



Barristers & Solicitors

Bay Adelaide Centre
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2S7

Telephone: 416.979.2211
Facsimile: 416.979.1234
goodmans.ca

Direct Line: 416.597.4119
rhouser@goodmans.ca

April 20, 2021

Our File No.: 151681

Via Email

Toronto and East York Community Council
2nd Floor, West Tower, City Hall
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Attention: Ellen Devlin, Secretariat

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

Re: TE24.11 – King-Parliament Secondary Plan Review – Final Report, Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments

We are counsel to First Gulf King Street Inc. (the “**Owner**”), the owner of the property known municipally as 333 King Street East and 200 Front Street East (the “**Property**”). We write on behalf of our client to express concerns with respect to draft Official Plan Amendment No. 525 (the “**Draft OPA**”) regarding the King-Parliament area, and the associated draft zoning by-law amendment for the Old Town Policy Area (the “**Draft ZBA**”).

As outlined further below, our client filed a rezoning application (the “**Application**”) for the Property in 2018 and is engaging constructively with City staff in processing site-specific zoning amendments for the Property. In our view, the Application is the appropriate mechanism for resolving the planning permissions for the Property.

Background

The Property comprises the central and western portions of the block bounded by King Street East, Berkeley Street, Front Street East and Princess Street (the “**Block**”). Formerly the site of the Toronto Sun offices and printing presses, the Property is currently the site of retail and office uses. With the exception of 54 Berkeley Street, the balance of the Block to the east of the Property is owned by an entity related to the Owner and is home to the Globe & Mail Centre.

In July of 2018, the Owner submitted the Application to facilitate a new office tower in the central portion of the Property as well as a new residential tower on the southwestern portion of the Property. Since filing the Application, our client has been engaging productively with City staff and the community. A community meeting was held in April of 2019, and detailed discussions with City staff and local residents associations have continued since then.

Building on the input received through this consultation process, our client filed a resubmission in May of 2020 and expects to file a further resubmission in the coming weeks which incorporates feedback obtained through additional engagement with City staff and the local Councillor.

The Proposed King-Parliament Amendments

The City's initiative to update the planning instruments for the King-Parliament area began in early 2019, well after the filing of the Application. An initial version of the Draft OPA was released in November of 2019 (the "**2019 Draft OPA**"). By letter dated June 12, 2020 addressed to planning staff, our client's planning consultants, Urban Strategies Inc., outlined a series of concerns with the 2019 Draft OPA. Those concerns focused on built form standards relating to setbacks and stepbacks, among other things.

While the numerical aspects of the built form standards have been removed from the Draft OPA, the principles largely remain. Further, many of the same numerical standards that were found in the 2019 Draft OPA are now proposed to be included in the Draft ZBA. For example, the Draft ZBA would impose a minimum setback of the streetwall of 3m and a minimum stepback above that streetwall of 5m. The Draft ZBA also imposes a 90m height limit. These standards do not reflect the particular built form context of the Property and its surroundings, which includes a diverse array of heights and approaches to massing.

A more fundamental concern relates to the absence of clear transition provisions in the Draft OPA and Draft ZBA to address in-progress planning matters such as the Application. As outlined above, our client has engaged in an extensive planning process with City staff and the community to establish appropriate forms of development for the Property in light of its specific circumstances. It is our expectation that the Application will be the mechanism through which planning permissions for the Property are resolved.

In these circumstances, it would be appropriate to include transition policies in the Draft OPA, similar to those in the approved Downtown Plan and Midtown Plan, providing that the OPA does not apply to complete applications filed prior to approval of the Draft OPA. Similar provisions could be included in the Draft ZBA. This approach would allow the constructive approval process for the Application that is already well underway to come to a conclusion, to establish planning permissions for the Property in a manner that appropriately takes into account its specific context.

Conclusion

Our client looks forward to continuing to work productively with City staff in processing the Application. In the meantime, we ask that this communication be treated as our client's written representation in respect of the Draft OPA and Draft ZBA in accordance with the *Planning Act*. We would also appreciate receiving notice of any decision of City Council in respect of this matter.

Yours truly,

Goodmans LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Houser". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter "R" being large and stylized.

Roslyn Houser
RH/MXL

cc. Clients

7154123.2