



Reply Attention of Mary Flynn-Guglietti  
 Direct Line 416.865.7256  
 Internet Address mary.flynn@mcmillan.ca  
 Our File No. 242169  
 Date September 5, 2017

**DELIVERED BY EMAIL – [teycc@toronto.ca](mailto:teycc@toronto.ca)**

The Toronto and East York Community Council  
 City of Toronto  
 City Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 100 Queen Street West  
 Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

**Attention: Ms. Ellen Devlin, Secretariat**

Dear Chair and Members of the Toronto and East York Community Council:

**Re: September 6, 2017 TEYCC Meeting  
 Item No. TE26.14  
 Designation of the King-Spadina Heritage Conservation  
 District under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*  
 Our Client: 462 Wellington Inc.  
 Property: 462 Wellington Street West, City of Toronto**

We are the solicitors retained to act on behalf of 462 Wellington Inc. (“**462 Wellington**”), the owner of lands municipally known as 462 Wellington Street West (the “**Property**”), which is located in the City’s downtown and specifically within the boundary of the proposed King-Spadina Heritage Conservation District (“**King Spadina HCD**”). On behalf of 462 Wellington I attended at the Toronto Preservation Board (“**TPB**”) meeting held on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 and made an oral presentation to the TPB to address our client’s concerns. We have now had an opportunity to review the recommendations from the Chief Planner and Executive Director of City Planning recommending adoption of the King Spadina HCD. It is our submission that it is premature for the TEYCC to recommend adoption of the King Spadina HCD until such time that the concerns raised in the numerous written and oral submissions have been appropriately addressed.

While we acknowledge that the goal of preserving the City’s history is a laudable goal however, preservation should not ignore the need for appropriate change and growth. The proposed King Spadina HCD isolates the goals and objectives of the plan to a specific historical period (1880 -1940) and ignores the numerous modifications and renovations that have occurred during the evolution of the area. It is overly onerous to expect present landowners to restore properties to previous building iterations. It is also equally unfair and onerous to classify extensively modified and renovated buildings to the category of contributing properties and then require strict adherence to the contribution property policies.

