



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: 416.597.4299  
dbronskill@goodmans.ca

April 20, 2021

Our File No.: 202165

**Via Email: [teycc@toronto.ca](mailto:teycc@toronto.ca)**

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

**Attention: Ellen Devlin, Secretariat**

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

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

We are solicitors for King Street I GP Inc., who are the owners of the properties known municipally in the City of Toronto as 234-250 King Street East (the “**Properties**”). We are writing to provide our client’s concerns in respect of the draft Secondary Plan and the draft Zoning By-law Amendments (the “**Draft ZBA**”) pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*.

At the outset, we would urge that Toronto and East York Community Council defer, at a minimum, consideration of the Draft ZBA. Our understanding is that the Draft ZBA was only released last week. This late release of the Draft ZBA makes it difficult to provide a full review and comment before the statutory public meeting.

We would also urge Toronto and East York Community Council to consider inclusion of a transition provision in the draft Secondary Plan as contained in the approved versions of the Downtown Plan and Midtown Plan. On December 23, 2020, our client submitted a complete rezoning application for the Properties. It would be contrary to established case law to evaluate this application pursuant to the draft Secondary plan. Instead, it is both fair and good planning to include such a transition provision to ensure that the legal basis for consideration of the rezoning application filed for the Properties follows the well-established principle that an application is entitled to be evaluated pursuant to the policies in force at the time of the application. Inclusion of a transition provision may even eliminate the need for an appeal.

Absent inclusion of a transition provision, our client has the following preliminary concerns:

Draft Secondary Plan

- Policy 1.5: This policy should be deleted. Not only is it unnecessary because it duplicates a requirement of the *Planning Act* but also it inappropriately references the Heritage Conservation District Plan. If this policy is to remain without revision, the Draft ZBA must be deferred until the Heritage Conservation District Plan is revised to comply with the directions in the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal decision.
- Policy 2.2: This policy is confusing and should be revised. Although it purports to preserve or expand non-residential gross floor area for cultural spaces, the operative policies would require a minimum of 25 per cent of the total proposed gross floor area in a redevelopment to be non-residential uses, regardless of whether or not such GFA is for cultural spaces. A similar policy in the Downtown Plan was revised to encourage the replacement of cultural spaces, recognizing this would be treated as a community benefit. Policy 2.2 should be deleted or at least revised to be consistent with the Downtown Plan to encourage the replacement of existing cultural space gross floor area.
- Policy 2.3: Although the non-residential replacement policies proposed in Official Plan Amendment No. 231 remain under appeal, this proposed policy would conflict with the direction in OPA 231, which allows for replacement within 500 metres of a rapid transit station or anywhere in the Downtown and Central Waterfront.
- Policy 3.5.1: The potential application of this policy is unclear. Various provisions of the *Planning Act*, including but not limited to Section 37 and Section 42, provide the mechanisms for the City to require an application to provide community service facilities and/or parkland. Further, the City has a responsibility for the provision of certain matters through the *Planning Act*, the *City of Toronto Act, 2006*, and the *Development Charges Act*. This policy needs to be clarified to ensure it does not require private contributions beyond statutory obligations or otherwise limit appropriate optimization of land and infrastructure in the event that the City has not fulfilled its statutory obligations.
- Policy 3.5.3: This policy must be revised because it inappropriately elevates zoning by-laws to the status of policy. In addition, and as one example, Official Plan Amendment No. 352 provides policy guidance for reduction of tower setbacks meaning that it is possible to reduce certain performance standards in conformity with applicable official plan policies.
- Policy 4.2: The vague nature of this policy should be reconsidered. Not only is the reference to “additional design responses” overly broad but also it would create uncertainty in the application of the draft Secondary Plan, especially when the policy includes cross-references to the Draft ZBA and urban design guidelines.

- Policies 5.1-5.3 & 5.6: The Downtown Plan specifically recognizes that certain expansions to the public realm network appropriately qualify as community benefits. The draft Secondary Plan should be revised to be consistent with the Downtown Plan.
- Policy 5.9: The prescriptive requirements for new mid-block connections should be deleted or revised. It is not appropriate to require an official plan amendment if a new mid-block connection is not 4.0 metres or is partially covered. Such instances may be appropriate on a site-specific basis and should be implemented without a requirement for an official plan amendment.
- Policies 5.10 & 5.12: These policies are an inappropriate extension of the City's specific legal authority under the *Planning Act* and should be deleted or revised.
- Policy 8.1: The use of the "context-specific" in this policy and other policies is problematic without clarification of the context. The parent Official Plan provides guidance regarding the existing and planned context, but this policy (and others in the draft Secondary Plan) do not recognize that this area is planned for growth and that development applications must be reviewed within this planned context.
- Policy 8.3: This policy is unduly restrictive. A blanket prohibition on buildings cantilevering over setbacks at all, even above certain heights, is inappropriately rigid and ignores site-specific context or existing development patterns in certain areas. Further, the policy appears to exclude below-grade projections into a setback but such potential should be specifically included.
- Policy 8.6: This policy is vague and unclear and could be read as inappropriately elevating zoning permissions into Official Plan policies without recognizing that this area is planned for growth. This represents an inappropriate approach to the draft Secondary Plan, especially when Official Plan Amendment No. 352 has been revised through its appeal process to include a process for determining adequate tower separation in the Downtown.
- Policy 8.7.2: The intent to limit large areas of glass along King Street East is inappropriately restrictive when glass may be appropriate for certain aspects of a development where retail is proposed. If this is not the intent of this policy, it should be revised to eliminate its ambiguity.

#### Draft ZBA

- General comments: In general, the Draft ZBA does not result in optimization of land and infrastructure within the King-Parliament area, including on the Properties. Further, the above-noted Local Planning Appeal Tribunal decision regarding the proposed heritage conservation district plan still needs to be implemented. This decision removed certain

matters from inclusion in the proposed plan, but it appears that the City is now proposing that these matters be included in the Draft ZBA without sufficient analysis.

- Heights/Streetwall Heights: Our preliminary review of the Draft ZBA indicates that the proposed overall height and streetwall heights do not reflect the pattern of growth in the area and are unduly limiting. Further, the approach to streetwall heights would remove the ability for flexibility, especially at corners or when a site is appropriate for infill.
- Setbacks: It appears that the Draft ZBA would require a minimum 3.0 metre setback. This is overly prescriptive and should be removed from the Draft ZBA with the appropriate setback determined on a site-specific basis. As noted above, our client has concerns that such a setback represents an inappropriate expansion of the City's authority to take land without recognizing the corresponding community benefit.
- Stepbacks: It appears that the Draft ZBA would require a minimum stepback of 10.0 metres in certain situations. Such an extensive stepback is without justification and should be deleted.

Again, with the Draft ZBA released late and without a fair opportunity for review, we would urge Toronto and East York Community Council to defer consideration of these materials for one cycle. It would also enable staff to report back on why they are not recommending use of a transition provision.

We would also appreciate this letter being treated as our client's request for notice of any decision made in respect of both the draft Secondary Plan and draft Zoning By-law Amendments.

Yours truly,

**Goodmans LLP**



David Bronskill  
DJB/  
7153617

Cc: Client