municipality settles with a developer, the LPAT is going to really put the pedal to

the metal to resolve and settle that hearing, no matter who else is at the table. And so we had to deal with that as part of our reality.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:13:46] And we also had to deal with and I don't want to go into too much detail, Shahrzad [[]] has professional work in other forums and we were in a situation that because Shahrzad was closely tied to the community, there was a potential for her work to be criticized as being not, as being partisan, as being not objective. And when you're prepared to appear as an expert witness in any court or any tribunal, you have to promise to that tribunal that you're going to be appearing as an objective witness. And I had no doubt in my mind that Shahrzad had the professionalism and the capacity to do that. However, because of where we stood with everything, because of previous relationships, that Shahrzad and the excellent work that Shahrzad had done in the community, there was a risk to us that she could have been found to have not been an objective witness. And that might have impacted, had a serious impact not only on our case, but also ultimately on Shahrzad's reputation as a planner, [[]] as an urban designer. And so those were some of the factors that we were weighing and that was not the only factor, but those were some of the factors that I should say I was weighing as I was giving advice to the HPCA Executive and ultimately recommending that the HPCA not challenge the settlement between the developer and the City.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:15:22] Now, I do want to recount something to give some perspective and not to say, look, I knew what I was talking about, to really help explain that the LPAT is a different place than it was even five years ago. And it is, unfortunately when the liberals amended the LPAT to give more power to municipalities, one of the side effects of that was the decimation of the LPAT's own mediation program. And so the LPAT is no longer in the driver's seat for mediating disputes. And there was a time when the LPAT had a Board member, James McKenzie, who was a huge champion of mediation and was well respected. With the decimation of the mediation program and the liberal reforms, there was then the introduction of Bill 108, the Conservative reforms that actually made the LPAT a worse place than it was when it was the OMB. It's not as simple as just saying that it's not that just saying it's the OMB/LPAT. But, it returned to having the tension of a court battle let's call it. But the mediation program never came back. James Mackenzie went into private practice as a mediator. And we were hoping to try to bring him in and to say, can we do private mediation with the parties? And although there was on a couple of occasions an indication (of) wishing to do that, at the end we discovered that none of the parties, and and I'm sorry to say the City included, had any interest in involving us in the mediations, in the negotiations that were happening. And that was a real disappointment. And it was a source of anger and pain because the community had always been a very strong ally with the City through this entire process.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:17:16] So when you added all of that together our BATNA really didn't look good. And we certainly could have gone to a hearing to fall on the sword. But I've now explained to you first that it would have potentially had an adverse impact on

a very valued member of the community. And in my mind, it would have been a waste of resources. And there were just other options on the table. You'll notice that we're allowed to talk about the fact that there was a settlement between us and Minto and Great West Life. Rather unfortunately, that's all we can say in terms of what the terms of that settlement are, other than to say that quite obviously we're no longer able to fight their development permissions per se as a result of this settlement we agreed to with them. And you're going to notice as you ask questions about that. That may sound like I'm either being evasive or dancing on the end of a needle, but that's just one of the features of the settlement between us and the two applicants.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:18:27] Those were the main things that I want to bring to your attention to help explain what the process was and how the decision was arrived at. I do want to say that if I was in the shoes of somebody listening and hearing some of these things for the first time, I might say, wait a second, the HPCA was thumping his chest for four years and asking me to to pay into its war chest. And now you're telling me that in the background you were always looking at settlement. And I want to say that it was always and it was truthful and in good faith that the driving motto was "hope for peace, prepare for war". And unfortunately, the "prepare for war" part had to keep going too and had to be projected the way it was. At the end of the day I do believe that the power...I do believe that the weight that we put onto this process impacted the ability the City had to negotiate the final built forms. I think that there was lofty and talented professionalism on the part of the City that got to that point. But I think they were able to say that the community was a force multiplier in that, and it is my hope that Councilor Perks might agree with that proposition. It so all is not lost and you will have a chance, Diana and Shahrzad with go over the [[]] plans and the argument for it without getting into the nitty gritty of it. I mean, there are [[]] changes that comply with policy and guidelines that the City has in place. And then that was part of the problem, of course, is that the settlement plans were a better project. It was a better application at the end of the settlement. Even if it's not quite what the community would have wanted. So I'm going to try to answer questions as candidly as I can. Sometimes I will appear evasive because there are things I can't say and that no one on the Executive is allowed to say. But please understand that it's not because we want to hide anything from you, it's that the terms of the agreement require some measure of confidentiality on some issues. Those are my comments, and thank you for giving me a chance to speak.

Elissa Aknay HPCA President [01:20:48] [[]] I think [[]] questions anyone has for Ian or for ourselves. Understanding now that [[]] but please go ahead and ask your questions. Albert, will instruct you [[]] there are people on the phone can ask questions as well.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:21:21] So I have a question here. Let me just put it on the screen. The question is "What sorts of details are we not allowed to know as members of

the community who donated to this fight [[]] why are we not entitled to know the specifics?"

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:21:43] You know, this is absolutely a legitimate question. And I'm going to try to answer it in the way that that is the most candid possible. The nature of, so the HPCA created a membership structure that was extremely liberal. In effect, the only thing you need to be a member of the HPCA is to live within the boundaries of the association's, kind of an area of concern, geographic area of concern. And so it is not uncommon when parties enter into an agreement to settle a disputed matter to make certain features of that agreement confidential. And obviously, you've already inferred, from what I've told you, is that there is a requirement for confidentiality in respect of the final terms of the agreement. What I can say is that the agreement covers a number of different items and issues, and that over the course of time, it's likely that you'll be able to infer what some of those issues are. However, the nature of the agreement itself is such that it's mainly because the membership is so large there's no controlling that obligation of confidentiality, we're just not able to share all of all of the specifics of the agreement. I will say that we put in a fair amount of effort to make parts of the agreement explicit, and we weren't successful in making that happen. So I'm sorry because I do agree with the general position that members of the community that contributed to the fight should know the details in the resolution. I do agree with that as a principle. Unfortunately, we are just bound by the agreement that we have. It was an agreement that at the end of the day, I was able to recommend to the HPCA and it has a number of features to it. So I'm sorry that I can't answer more than.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:24:14] Ok, we have a request to speak briefly from Barbi. Barbi, go ahead.

Caller [01:24:23] Thank you. So I just wanted to comment just in response to, I guess sort of the attitude of giving up just because we didn't expect to win at the OMB, everything that you're saying, I understand and I know this was explained as well. I don't think that we necessarily ever expected to win at the OMB. I think a lot of us would say that if we went to the OMB and delayed the start of the project, that's a win. I know I personally feel like I've had the most amazing summer here on this property, you know, literally almost every day. And yet, you know, walking around outside every day, sitting on a bench in the greenspace, taking my lunch downstairs to the barbecue patio. And, you know, I know of a case of another group that recently had a case at the OMB where it took 18 months to deliberate. And so for me personally, that would have been worth so much more to me than the so-called benefits that we received through the negotiated settlement. And, you know, any little bit of financial benefit that we get out of that settlement, that's so much less important to me than just having as much time as possible in this community the way it is. So I just want to make comments and I know other people might disagree or feel the same way [01:26:17][114.3]

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:26:19] Barbi I would like to give you a bit of an answer to maybe elaborate on that. In the case of the Grenadier Square the City was an objecting party. Now they didn't participate substantively in that hearing, unfortunately, even though they were instructed to do so. But they weren't there settling with the developer. They had actually rejected a settlement offer with the developer. So in that case, the Board had before it, the [[]] wasn't a residents' association it was a group of residents, and the City as objecting parties, and took a long time to make its decision. I'd indicated in my opening remarks that the Tribunal will tear into settlements now with fervor. The Tribunal is under a lot of pressure to get through its backlog. And one of the ways that it's getting through the backlog is by quite literally bullying any party that's trying to upset a settlement. And one of the members of this association (HPCA) did carry through with attempting to challenge the settlement in this case. And I've never seen a spectacle as disgusting, I'll say that, as I saw the way the Tribunal treated her. And I don't hesitate, and I have an obligation as a lawyer to to uphold respect for the administration of justice, and I will say that it was a form of bullying and threatening that was uncalled for. And as a result of it, I actually, independent of any instructions, sought an adjournment to discuss the ethics of the matter with the other lawyers who were in the room, and we all agreed that it had to be [[]] differently. That's how bad it was. I'll give you another example. I was involved in a hearing where there was a settlement between a municipality and a developer. And they settled that (at) the prehearing conference (and) didn't even let an adjacent landowner, my client, become party to that settlement. So, yes, there is an interpretation of possibilities where we might say that the Tribunal might have reserved its decision four or eight, nine, 10 months, 18 months. But I think that under the current climate, the Tribunal could also have turned its decision around in a matter of months, not differently than the way it did in this case. But I do understand that, you know, one of the potential outcomes could have been that reservation, and even fighting appeals and drawing it out. And I can understand why you would say that would have had value to you. Hopefully, and I say this is a silver lining in the cloud, hopefully [[]] will cause a bit of the delay that you're looking for and allow you to appreciate the surroundings you so like. But, that 's what I can offer as a response to what you [[]].

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:29:15] Another question. "So what can we say we achieved through a settlement?"

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:29:26] You can certainly say that you have um, that you have a number of commitments from the developers, commitments that are actionable before the Landlord Tenant Board. And that's as far as I can say in terms of anything concrete. You can also say that the weight that you placed on this matter, I think, gave the City extra strength in its negotiations with the developer. And, I know that I'm going to get this question in many different forms and I'm going to dance around it in different ways. But I'm afraid that's that's all I can really say in terms of the concrete aspects.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:30:25] Another question: "What has caused this sudden turn around in the City's response to the development application?"

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [01:30:36] I'll leave that question to someone from the City. I don't want to be seen speaking on its behalf.

Councillor Gord Perks [01:30:39] Would you prefer that I talk about just now? It's Gord. Or should I wait until my spot on the agenda?

Elissa Aknay [01:30:50] All right. I'm wondering if we can hold off on anything for Gord's specifically. We [[]]. Can we just stop the question now. We're going to [[]] and then we'll have a Q&A. [[]] full of time. And there's going to be lots of questions. [[]] And we're going to try to get in as much as possible. [[]] re: Presentation of plans [[]] That be OK?

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:31:36] Yes, we can do that. So I'm going to save the rest of the questions till later. What I'll do now is I'm going to share Shahrzad and Diana's presentation. For now I'll also mute everyone's mics except for theirs, just so we have clear audio going through. Shahrzad can you hear us?

Presentation by Shahrzad Davoudi and Diana Jardine on the City's agreed upon plans for Minto and GWL applications, and chart comparing HPCA counter proposal and what City achieved/Q&A

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:32:03] Yeah. Can you hear me?

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:32:05] Yes. And sorry, let me just find Diana. You can hear us as well.

Diana Jardine Retired Planner [01:32:12] Yes, I can hear you.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:32:15] Yes. So I'm going to switch to that presentation right now. OK. You can see this on the screen? (Yeah). So go ahead. **(Slide PAGE 1)**

NB: THE VISUALS OF THE PRESENTATION ARE POSTED ON THE HPCA WEBSITE. PAGE REFERENCES ARE INDICATED IN THE TEXT THAT FOLLOWS.

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:32:38] Hi, everyone. I'm Shahrzad Strike. I'm an urban designer. I've been working with the HPCA for, it's been a couple of years. I also used to live in the community, 40 High Park. So, I'm just going to be very brief on (comparing) the sort of the massing, site plan, and elevation changes from the original application that

was submitted in 2017 to what we have today, which was kind of submitted in 2019. I would really appreciate it, I'm getting a sort of an echo of my own voice, if everybody can mute themselves, I would really appreciate that.

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:33:28] Before we go to the next slide, I'm going to quickly speak about the perspectives, because I think it's easier for people to see that the towers, the original towers, were more of a "slab" building. **(Slide PAGE 1)** They were very long and skinny towers. One of the issues that these towers had was how close they were to the existing buildings that were around them. This was an issue that both the City and the community had in terms of loss of privacy, access to sunlight. So as part of the negotiation and the settlements, the towers, which is the picture to the right, are now much more compact and more square. And they have increased their distances from their adjacent buildings extensively, which is a positive. Could you move to the next slide? **(Slide PAGE 2)**

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:34:23] So in this slide, as you can see, the picture to the left is the site plan 2017. And the one to the right is the one that was part of the settlement. So as you can see, those townhouses on Glenlake they're no longer there. They got removed. On Pacific Road the Tower 1 that had a section that was also townhouses, those townhouses were removed. And the building on Oakmount Rd. was extensively reduced in its footprint. And then looking at the picture, the site plan to it right, you see the tower was relocated South to just protect the existing building to its North. And then there were some townhouses added to the Pacific Avenue. But from the two pictures, you should see that the massing has been extensively reduced and its footprint. And now if you move to the next slide. **(Slide PAGE 3)**

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:35:36] So these are the changes to the height from the 2017 to 2019. Four floors were knocked off, for the lack of a better term, from one of the towers, and the other building just lost one floor. Can you move to the next slide? **(Slide PAGE 4)**

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:36:00] As a result of the reduction in the footprint and reduction in height, the number of units were reduced from one thousand five hundred eighteen to a total of seven hundred twenty units. So seven hundred ninety eight units were reduced from the development. And I just wanted to again, reiterate, that while the number of the building floors are not reduced, the massing and the footprint was reduced. So that's where, that's where the change comes in terms of the number of units in this application. Next slide. I'm going to let Diana speak to some of the other changes. **(Slide Page 5)**

Diana Jardine Retired Planner [01:36:49] [01:36:49] So the parts of the settlement that Shahrzad and I are talking about were subject to a Council decision in December, and it was approved in principle by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) in January. So, in addition to the reduction in building and unit numbers, there are a number of studies that are still

to be prepared by the developers. For example, a natural heritage impact study, hydro geological studies, a tree protection plan. And a study addressing the Toronto Green Standards checklist. And the city council decision also then agreed to significant community benefits to be paid for by the developers. So there's two hundred thousand dollars to go for streetscape improvements. Seven hundred thousand to go for local park improvements. Five hundred thousand for public art. Two hundred thousand for non-profit daycare as well as the creation of a designated off-leash area for pets and the retention of publicly accessible spaces, mid-block walkways throughout the site So it's significant. And I should add that finally, 10 percent of the units are to be affordable housing. And I'm sure Councillor Perks later on will talk to Section 37 benefits and how those will be determined. So what you see in the chart is what we asked for on the left. And then on the right hand side is what City Council decided still remain part of it. That's it for now. [01:38:51][122.6]

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:38:56] OK. Please move to the next slide. **(Slide PAGE 6)** Now for the GWL application we do not have a perspective (illustration). But I just wanted to put the original perspective in front of you. Can you move to the next slide? **(Slide PAGE 7)** So the approach that this applicant took is different from the Minto development. As I said in the Minto, the reduction happened by reducing the building footprint rather than taking the heights off. This application reduced the heights extensively, but did not reduce the building footprint as much. So what you see on the left of your picture is the site plan from 2017. A portion of that Tower A was taken out, but those were mainly podiums (base floors) of two three stories. And there were the mid-rise buildings to the South right next to the park that were taken out of the, out of the site plan. And one of the towers, the one to the top left, became a mid-rise building that I will speak in terms of height. Next slide, please. **(Slide PAGE 8)**

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:40:15] So this is where you see that the change happened mainly on the height about this application. So the 34 story building lost four floors and it's now a 30 story building. And the high rise that was a 29-storey building became an 11-storey mid-rise.

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:40:36] Next slide . **(Slide PAGE 9)** There Tower A that was again 39 storeys, lost 3-floors three floors and that mid rise building that was 8-storey, was taken off the site plan.

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:40:52] Next slide, please. **(Slide PAGE 10)** Through the changes that happened from 2017 to 2019, and also as part of the settlement offer, the number of units were reduced (by) 263 units. So it was originally 1,995 units. They came with a 1,760 units as per their settlement with this City. They reduced it to 1,732 units.

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:41:31] Next slide. Diana. **(Slide PAGE 11)**

Diana Jardine Retired Planner [01:41:37] [01:41:37]OK. This is what the City Council agreed to in its decision in December for the Great West Life (GWL) application and in the

case that went before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) in January. The parkland dedication by the developer was increased 15 percent, and that will be added to the new City Park where there is existing the tennis court-that is between High Park Avenue and Pacific. Reduction of the trees to be eliminated from 143 to 125, and 193 new trees to be planted. The Section 37 benefits Councillor Perks will describe these more fully. Rental tenure of existing [] will be secured for 20 years, which means I guess not converted into condo units. There will be a tenant relocation assistance plan here. There will be assurance that the existing tenants will have access to new, indoor and outdoor amenities. There will be an off-leash dog area adjacent to the park and there's an extensive number of studies required by the City including a Natural Heritage Study, money (\$8.9 million), tree protection plan, construction strategy, transportation impact strategy and demand management report and functional servicing reports on storm water, a pedestrian level wind study, housing issues report and acceptable landscape plans. And these will have to be acceptable to the City. So that's a plus. Finally, the site plan itself will have to be approved by the City. [01:44:04][147.0]

Elissa Aknay [01:44:10] I guess we're ready.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:44:17] Thanks so much, Shahzad and Diana. I'm going to switch back to that PowerPoint format. So let me just get ready right now. Elissa should we start from the questions that were put off earlier?

Elissa Aknay [01:45:02] So can we start with any questions that are specifically about the plans? Are you ready? Probably being [] development looks like? Anything Sharhrzad and Diana spoke about []? We have 10 minutes for those questions [] write them [] as well. So if we can try and focus as much as possible on questions related to what the design looks like [] in changes from 2017 to 2019 in their (the City's) settlement agreement. That would be great. And then we'll have [] time for that [] any extra questions we didn't get to.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:45:38] So I'm going to try to get those questions from the Chat there in coming. And there's also a lot from before, so bear with me [], sorry. There is a specific question, I guess, about the construction. So, "When is construction expected to start? And will we be shown a layout again of the buildings [] the settlements?" Shahrzad?

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:46:20] So, I cannot, obviously I cannot speak to the construction because that's up to the applicant. But, I just wanted to say that through the process of the City planning, site plan application is still outstanding. So both applicants have to submit an application for "site plan development". And a lot of issues will be resolved through the site plan, for instance, architecture, the building, landscaping of the building. These are still things that they need to submit to the City as part of their site plan application and that process is public and HPCA can share that when those applications are posted.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:47:13] I have another one. "The tower on the south side on Pacific looks larger in the new plan versus the old one." Let me see if I can't pull up the PowerPoint, sorry, the slides again. **(Slide PAGE 2)**

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:47:44] I believe it's Page 2. Yeah. So I can speak to that building on Pacific. If you look at where I have drawn on the box. That's the tower. The rest of that link [[]] is a five story podium. Compared to the picture, that is to the left. That was an eight story podium, plus the tower. So both the buildings [[]] have been reduced and the number of floors on the podium have been reduced. And I believe the size of the tower itself has been reduced.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:48:26] [[]] Let's get back to the questions. Similar question, "Are these images to scale? Because the massing looks larger for the South building on Pacific." I'm wondering if this is the same question?

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:49:03] It sounds like the same question. However, this site plans are the same size and scale.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:49:18] Let's see.

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:49:28] I just wanted to clarify that the perspective drawings (illustrations **Slide PAGES 1 & 6**) are not scale, the site plan is, but not the perspective.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:49:38] There's another question. Does this mean the townhouse on Glenlake to the north of 255 Glenlake are off the table?

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:49:47] Yes.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:49:56] "When I spoke to the site plan office two weeks ago, she said site plans tend to take eight to 12 months for approval and they haven't received one yet.

Diana Jardine Retired Planner [01:50:07] And that's correct.

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:50:13] I have a... This is the last one pertaining to the building plans. "Are there any retail in the approved building?"

Shahrzad D. Strike Urban Designer [01:50:29] I believe there is a small retail approved. Diana. Can you confirm that?

Diana Jardine Retired Planner [01:50:34] Yes, I think it's [[]] small retail [[]]. But the information provided is not entirely clear, but certainly the large store [[]] on High Park Avenue, that's been taken out..

Albert Fung - Moderator [01:50:52] OK, so I think that's it for Shahrzad and Diane, thanks very much. Elisa back to you.

Elissa Aknay [01:51:02] OK, that's great. Thanks everybody. We're going to invite [[]] right now [[]] will stick around for a little bit longer if we need them to answer some questions later, so let's go ahead and give Gord [[]] to speak, to do a Q&A with him. [[]] moving on in the timeline.

Councillor Gord Perks' remarks/Q&A

Councillor Gord Perks [01:51:29] Sure. Can I just remind everybody to mute your microphone so that we can get rid of this echo and all understand each other better? So I wanted to start by picking up on the presentation you just saw. And, I'm not going to run through all the numbers and details. I find that with this echo it's just too hard. But, going back in history, you had an application, two applications, that were massive. And then you had a community come together and build a response to that through the study of the area that you did cooperatively with City Planning. And that set out a number of goals. One goal was to reduce the number of units overall. Another goal was to make sure that the buildings got smaller and [[]] impact and [[]] too close to the existing buildings.

Councillor Gord Perks [01:52:46] Another goal. And this one many of you have spoken to me about, was to make sure that everything possible was done to maintain the green and open feel of the neighbourhood. If you look at the presentation you just saw from Shahrzad and Diana, well, we didn't get everything that we agreed to as a community, we met those broad three themes. This [[]] between these two developments, there are hundreds fewer units than were originally applied for. The buildings are generally smaller or shorter, and further apart. And this is especially true at the ground level. The City was able to secure the green open space and parks and tree protection and pedestrian pathways that were in those design guidelines.

[01:54:01] I want to make sure you all understand that is only possible because of the work of the community group and all of you. While some people have said it would have been better to continue the fight and to try to stop this application altogether, I think Ian, your lawyer said it best, which is, given the way planning law works, no matter what happened, something was going to be built there. Elissa started up by talking about the four years of hard work. And if you looked at those diagrams that were presented by Shahrzad and Diana just a minute ago, your hard work paid off. I wanted to address something that Ian said and Elissa referred to in terms of the mediation. I was always and always am a fan of mediation. But as Ian said, after Doug Ford got elected there was no effort made to create

any mediation capacity within the OMB. Private mediation is an entirely different beast. It does not carry a guarantee that it will be respected by the Board member who finally has to settle or accept whatever is done. It doesn't put the same onus on developers to go into those mediation conversations in good faith. And finally, to be absolutely clear, I checked this with the City lawyer, neither Minto nor GWL ever formally agreed to enter into a mediation process. What we had to decide in a very short period of time, because the developers waited until the last minute to make their concessions, was would we do better than these settlements if we went to the OMB?

[01:56:29] Ian pointed out in his presentation, and Elissa talked about this, too, that the developer had successfully made sure that the rules the OMB was going to be hearing this case under were the ones that were absolutely the worst for the community and for the City. Under the rules that this hearing would have had, the developer could have had what's called a "de novo" hearing. They could have brought in even more than what they originally applied for. It's the worst aspect of the OMB and Doug Ford has recently put that back in place.

[01:57:19] On top of that, I want to report to you that just on Friday the Province of Ontario released new rules on community benefits. We don't have a complete review of it yet, but it looks like going forward, the community benefit package that Diana talked about on this property would be impossible to achieve. In fact, we probably wouldn't even get half what we did get. What we were able to get is, Diana laid out some of the numbers and it's all public and you can all review it, but from Minto we got about six and a half million dollars worth of community benefits in the form of things like child care, additional green space and so on, and affordable housing.

[01:58:22] From GWL, we got about eight million dollars worth of benefit to the community for similar reasons, similar things, including park land.

[01:58:33] I will tell you, I have never dealt with a developer as bad as the dealings I had with GWL. Even after the settlement was done and Council approved it, GWL showed up in my office, the only time they ever talked about the whole process, and asked me to pull back some of the agreements they had made for affordable housing. I've never had a developer do that. I had to throw them out of my office. This community was up against incredibly aggressive development pressure. You said you wanted fewer units. We got hundreds fewer. You said you wanted the buildings not to be so close to each other and so big and imposing and blocking out views. We achieved a lot of that. Not as good as what we hoped for in the secondary plan, but we achieved the principles. You said you wanted a lot more protection of the green space and the open feeling of the neighbourhood. And we were able to meet the design criteria in that secondary plan that we all agreed to. This happened because of you. And it happened because of the leadership of people like Elissa and Steve and Diana and Shahrzad, Cathy Brown and all of you. I want to thank you. A lot of communities in Toronto have not done this well recently. The province of Ontario threw out our entire downtown plan and imposed one that was worse than where we started.

They threw out the entire plan for Young and Eglinton and imposed something that was worse than where we started. You've been brave. You've been strong. And it showed results. Thank you.

Elissa Aknay [02:00:37] Thanks, Gord. We're going to open it up for questions and answers with Gord now specifically. In the ground rules [[]] a mixture, everybody gets a chance at [[]] the questions [[]] and then we'll come back [[]] after.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:01:00] So we do have one from previous that we kind of cut off, which is "What has caused the sudden turn around in the City's response to [[]] development application?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:01:14] So I think this is an important question. Just as Ian said, you prepare for war or and hope for peace. With every development application, the City has to think about whether we want to come to an agreement with the developer that we choose or whether we want people appointed by the provincial government to decide. Taking the secondary plan (Area Character Study) that we worked on together with you in the neighborhood, we pushed as hard as we could. In fact, I actually held up the agreement for three days and City Council to get a further concession from Great West Life. In my judgment and in the judgment of the City's lawyers and planners, the agreement we got to was far, far better than what we would have got if we had gone to the OMB. That's not a change in the City's response. That's the way we talked about this development application from day one, we'd fight them as hard as we could, we'd see what concessions they were willing to make, and if they were good enough, better enough than what we would have got OMB, we would settle.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:03:01] Oh, sorry, I was muted. "Could the Councillor talk to the process for securing the community benefits? And can the community have inputs?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:03:12] So the process, and this is a good question too, and this actually is a way for me to talk a little bit about how I and frankly, the good members of City Council, do community benefits. We have a rule, which is why before we even talk about community benefits, we get the buildings to the best state we can get them to. So I didn't have any conversation with the developer or City staff about community benefits until we had got as much as we could on the size of the building, the number of units, the distances between buildings, the heights, the widths of buildings and the green space. Once that happened, and again this was just days before the Council meeting, the planners on the file looked at how much floor area was being agreed to. Look at what you would typically get for that much floor area. And made a proposal to the developers. The developers came back counterproposals, back and forth it went. With Minto, we were able to get an agreement before the Council meeting. And frankly, it's quite generous. And it's public and you can look at it. With Great West Life, as I said, I've never dealt with a more difficult developer in 14 years on City Council being the chair of the Downtown Toronto Community

Council for a lot of that time. They didn't want to agree to a community benefit agreement that would have satisfied the City.

[02:05:08] So I held their item at Council and pushed it to the very end of the meeting and told them I would not agree to their settlement offer if they didn't improve the community benefit offer. Luckily, they conceded and we were able to get a park land, the protection for 700 tenants or so, the green space protections and the other features that the community benefit agreement, there are about 15 of them. It's public and you can look at it. In terms of the community having input, as I said, my hope had always been to get to a mediation. But because the province eliminated the mediation unit at the OMB and neither of the developers ever agreed to have mediation, we were unable to do that.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:06:13] And we have some questions that were mailed in to us a little bit earlier before the meeting. These are also for Perks, "Why did the City drop out stop supporting the HPCA in their fight against the Minto and GWL development applications?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:06:33] Well, I answered a similar question to this one a moment ago, which is that the City did not drop out and we did not stop supporting HPCA. In fact, the agreement you have in front of you was agreed to by the HPCA and the City. It's important to remember what Ian said early in the meeting, there's always, you always prepare for the war, and hope for peace. Based on the principles that the HPCA endorsed in the secondary plan for the area (Area Character Study), we got something that's pretty damn close to that. And we felt that if we went to the OMB we would not be able to protect that. There was nobody advising the community that there was nothing going to be built on this site. Elissa said so at the beginning. Your lawyer told you that, too. It was always gonna be the case that there was something built here.

[02:07:38] What the City did was take the input from the community in a secondary plan, push it as hard as we can to get close to that, even though the OMB said, we could not make the developers meet those requirements. And when we got as close as we could, we came to a settlement which the HPCA later endorsed as well.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:08:09] Councillor, there's a follow up for the community benefits. "So just to be clear, there is no further opportunity for community input in community benefits? They've just been confirmed and decided?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:08:25] By and large, that's true in the main. Like the amounts of money, the number of affordable housing units, things like that. There are some tiny little tweaks that will come in the site plan that will relate to how the green space and the building materials and all of that work that are related to the community benefits. But in terms of the main community benefit agreement, the City has to give, and all the parties including the HPCA, have to give their consent to that agreement when we settle the built

form, which has already been done. So the City, the HPCA and the developers have all agreed to the community benefits agreement.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:09:22] So I think there's a few more. "Any idea if the developers are on track with the reports they need to get done for the October 2020 case conference, or have there been pandemic related timeframe setbacks?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:09:41] I wish I could tell you this. I don't know. For a period of several months the province froze all work at the OMB LPAT. And I don't know if that will affect timetables moving forward. I'll tell you this. It is very much in the developers' interest to get those reports done, because if they don't get them done, then they don't have an agreement to build those buildings.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [02:10:17] I can actually address that very quickly, sorry Councillor Perks to jump in. I can actually say that I had a conversation very recently with Minto's lawyer, and work at Minto in respect of these projects pretty much ground to a halt at COVID, and it's only the last couple of weeks that they've got going again. So that doesn't tell us what the status of these reports are. And just to be clear, on October 30th, what's expected at the LPAT is a status update. So all the parties will write in and say, here's where we are and here's where we expect to go. So certainly from Minto's lawyer, there is a confirmation of a delay related to COVID. And I know that it has been quite hard for both the private sector and the public sector to review plans at the same pace that they did pre-COVID. So I have that answer, at least in respect of Minto.

Councillor Gord Perks [02:11:09] Thanks, Ian.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:11:13] I have some more of the mail-in questions. "Is there any information about the timeframe for starting destruction or construction? How much notice there might be, if any?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:11:34] Here we go through a number of steps. The first step, which Ian was just talking about, is the site plan, and that can take a year, a year and a half. Then there's a construction management plan that has to be done, and I will make sure that all of you are made aware when we're at that phase. So, at a minimum, I would say we're 18 months to two years before construction. There may be applications for demolition in the meantime but that is a public process as well. And I will give you notification if anything like that happens. You should be aware that the City cannot compel the developers to move ahead on a given date. It could be two years. It could be five years. It could be 20 years. It could be never. All that they've got is a general zoning permission. They do not have a building permit. That's way down the road.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:12:48] I think one more. "Can you explain what 'affordable housing' means in this case? Are those units affordable for people on welfare ODSP?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:13:01] So the definitions, and again it's very awkward to go through them because there are two different agreements. But the definitions of affordability that were used at the time we settled this are the ones that the Official Plan sets out which are based on CMHC average rents. And I would not say that we are getting units that will be affordable to people who are on Ontario Works or Ontario Disability Support Program. But again, this is one of the areas where I will tell you GWL, it was just impossible to deal with.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:13:56] We have a final question from our audience right now. "Is a detailed question for the community benefit that involves green space, the developer or owners pay for it and its maintenance? It's not given to the City Park department to take care of?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:14:15] So there actually is more than one answer to this question. And I encourage everybody to look at the Section 37 agreements. They're public, we forwarded to the HPCA and if anyone doesn't have them please get in touch with me and we can share them.

(NB: The Section 37 details approved by Council Dec 17-19, 2019 are posted on the HPCA website)

Councillor Gord Perks Some of the green space is what we call "park land dedication". In the case of parkland dedication, the developer builds [] manages the space up to what we call "base park condition": the soil is clean, the space is well maintained, it's green. Then the City goes in and puts in any amenities, swing sets and so on. The developer pays for all of that. Then, the maintenance of those areas becomes the City's responsibility. Other portions of the Section 37 agreement are what we call a POPS, a publicly accessible open space. In that case, the maintenance and ownership of the green space belongs to the owner of the property and they have to meet a City standard, and if they don't, we can issue a property standards violation notice against them and they have to clean up and maintain.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:15:47] I believe that's all the questions I have for Councillor Perks.

Councillor Gord Perks [02:15:53] Thank you!

Elissa Aknay [02:15:56] OK. So I wonder if Ian has anything he wants to say in response to anything Gord mentioned before we throw it out to a larger Q&A, or if we want to just come right to the larger Q&A?

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [02:16:13] No. Only I would say that having dealt with a number of different Councillors at different communities, Councillor Perks has demonstrated real dedication to be on the line until 9-pm and is one of the more articulate critics of the entire

LPAT system and provides very interesting thoughts on the way that happens. So thanks from me and [[]] else in the community

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:16:42] OK. Sorry. Go ahead.

Elissa Aknay [02:16:45] No, go ahead Albert, I was just going to say that if [[]] any other questions that haven't been answered yet. Thank you to Gord and Ian, who both agreed to stick around for a few extra minutes so that we can get as many questions in as possible. And I apologize for this feedback echo [[]] in the audio.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:17:10] We can start with some of the mailed-in questions earlier for either the Executive or Ian. The first one we got was, a number of people asked the same question, which is their concern about the City approved plans and wanted to know what else can be done to oppose the Minto and Great Westlife development proposals in the High Park North apartment neighborhood.

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [02:17:37] So, just in a nutshell, the HPCA can neither directly nor indirectly oppose the Great West Life and Minto plans. So that's not a question that we're in a position to answer.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:17:56] There, another mail in question, "Can some of the unused funds be donated to the High Park Tenants Association?"

Elissa Aknay [02:18:06] I can answer. So if you think (of money) that is left over from the amount that was raised from the community, as I mentioned, at our probably next and final meeting, we will vote on a community organization to donate those funds to. High Park Tenants Association would by definition of what they do, and how they're an organization, meet the criteria for eligibility to be considered one of the places we can donate any unused funds. And then they will come up with a list based on how much we have leftover and vote on that. Yes, it would be eligible to receive the funds.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:18:58] I'm just catching up on some of the questions that we didn't get to earlier. So this is kind of talking about the settlements. "Does this mean that the agreement of the settlement is that we are muzzled? And we are not allowed to know how we've affected the developments?"

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [02:19:22] So , I'm just going to read the question and make sure I fully understand, "does this mean that the agreement of the settlement is [[]] muzzled? So, "we" as in the High Community Association, if you want to use the word "muzzled" I'm not sure that's quite the right word to use. But certainly as an incorporated body the Association cannot directly or indirectly interfere with the developers getting their building permits, and they're not allowed to [[]] effect the development. You know, I think Councillor Perks went through in some detail the process, at least from the City's point of view, and confirmed that it was in fact the organization, the community, that led to

blueprint for a plan, which in turn empowered the City to get what it did from the developers as a final settlement. I will say that when I read the settlement, I didn't think that we, I didn't think that it was something to celebrate. But I was in some instances surprised by how much reduction there was by the two applicants. So I think that Shahrzad's presentation and a side by side comparison of the 2017 submission to the 2019 resubmission tells the tale of how you affected the development.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:20:54] All right, another one. "Will it be possible to disclose the settlement within a period of time? "

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [02:21:03] You know, it's theoretically possible. I do mull around...there are terms of the settlement that I don't think would necessarily be controversial, and it is possible that parties who make an agreement can return to the agreement and revise aspects of it. So I wouldn't say that it's over the bounds of possibility that aspects of it might be able to be disclosed. But unfortunately, at this time, we're [[]].

Councillor Gord Perks [02:21:36] If I could add something, it's Gord. The actual buildings, all of that stuff, all of the design, all of that, that's public and done. So whatever is hanging out there, and I haven't seen it with the HPCA, that doesn't affect the size and shape of the buildings, the number of units, the footprint, any of that. That's done. All the parties, HPCA, the City and the two developers have agreed to all of that. And all of that is public.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:22:14] One last one for Ian. "In the settlement were the rights increased compensation for displaced tenants discussed?"

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [02:22:25] So as a general principle there's a thing called "settlement privilege", and conversations towards settlement remain confidential in between the parties. I can say that tenant issues were at the forefront of the HPCA's concerns going into the negotiations at that late stage. But I unfortunately can't get into the nuts and bolts of precisely what was discussed.

Councillor Gord Perks [02:22:56] I can add one thought, it's Gord again. In the Section 37 agreements which are public and you can see, the City did secure rights for displaced tenants. And it's all spelled out there in accordance with the City policies, which, by the way, are the best in Canada for tenant relocation. That's all dealt with in the public agreement between the City and the applicants.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:23:32] So I think we have a few more just in general, not just for Ian or HPCA.

Elissa Aknay [02:23:38] Can I actually just say one thing? I know we've mentioned Section 37 quite a bit. We can look into posting a copy of that on the Web site to make it easily accessible for everybody.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:23:57] So one of the questions we had, this is probably kind of touched on this earlier. But, "Will, the single pane aluminum windows at 65 High Park Avenue and other buildings be replaced before construction or destruction?" I believe Barbi kindly volunteered to answer this earlier. So I'm going to go ahead to the next one, unless we have anything else to add?

Caller [02:24:25] So [[]] to see that now that Gord explained we are probably still looking at least a year to two years before construction begins. As long as they keep their word, definitely they are [[]] plans to be replaced before that.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:24:42] Awesome. Thank you, Barbi. So the next one would be "What provisions would be made for moving in or out of 65 High Park Avenue if the South driveway and loading ramp are closed due to construction?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:25:02] I'll take this it's Gord. So, a year or two from now when we get to the construction management plan questions like this will be dealt with and you'll be part of that conversation. I will want to know from you what needs we need to protect. And the decision on the construction management plan is a public decision. So you'll be able to treat it as it goes forward. We will make sure that whatever needs people have moving in or out or doing their daily business are protected.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:25:45] Thanks Gord. And then we have the last one, "Will there be provisions made for electric vehicles? And if not, why not?"

Councillor Gord Perks [02:26:03] It's Gord. So, we did not get specific protection for electric vehicles as part of the settlement here. Many developers are choosing to do it on their own now. The City is also working on an electric vehicle strategy to make sure that charging stations are publicly accessible around the City. That's a couple of years out before we're going to be able to offer that. The decision on the part of the developer about whether or not to make provisions for electric vehicles is something I haven't heard [[]].

Ian Flett - HPCA lawyer [02:26:39] I'll just echo Gord's comment that most developers now are roughing in electrical connections, so they're not necessarily putting the wiring in, but they're making it easy to install the wiring as a retrofit.

Councillor Gord Perks [02:26:53] Yes. Thank you for that Ian.

Elissa Aknay [02:26:57] Hi, it's Elissa again. This is one last question, and it is basically the one we've gotten over and over again. It's somewhat been answered tonight, but I want to make it clear for everybody. Ian has mentioned, there is nothing further High Park Community Alliance can do to prevent these applications, these developments from going forward. Is there anything that would stop these developments from going forward? Is there anything that people would do on any end, anywhere that could prevent these

developments as they were agreed to by the City, by the developers and by HPCA settling, from moving forward?

Councillor Gord Perks [02:27:47] Basically, by signing off on this, by being a party to this hearing and settling, the HPCA has surrendered its right to, you know, seek a judicial review or some other tool like that. I'll tell you right now, there is no grounds for a judicial review here. There is no legal avenue to stop the zoning permission from going forward. The City is now in a process and you'll be kept informed as this is going on and your advice will be sought on some very fine details under what is called a "Site Plan" [[]]. You cannot in law use something like a site plan to try to stop the building from going up altogether. You can argue about whether a tree should be two feet to the right or two feet to the left or whether they should use brick or concrete. That kind of stuff. And it has to be a good faith effort to get the building built. With all of that said, I do not know for a fact that these buildings will ever be built. It is 99% likely, but there are many, many buildings in the City of Toronto that received zoning permission to be built that have not been built yet. A lot of that depends on the market globally for housing, for the economic health of Great West Life as a business and all of those kinds of things. So, no, the community cannot take actions to try to stop these buildings from going forward.

President's closing /next steps/adjournment

Elissa Aknay [02:29:46] OK. Thank you very much for answering that because that is something we've repeatedly gotten questions about from not just like people in the part of HPCA, but just people as individuals. So thank you for clarifying that. That is all the questions that we have. I want to thank everybody for participating tonight. So in terms of next steps, again, about the grant that we got, we are working to solidify the plan to transfer those funds the HPCA has on its books to an organization that can administer them to help with Landlord and Tenant Board matters, rent abatements, that sort of thing. And we will update the community when that's finalized. We're going to have Ian Flett attend the October LPAT case conference to get an update and we will send an e-mail out updating the community after we have information from that hearing date. And then, as I mentioned several times, High Park Community Alliance was created for the purpose of addressing these two applications specifically. We had to incorporate to go before the OMB. But it was always our intention of dismantling HPCA when there was a final outcome of the community's involvement in challenging the applications. We've consulted with our lawyer. There is no other way the HPCA can challenge the applications. It is likely by the end of this year or early 2021, we will have a final meeting to present the last financial statement, vote on dismantling the HPCA, and vote on how to spend any leftover funds raised by the community. Our constitution lays out that we have to give it to a local

nonprofit. People have thrown out various ideas, including other community organizations, environmental groups. Closer to our next meeting we will send out an email asking people to send us suggestions so that we have some in advance for our membership to consider and vote on. And we will also confirm how much is available to be donated at that time. So thank you all for attending and participating and going through with the awkward technology of the virtual meeting. Thank you to Shahzad and Diana. Thank you to Gord Perks and Ian Flett. Thank you to Richard and Steve and Albert. And please everybody, have a good night. Stay safe. And now I'm going to move to and move to end the 2020 HPCA A.G.M.

Albert Fung - Moderator [02:32:44] Seconded.

Elissa Aknay [02:32:47] Thanks, Albert. Take care, everybody. Thank you.