CC43.17.2



June 26, 2018

To: Mayor John Tory and Councillors

Toronto City Hall

Re Agenda Item CC 43.17 – 89 Church LPAT Appeal

The Local Planning Appeal Tribunal has recognized Spire Condominium as a Participant in the above-noted appeal. I attach our LPAT Participant Statement, submitted to the Tribunal earlier this month, emphasizing the need to avoid negative impacts on the iconic silhouette view of St. James Cathedral from Front Street.

In addition, we have grave concerns regarding the proposal's proposed 20+ density as well as the absence of a POPS contribution.

I have requested the City Clerk to place our Participant Statement on your agenda as an attachment to this letter.

Since the City Solicitor's report on your agenda is confidential, we are unable to determine the impact of its recommendations. However, we urge Council to avoid adopting recommendations that would negatively affect the iconic silhouette view of St. James Cathedral from its Front Street viewpoint.

Sincerely,

Non Morrisi

Ian Morrison President obo Board of Directors, TSCC-1864 33 Lombard Street, Toronto

Enc.



June 7, 2018

Participant Statement — Spire Condominium (TSCC 1864), 33 Lombard Street, Toronto, ON, M5C 3H8 (management@thespire.ca)

LPAT Case Number PL170328

This statement focuses primarily on an iconic view of St. James' Cathedral — the view from Front Street through the Sculpture Garden. The iconic view emerged serendipitously decades ago, when buildings were demolished on Front Street and on the future Sculpture Garden site on the south side of King Street East. More recently, the Market Square buildings were aligned to open up the view from Front Street. And later still, the City's Official Plan was amended to prohibit future obstruction of this view.

The sky beyond the Cathedral is a key component of this iconic view. The sky component frames what is known as the "silhouette view"¹ — a view that the Spire Condominium has helped to protect. To permit our building's construction, the City transferred development rights from the Cathedral lands to our property. As a result, buildings currently on the Cathedral lands utilize all of the on-site development potential — with the effect that silhouette views cannot be compromised by future development on the Cathedral's lands.

The 89 Church Case, now before the Tribunal, involves the nearest potential development site to the north of the Cathedral. Given this proximity, the view from Front Street can be materially affected by the

¹ The significance of silhouette views can be appreciated, for example, at various locations on Bay Street. From locations south of Temperance Street, buildings beyond Old City Hall loom over its roof — compromising the heritage view. However an observer at Temperance Street (or farther north) sees only clear sky above the roof.

Tribunal's decision. Three issues in the Procedural Order are especially relevant to consideration of the current development proposal:

Has the Proposal been designed to conserve the cultural heritage values, attributes and character of the designated heritage property, St. James Cathedral, and to mitigate visual impact on it?

Does the Proposal negatively impact and undermine the historic character of the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood?

Is the Proposal in keeping with the provincial interest, the public interest and the legislative intent and policy framework respecting the protection and conservation of heritage properties, as it relates to St. James Cathedral and the historic St. Lawrence Neighbourhood?²

Before examining the current proposal for 89 Church from this perspective, it is necessary to consider an already-approved development farther north — a 52-storey tower at the southeast corner of Church and Dundas (see Appendix). While construction of that tower hasn't commenced, units are currently being marketed by the developer (Pemberton Group). If that tower is built as planned, as seems likely, it will intrude into the silhouette Cathedral view up to a point just below the clock — unless buildings yet to be approved conceal that 52-storey tower when viewed from Front Street.

A 24-storey building at 89 Church will just conceal the 52-storey Church-Dundas tower without further intrusion into the silhouette view.³ A building taller than 24 storeys would be inappropriate — not only due to further intrusion into the silhouette view, but also due to exceeding an appropriate maximum height for new buildings in the vicinity — i.e. along Church Street in the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood. A maximum in this range is supported by visual evidence: the 25-storey 60 Colborne project, newly completed two

² The Procedural Order was circulated by the Tribunal on May 10. The above-noted issues, which overlap to some degree, are numbers 9 to 11 (respectively) on the list submitted to the Tribunal by the City.

³ The Cathedral's Participant Statement is our authority for the above-cited 24-storey height, and for the point on the Cathedral spire an observer on Front Street will see as aligned with the Church-Dundas tower's roof line.

blocks south, is at the upper limit of acceptability when viewed as a precedent for other sites.in the vicinity.⁴

As noted above, a 24-storey building at 89 Church will loom behind the Cathedral up to a point just below the clock when viewed from Front Street. An appropriate design for the building could mitigate negative impacts on that view. The photo on the following page, taken looking eastbound on May 26, 2018 from a bridge over Queen Street, will serve as illustration. The photo shows two buildings behind the Old City Hall Clock tower: the building on the right is the office building at 20 Queen West, while the building on the left is the Massey Tower condominium — still under construction, but sufficiently complete that its impact on the silhouette view is clear.

As is evident in the photo, 20 Queen West blends deferentially with the sky, minimizing its impact on the silhouette view. Conversely, the Massey Tower draws attention to itself, competing with the clock tower for attention. The 89 Church design as currently proposed resembles the Massey Tower's design; however, there is no evident reason why its south elevation could not be redesigned to blend deferentially with the sky.

<u>Recommendation</u>: We urge the Tribunal to consider an order limiting the height of an 89 Church building to 24 stories, with the added requirement that its south elevation be redesigned to blend deferentially with the sky.

Respectfully submitted by:

Ja Monon

Ian Morrison President Spire Condominium Board of Directors

⁴ The Spire at 33 Lombard is obviously taller but, as indicated above, it includes permitted density not just from its own site but from the St. James Cathedral site as well. The two sites should be considered together.



Appendix

Elevation Drawings: Approved 52-storey Tower at Church and Dundas (southeast corner)

Note: north and south elevations of the 52-storey tower, called "Social at Church + Dundas", are shown on the next page. If the tower is built as approved, and if no structure is built at 89 Church, the south elevation would be visible behind the Cathedral up to a point just below the clock. Given this reality, an appropriately designed 24 storey building at 89 Church could be preferable to no building at 89 Church.

| | | | -0.0456 T 8245 | ~ | | TO.FMANET ZELS | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| | | | 8 | | TR IN | 8 | |
| | 1 BRCK | | | | | | |
| | 2 CURTAIN WALL | | | | | 23461 g | |
| | * WNDOW WALL | | MERICAT / SHEET | HEDRANCH, FORDING | | | |
| | CLASS BALCONY BLARD | | Land Artes | LEVEL 22 OF TOOR APPRICATES ALS | | Lawrent / James H | |
| | S ARCHITECTURAL SCHEEN | | and this ! | | TRIFFIC NUMBER | Level (Sile) | |
| | E METAL PANEL | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Contract of the second second second |
| | THE DESCRIPTION OF A REAL | | | | THE PROPERTY NAMES AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY | | regione de la companya de la compa |
| | | | | | | | 1000 |
| | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | The second se | | THE REAL |
| | | [[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] | | | | Court of Casa B | NOT DO NOT THE REAL PROPERTY. |
| | | | Loverty (Masso) | | | 1000 15 / 865 W | NUMBER OF A DESCRIPTION |
| | | | 100010 (mm) | | | train of the A | |
| | | | 1-44 / 72.00 | | | Tank Trans A | |
| | | DELL'ENTER AND | Level 0 / 2527 | | | Levers / Jun 1 | |
| | | | | | min in a state of the state of | Law of Control B | |
| | | | | | TRATITINA TOWNER | 8 | |
| | | THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE | | | THE THE A REPORT OF | 2 | |
| | | | | | THE DITCH SHITTER | 8 | NUMBER BUILDED |
| | | | | | 1 Mainter Station of Mainter | 8 | |
| | | | Level 30 / 20102 8 | | | Land 37 / 30166 3 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | int Nin | | III | 1 met 20 2 | |
| | | Instruction of the second second | Level 34 / Star | | million and an an | Les H BB | |
| | | | | | | Lood Sta / Security B | |
| | | | 1000 | | I THE FREE REFERENCE | Long Can I | |
| | | And the second s | | | | | |
| | | | | | NUTHIN STRATT | B | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | INCOMENTATION OF A DESCRIPTION OF A DESC | Level 28 / 04.5 | B | INTERPORT OF THE PARTY OF | Land X Tong A | |
| | | MICH MICH PROPERTY IN COMPANY | Serveral Street | 3 | milis first | Lener Star 2 | |
| | | | | - | | internet | |
| | | | Lennis Frain I | | IN A COLUMN A COLUMN TO THE | Level 25 / State A | |
| | | http://///////////////////////////////// | | | marin a strand | | |
| | | 1 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1 | | | TREASURE AND | | |
| | | | | | I THE THE REAL PROPERTY IN THE REAL PROPERTY INTO THE REA | 8 | |
| | | | | | TO THE AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNE OWNER | | |
| | | | | | i the second sec | | |
| | | | | | | | - |
| | | III THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF | Levels / Hitce 3 | | III ADAL DATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF | Laws 20 10200 | |
| | | | invest / Man | | | Anna Anna | |
| | | | ient" WOR | | NO. TO A CONTRACT OF A CONTRAC | Lest and | |
| | | | Level 15 / Data | | | Level 6 / State 1 | NOT TO ARE ADD STREET |
| | | | ann (and I | | TRACTICE AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF THE | | -1 40 13700720 -1 40 13700720 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 14072 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1001'2 267 | | CHARTER CONTRACTOR | | |
| | | | Level 1/ ALLA | | | | PEMBERTON GR |
| | | | instruction and | | | | |
| | | | Land2/17.00 | | | AND 100 A | |
| | | difference in the second se | unds / tun | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 1.00 |
| | | | Lande ma | | | NULLIVE MARKEN MARKEN | NORTH AND SOL |
| | | | | senorcouves - | | | ELEVATIONS |
| | | | | | | Lost / HAB N | |
| | | | | | | Lovet Mile B | 2.702 |
| | 1 NORTH ELEVATION | | | 2 SOUTH ELEVATION | | | 1.300 |
| | * 007070 | | mm | | | | A402 |
| | G.AM C | | 1000 | | | | A402 |
| | | | ANY DECK. ANY | | | AND LEASES / THE P | |