Stikeman Elliott

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

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

Calvin Lantz

Direct: (416) 869-5669 clantz@stikeman.com

September 29, 2017 File No.: 137369.1001 By E-mail clerk@toronto.ca

City Council
City of Toronto
12th Floor, West Tower, City Hall
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON
M5H 2N2

Attention: Ms. Marilyn Toft

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

Re: TE26.14 - Designation of the King-Spadina Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act 49-51 Camden Street

We are counsel to 49 Camden Street Holdings Ltd. and 51 Camden Street Holdings Ltd. (the "Client"), the owners of the properties municipally known in the City of Toronto as 49-51 Camden Street (the "Property"). The Property is located within the proposed King-Spadina Heritage Conservation District.

Our Client has reviewed the draft King-Spadina Heritage Conservation District Plan, and in particular, the draft plan dated June 2017 (the "**Draft HCD Plan**"), which is included as Attachment 5 to the Report for Action from the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, dated June 14, 2017.

As outlined in our previous submission to the Toronto and East York Community Council, dated September 6, 2017, we wish to reiterate our Client's concerns regarding the Draft HCD Plan.

The policies and guidelines of the Draft HCD Plan impose overly prescriptive built form requirements for development. Such unduly restrictive requirements are inappropriate for a high-level policy document like the Draft HCD Plan, which does not contain a mechanism for amendment or appeal once the HCD Plan is in effect.

Our Client is also concerned that the Draft HCD Plan does not contain transition policies to deal with developments that have already secured zoning approvals, but for which demolition or building permits have yet to be issued. As a result, it is possible that even though an owner has already obtained zoning approvals for a proposed development, the City may, following the adoption of the Draft HCD Plan, refuse the issuance of a heritage permit for demolition or construction, notwithstanding the zoning approvals already secured for the development.

This concern is especially pertinent to our Client's Zoning By-law Amendment application for a hotel development on the Property, which was approved by City Council through Council's decision on July 12, 2016. Our Client is concerned that the Draft HCD Plan will impose inappropriate restrictions on the development of the Property that are inconsistent with Council's approval. The Draft HCD Plan should not be used to undermine prior approvals that have been negotiated in good faith with the City and approved

Stikeman Elliott

by Council. For this reason, to address the situation described above, we respectfully request that: (1) the Draft HCD Plan be revised to include sufficient transition provisions; (2) the Draft HCD Plan be revised to include sufficient provisions for site-specific policies and amendments to the Draft HCD Plan; or (3) that the Property be excluded from the Draft HCD Plan. We are happy to explore these possible solutions with City staff, and we strongly urge City Council not to accept the recommendations to designate and adopt the Draft HCD Plan until meaningful consultation is undertaken by City staff to address these concerns.

Please provide us with notice of all other meetings of Council and Committees of Council at which the proposed designation of the King-Spadina Heritage Conservation District and the adoption of the Heritage Conservation District Plan will be considered, and any notice of Council's decision with respect thereto.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact the undersigned. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours truly,

Calvin Lantz

CL/jsc

cc. Clients